



SHAKER HEIGHTS

Landmark Commission / Architectural Board of Review Minutes
Wednesday, May 24, 2023
7 P.M.
Via Zoom Webinar

Members Present: Nancy Moore, Landmark Commission, Chair
Stephanie Ryberg-Webster, Landmark Commission, Member
Crystal Montgomery, Landmark Commission, Member
Ron Reed, Landmark Commission, Member
Jason Carroll, Landmark Commission, Member
Meghan Hays, 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
Phil Koepf, Architect, Project Representative

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

* * * *

Approval of the March 22, 2023, Meeting Minutes

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

Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * *

Certificate of Appropriateness: 13051 Larchmere Blvd – Resubmission, Rear Façade Renovation.

Ms. Mates presented the project proposal for 13051 Larchmere Blvd, built in 1955, which lies in the Shaker Square Historic District and is one of 106 buildings that make up the Historic District, established in 1980. As such, the project requires review by both the Landmark Commission and the Architectural Board of Review.

Ms. Mates described the existing conditions of the rear building façade, which include a brick wall enclosure and canopy over the rear entry door. She then reviewed the proposed renovations that include a new 7’ screen fence enclosure that will replace the existing brick wall and conceal the utilities,

CITY OF SHAKER HEIGHTS

a new 9' cooler enclosure, and a new 10'-high metal canopy to support and conceal the new exhaust system. She noted a portion of the remaining brick screen wall will be retained at the corner of the east and north facades if possible.

Ms. Mates shared images illustrating the existing conditions. She then presented drawings of the proposed façade renovations and shared images of the proposed material for the new screen 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 both as proposed and with conditions at 13051 Larchmere Boulevard, Scorpacciata, 13165 Larchmere Blvd., the BP Gas Station, and 2500 Kemper Road, the Cleveland Skating Club.

Ms. Mates summarized the staff recommendation supporting the renovations with the following condition:

- The rear enclosure material should be a dark industrial metal that matches the new storefront canopies and creates consistency between the front and rear facades.

Chair Moore ask Mr. Koepf if he would like to add any comments. Mr. Koepf had no additional comments but noted it is a unique project where they are working to accommodate and conceal equipment, utilities, and exhaust systems in a tight space. He added they are recommending to leave the remaining angled brick wall in place to protect the new fencing in a tight parking lot.

Ms. Hays asked Mr. Koepf about the brick wall that will be retained as it was not noted in the drawing. Mr. Koepf explained the brick wall is shown in the plan and the elevation shows the proposed fence, but his preference is to retain the remaining brick wall.

Mr. Koepf clarifies that part of the remaining wall will be taken down to install the new cooler and added that the existing brick wall is 4 feet tall.

Ms. Hays asked if there are any drawings or illustrations of where the existing brick wall will meet the new, proposed fence to show the juxtaposition of the two elements. Mr. Koepf noted the new fence will be 7' tall and the existing brick fence is 4' tall.

Ms. Ryberg-Webster asked if there are any concerns about reduced visibility at the building corner where the fence is 7' high and recommended clear signage for entrancing and exiting the parking lot. Mr. Koepf noted there is parking directly behind the fence so there will be little traffic in that area and signage is already in place.

Mr. Petznick inquired about the open and closed slats for fencing and where each would be used because two different types are shown in the proposed material images. Mr. Koepf clarified his preference is to use an open fence to allow air flow but the fencing has not been assigned yet. He also noted he will leave a 1' gap between the top of the fence and the canopy to allow air and light to penetrate the space.

Mr. Petznick asked why there are different fencing heights and recommended there be continuity across the fence heights to create a continuous line. Mr. Walter agreed and asked if the fencing slats can meet the columns holding the fence in place.

Mr. Koepf said he can make the fence heights continuous and was unsure about height limitations. Mr. Feinstein clarified there are no height limits for a commercial building for zoning and he would call it a screen wall rather than a fence.

Mr. Walter also recommended replacing the brick wall with the new fencing. Mr. Petznick agreed and suggested looking into bollards for protection.

Mr. Koepf reiterated the discussion for open slats, raising the fence slats to the height of the columns, and removing the remaining brick wall while carrying the fence from the corner post to the building corner at a bias to help direct cars, with the addition of bollards to protect the fence.

