



SHAKER HEIGHTS

Architectural Board of Review
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
8:00 A.M.
City Hall Council Chambers

Members Present: Sandra Madison, Chair
Hans Walter, Vice Chair
James Neville, Member
Robert Sullivan, Alternate Member

Others Present: Daniel Feinstein, Senior Planner
Kelly Beck, Planning Specialist
Joyce Braverman, Director of Planning

The meeting was called to order by Ms. Madison, Chair at 8:00 a.m.

* * * *

Approval of the January 7, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Approved.

* * * *

#20108 - 3396 Tuttle Road - Resubmission: B-1 Restaurant Building – Façade.

Mr. Feinstein summarized the last meeting and changes to the design. The applicant has been to the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) and City Planning Commission Working Group in the interim. He summarized the conditions set by the BZA.

Brian Meng, Bialosky Architects, said the interior has been unchanged since the last meeting. The storefront design is somewhat changed. The building shell is unchanged, using clear anodized storefront systems for the first floor tenant. They propose a film over the freezer and storage room windows, with open windows into the rest of the kitchen. They proposed a white film originally but are now looking at a warm beige color and are awaiting samples. They have opted for an angled “wall” boxed out feature behind the glass in the ceiling level that makes cleaning the windows possible.

Mr. Walter asked about the horizontal frit on the glass and how that pattern is set up across the building façade.

Mr. Meng said there is frit detailing on all of the upper floor windows and a portion of the first floor of the restaurant facing Farnsleigh Road. Signage is currently in design, but placeholders have been added to the drawings. They are proposing an awning over the storefront facing the Living Room park, which will contain signage. Planters and landscaping will be used to

emphasize the main entry closer to Tuttle Road, along with a blade sign on the corner of the building.

Ms. Braverman said the Board of Zoning Appeals referred the design back to the Architectural Board of Review to assure that a main entry appearance is achieved facing the Living Room park.

Mr. Meng said they considered splitting the canopy but were not pleased with the appearance.

The Board said a pop of color over the doorway might differentiate it.

Mr. Meng said color is possible, but branding is still in the works.

Mr. Sullivan asked if lighting could be used to emphasize the entry.

Mr. Meng said there will be a lighted sign and small sconces on the wall, but there is plentiful lighting from the street lights nearby.

Mr. Neville asked if the paver detail could be modified to reinforce this doorway as a main entry.

Mr. Meng said the pavement here is already in the living room park paver pattern.

Ms. Braverman read the BZA charge for the Architectural Board of Review is to seek a main entry design.

Mr. Meng said the blade sign helps with the identification of the space.

Mr. Neville said the corner blade sign is a good start to draw people to this side of the building.

Mr. Sullivan said the second floor tenant canopy detail seems more substantial and recognizable as a main entry. Could something smaller than that be replicated at the first floor restaurant entry?

Mr. Walter asked why the floor plan could not be turned around.

Mackenzie Makepeace, RMS, said the restaurant main entry is activated through the activity of the rest of the development as it is across from the parking garage and Market Hall to the south. The restaurant tenant desires to address that district activity with their main entry.

Mr. Walter asked what keeps the next tenants from designing their floor plan the same on the west end of the building. He understands the argument, but the front façade design of the building faces Farnsleigh Road.

Mr. Feinstein noted the BZA granted a variance specifically to only the east end tenant.

Mr. Sullivan said a more substantial entry for the first floor tenant is needed.

Mr. Meng said they can work on the entry design. He asked about color on the wall material, or if a different material could be used instead of metal infill around the entry.

Mr. Neville said masonry could be used. It needs to be architecturally reinforced.

Ms. Makepeace said ownership wants each of the tenants to have their own entry experience. If both enter from the same doorway it just becomes a hallway neither tenant cares about. The identities of the tenants become muddled.

Mr. Walter said this is a well-designed building. The design is now being driven by tenancy that was not envisioned at its inception.

Mr. Neville asked if a landscape component could be used to reinforce the entry. This needs to be a well-designed solution and comprehensive to more than 5 feet from the building.

Mr. Sullivan asked if there is separation from the patio dining in this area.

Mr. Meng said this may be an open container district, so that is not determined yet.

Ms. Braverman clarified that this could be an open container district, which might alleviate the need for fencing.

The Board noted a low wall or fence separation at the entry could help. This has got to be a comprehensive review, not just a low wall with plantings.

