



**Landmark Commission / Architectural Board of Review Minutes
Wednesday, January 27, 2021
7 P.M.
Via Zoom Webinar**

Members Present: Nancy Moore, Landmark Commission, Chair
Meghan Hays, Landmark Commission, Member
Ron Reed, Landmark Commission, Member
Crystal Montgomery, Landmark Commission, Member
Stephanie Ryberg-Webster, Landmark Commission, Member
Thomas Starinsky, Landmark Commission, Member

Others Present: Cameron Roberts, Planner
Daniel Feinstein, Senior Planner
Hans Walter, Architectural Board of Review, Member
Sandra Madison, Architectural Board of Review, Member

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

* * * *

Approval of the October 28, 2020 Meeting Minutes

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

Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion Carried.

* * * *

Certificate of Appropriateness: 18938 Winslow Road—New Attached Garage. Joseph and Mary Jo Ciuni, applicants.

Mr. Roberts said the application is for a proposed new attached garage. He shared that the home was built in 1928 and designed by the architect George H. Burrows.

He explained that the proposal is to demolish the existing detached garage in the rear of the property and build a three-car garage attached to the existing house. Mr. Roberts shared that the proposal also includes a new mudroom with an exterior door. This addition is intended to act as a transition between the garage and the house.

CITY OF SHAKER HEIGHTS

3400 Lee Road Shaker Heights, Ohio 44120 P 216.491.1400 F 216.491.1465 Ohio Relay Service 711
shakeronline.com www.shaker.life

Mr. Roberts presented the architectural plans and pointed out that the new addition includes siding, windows, lights, and garage doors. He shared that the transition between the existing house and addition would not be straight as the addition will be set back several additional feet on the property.

He mentioned that the applicant provided two choices of paint colors as they will be repainting the entire house to satisfy an existing point of sale violation. Mr. Roberts stated that staff does not have a preference of appropriate color and requested guidance from Commission and Board members during the discussion.

Mr. Roberts moved on to the Landmark Commission precedent and stated that all of the materials proposed by the applicant have previously been approved for detached garages on Winslow Road. However, he pointed out that the proposed fiber cement siding has never been approved on an attached garage and if it is approved, a new precedent will be created.

He asked if Mr. Feinstein had anything to add for the Architectural Board of Review.

Mr. Feinstein added that the preliminary plans and designs for this project came to the Architectural Board of Review twice and Board members recommended a number of revisions. The applicant's revised plans meet all of the requested revisions.

Mr. Feinstein mentioned that the project also needed two zoning variances, which were reviewed and approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals during their January 5, 2021 meeting. He continued on, saying the zoning code requires that the same type of garage, attached versus detached, be built on the property to match the majority of the garages on the block. Mr. Feinstein mentioned that Winslow Road has one other attached garage, and the rest are detached. He noted that a variance for the setback of the rear property line was also granted. He then stated that the condition of approval by the Board of Zoning Appeals was that the design also had to be approved by the Architectural Board of Review and Landmark Commission.

Ms. Moore introduced the applicants, Mr. and Ms. Ciuni, and asked if they had anything to add. Ms. Ciuni added that the windows and man door will be Pella, and confirmed that the windows will have simulated-divided-lites.

Ms. Moore opened the discussion to Landmark Commission and Architectural Board of Review members.

Ms. Hays asked how the new and existing siding would transition and whether they would look similar.

Mr. Ciuni explained that they picked a shingle with 11 inches of exposure, which matches the exposure of the existing shingle siding on the house. He mentioned that there was a violation for painting, therefore they are painting the entire house, including the new addition, to look the same.

Ms. Hays continued on, saying she does not have a preference of the two paint colors and asked for the opinions of other Members.

Mr. Reed asked if the stucco on the façade will be painted in addition to the wood siding.

Mr. Ciuni confirmed that they will paint the stucco, but that it will remain white.

Mr. Reed recommended the lighter of the two paint choices. He said it would be more compatible because it would have the same level of contrast as what currently exists between the stucco and half-timbering.

Ms. Ryberg-Webster expressed support for the lighter gray paint color as well.

Mr. Reed asked if the Tudor brown proposed for the trim is close to the current color of the half-timbering.

Ms. Ciuni confirmed it is close to the current color.

Ms. Madison agreed with Mr. Reed and Ms. Ryberg-Webster's preference for the lighter gray paint.

Ms. Moore asked if there were any questions on the actual design.

Ms. Montgomery asked the applicant why the mudroom window is larger than the other windows on the garage.

Mr. Ciuni said they are proposing smaller windows on the garage for security and the larger window was to bring in light to the mudroom.