Mr. Reed agreed with the recommendations from Mr. Petznick and Mr. Walter and noted it would be consistent with the previous condition of the brick wall which did not have posts extending beyond the top of the wall. Mr. Koepf agreed and said he can raise the fence to the post height and make it consistent across the enclosure.

Ms. Hays agreed it is better to remove the brick and replace it with the new fencing. She asked about the location of HVAC unit in the corner and if there is space to create a diagonal between the building corner and fence corner. Mr. Koepf noted they can do this but will need to keep the existing gas meters protected and can pull the fencing back from the building corner and install bollards to provide additional protection.

Mr. Carroll inquired about the material of screen fence at canopy level and Mr. Koepf clarified the fencing material is the same above the canopy.

Mr. Walter asked about the corner attachments that appear to be rendered differently than the fence posts. Mr. Koepf noted the corner attachments are smaller and lighter, designed to be mounted on the roof. He explained there are three different types of posts being used, but the fencing will be the same.

Mr. Walter asked if they will align the screen face with the columns and Mr. Koepf noted they will be aligned. Mr. Walter also noted the canopy is aligned to the interior face of the lower column and it should be aligned with the exterior of the post.

Chair Moore asked Ms. Montgomery for any comments. Ms. Montgomery agreed with all of the recommendations that were made.

Ms. Mates summarized the conditions that were specified and included:

1. Removing the brick wall
2. Extending the fencing to the corner, allowing space for bollards to be installed
3. Increasing the fencing height so it meets the top of the posts
4. Shifting the canopy to meet the western face of the post

Chair Moore noted additional conditions included:

5. Using an fencing material with open slats
6. All fence heights will be the same height as the posts and cooler enclosure

Mr. Reed also noted they discussed pulling the fence at the corner back, at an allowable distance, to increase the visibility at the corner.

It was moved by Mr. Reed and seconded by Ms. Ryberg-Webster to approve the certificate of appropriateness for the resubmission of façade renovations with the following conditions:

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

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

* * * *

Other Business

Chair Moore discussed a resident concern that was brought to her attention regarding paint colors that are being used on homes in the city. She noted the resident would like there to be regulations but the Landmark Commission has never regulated paint colors outside of comments that are made during meeting discussions.

Chair Moore asked if Shaker Life Magazine could be used to bring attention to the Shaker Village Colors to provide guidance and help residents select traditional and historic paint colors.

Mr. Reed suggested Shaker Life could replicate the Shaker Village Colors publication within the magazine. .

Ms. Hays noted the Landmark Commission reprinted the book and there are two versions, one that is more descriptive and one that included the paint chips. She also noted there is a misconception that the Commission has restrictions on paint colors that can be used.

Ms. Ryberg-Webster inquired about the process of approving paint colors or regulating paint and noted her recent experience having to match her home addition’s color to the rest of her home.

Mr. Feinstein explained that changes involving additions or renovations, for example, must be painted to match the existing conditions, but if the home is only being painted, paint is considered a non-permanent change and there are no color restrictions.

Ms. Ryberg-Webster, Ms. Hays, and Mr. Reed feel it is not necessary to promote the Shaker Village Colors. Mr. Reed clarified if Shaker Life was going to dedicate space to sharing the Shaker Village Colors it would be easy to replicate the existing publication.

Ms. Hays noted she does not feel it is a good story for Shaker Life. She added that it is a historical document, the colors go together and they are a suggestion, but they are not being regulated.

Ms. Montgomery wondered if additional colors could be included as recommendations to expand the options.

Ms. Hays suggested highlighting paint combinations through the Preservation Awards.

Chair Moore stressed that the publication would merely be a resource for residents who may not be aware of the publication. Ms. Hays agreed the book could be promoted as a resource.

Mr. Feinstein suggested that these historical documents and publications can be referenced within the Shaker Life article about the Preservation Awards next year, allowing them to be highlighted as a resource for residents.

Chair Moore asked about the status of the Preservation Photo Contest submissions and Ms. Mates noted there were many submissions submitted through Instagram and she is in the process of collecting submissions through the online submission form. Ms. Mates noted the contest ends on the May 31st and she is working on a way to organize and share the images with the Commission members to get feedback on the submissions.

* * * *

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:59 pm. The next meeting will be held on June 28, 2023.



Anna Mates, Secretary
Landmark Commission