Mr. Neville said the first floor entry could be enhanced by a form related to the entry over the Farnsleigh door.

Ms. Braverman said concepts could be submitted to staff and circulated with the Board between meetings to be as time-sensitive as possible.

Mr. Neville asked to discuss the “light box” detail.

Mr. Walter suggested all windows get the same frit treatment along the first floor for a consistent architectural look, rather than a patchwork.

After discussion, the Board agreed application of a panel to the underside of the work table area and to obscure storage and service from the exterior would be a good option instead of film.

Tabled for the applicant to investigate the following: 1) enhanced entry design including an entrance element or canopy, pavement design and landscaping; 2) study extending the glass frit detail with film on the Farnsleigh Road elevation to include all of the windows on the first floor with the exception of the corner entryway, which will be clear glass; and 3) additional information regarding the interior panel details on the Farnsleigh Road elevation as an alternative to window film.

Revised plans will be submitted to staff for Board review.

* * * *

Ms. Madison left the meeting.

* * * *

#20103 - 3385 Tuttle Road - Resubmission: Storefront - Nature’s Oasis.

Mr. Feinstein summarized the previous meeting for the Board.

Gary Ogrocki, Dimit Architects, said they have revised the rowlock on the windows on Farnsleigh Road to match the Tuttle Road detail as asked for at the previous meeting.

Mr. Neville said he prefers the revisions to the mullions above the large windows on the Farnsleigh elevation to the previous submission.

Approved.

* * * *

Mr. Walter left the meeting.

* * * *

#20118 - 3596 Normandy Road - New Garage.

Andre Mann, contractor, said they will be using clay colored siding with white trim and doors. The roof will be Barkwood color asphalt shingles.

Mr. Feinstein noted the form marks need to be rubbed out of the concrete foundation for a smooth finish.

Approved with the condition that the garage be at least 3 feet from the side and rear property lines.

* * * *

#20119 - 21142 South Woodland Road - Window Alteration: Casement Window to Gliding Window.

Chris Milowicki, Renewal by Andersen, said this is a 50's home with a more recent addition. They would like to maximize the glass while retaining air flow. The current casement windows here are not consistent with the remainder of the house.

Mr. Neville said it is not uncommon for porch windows to be different than the main house, especially for this vintage of home. The Board indicated slider windows are not typical window types installed on this vintage or style of home.

There was discussion regarding options for the window openings.

Denied the gliding windows.

The Board approved the use of replacement windows that exactly match the existing window layout, whether that is three casement windows, two casement windows and a picture window or a single casement window and two picture windows in each existing opening.

Confirmation of chosen window option will be provided to staff for approval.

* * * *

#20120 - 2935 Carlton Road - Porch Alteration.

Matt Viau, Viau Builders, said this is a 4 by 6 foot porch infill, with no change to the footprint. The new brick will be toothed-in to match the house. The brick color is very close and the mortar will make up differences in brick size.

Mr. Neville said buff tint for the mortar and a textured finish should be used to most closely match the existing house.

Mr. Viau said there will be a window added on the rear elevation to match the existing windows.

The new window will have the same spacing between as the existing two windows. The trim details and size of the window will also match.

Approved with the condition that the new window is comparable in detailing to the existing wood windows.

Window details will be submitted for staff review.

* * * *

#20121 - 20577 South Woodland Road - Façade Alteration.

Antwann Teasley, contractor, said they propose a stone veneer at the gable feature on the front façade. This house has aluminum siding. The red and sand colored stone are colors like the chimney. This stone will only be applied to the front of this area and he will bring a j-channel to meet it.

Mr. Neville said a masonry detail typically goes around the corner. He would want this detail to return to the house wall on either side of this small bump-out.

Mr. Feinstein asked if the aluminum siding and original wood siding will be removed.

Ms. Beck noted the house was constructed in the early 1980's. It is possible there is no wood siding.

The Board asked about constructability. The details of the fascia and rake board need to remain. Is there enough room for this fairly deep stone treatment?

Tabled for the applicant to provide the following: 1) proof of the appropriate depth needed to maintain the eave details; 2) revised plan to show a return from the front façade to the other adjacent façades; and 3) provide a photo of three stone color option boards up against the house for Board review.

* * * *

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m. The next meeting will be February 4, 2019.



Sandra Madison, Chair
Architectural Board of Review



Hans Walter, Vice Chair
Architectural Board of Review