Mr. Walter asked what the material of the balustrade decorative portion between the major components was and if it was intended to be wrought iron.

Mr. and Ms. Ciuni confirmed that it is black, ornamental metal.

Mr. Walter asked the applicant whether they will also be painting the posts black.

Ms. Ciuni shared that they plan to paint the posts Tudor Brown.

Ms. Moore asked if the Landmark Commission approved of the new precedent for fiber cement board siding.

Ms. Ryberg-Webster stated that the Board of Zoning Appeals considered the attached garage part of the main unit and asked whether they are setting a precedent for rear garages or for the entire house.

Mr. Feinstein explained that design review is different than zoning review. Based on staff's viewpoint, allowing fiber cement board siding on the rear garage addition would be setting a precedent for rear garage additions, not the entire house.

Mr. Reed said the differentiation is that the new construction is not changing the material nature or historical integrity of the actual historic structure.

Ms. Hays asked whether the attachment of the garage was unusual and if the Architectural Board of Review has seen any other cases for a new attached garage.

the originals and because they contain interior grids. He shared photos of the rest of the windows on the house, which are all original to the property.

Mr. Roberts shared the applicant's six proposed options for window replacements. He mentioned that the applicant's preferred option would be to replace all 31 original wood windows with new vinyl windows.

He briefly covered the Landmark Commission design guidelines on window replacements and past precedent for the application. Mr. Roberts stated that the window standards recommend that new window replacements on a landmark property must match the original windows. Regarding precedent, applications for vinyl windows on Winslow Road have only been approved in instances involving economic hardship.

Mr. Roberts stated that staff is recommending approval based on the Landmark Commission's design guidelines, window standards, and past precedent if the applicant decides to go forward with two options:

1. Option 5: Restoration of all the existing wood windows.
2. Option 6: Replacement of existing wood windows with new appropriate wood windows.

Mr. Roberts then said that staff is not recommending approval for the other four options, which all include new vinyl windows.

Ms. Moore stated that many of the homes on Winslow Road were modified prior to becoming a Local Landmark District and they are now inconsistent with the Landmark Commission's standards. She noted that regardless of these modifications, the Commission is bound to the rules of the design guidelines and window standards that are in place.

Ms. Moore asked the Commission whether they had any questions or comments.

Ms. Hays said she is opposed to vinyl windows in general and that the Commission encourages homeowners to restore wood windows no matter their condition since they are still functional. She mentioned that the aluminum storm windows are common to wood windows in Shaker Heights.

Ms. Ryberg-Webster said she is opposed to vinyl windows and recommends other options.

Mr. Lun asked the Commission if they would consider vinyl windows for the bedroom and bathroom since they are located in the rear of the house and away from the street.

Ms. Montgomery stated that she is in agreement with having wood windows on the house. She suggested that the applicant look into replacing the existing storm windows if they do not like their appearance and added that he should consider a phased plan for restoring the wood windows.

Mr. Lun stated that restoring the existing windows is financially burdensome.

Ms. Moore suggested the provision for a certificate of economic hardship, which addresses the high costs of replacing and restoring original windows.

Mr. Roberts explained the Certificate of Economic Hardship to Mr. Lun.

cemetery. He added that the plan would include not only Historic Preservation elements but also landscaping plans and security plans for the cemetery.

Mr. Roberts said staff are currently working on the application, which is due February 12. He mentioned there have been meetings with the Historical Society, and the library, which included Ms. Hays, over the past several months.

Mr. Roberts noted that they would be requesting \$25,000 from the State for this plan and since preservation plans are currently a priority for the State, they would not need to contribute a local match. He stated that grant awards should be announced toward the end of March. An RFP for consultants will be submitted if the application is successful.

Ms. Moore mentioned that the Master Plan would serve as a model for cemetery restoration throughout the state of Ohio.

Mr. Roberts confirmed by stating that staff tried searching for comparable plans but could only find examples for larger cemeteries, such as Lakeview Cemetery.

Ms. Moore asked Ms. Hays if she had anything else to add.

Ms. Hays stated that the cemetery is a great place for learning since many people are not aware of it. She said that it is the oldest existing cemetery in the County. Ms. Hays also mentioned that the remains from the original Shaker cemetery on South Park were moved to the corner of the cemetery with a marker placed approximately where they were buried.

Ms. Montgomery moved to express support for the grant application.

Mr. Reed seconded the motion.

* * * *

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:39 p.m. The next meeting will be February 24, 2021.



Cameron R. Roberts, Secretary
Landmark Commission