



**Landmark Commission Minutes
Wednesday, January 29, 2020
7 P.M.
City Hall, Conference Room B**

Members Present: Nancy Moore, Landmark Commission, Chair
Clifford Brown, Landmark Commission, Member
Tom Starinsky, Landmark Commission, Member
Meghan Hays, Landmark Commission, Member
Crystal Montgomery, Landmark Commission, Member

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

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

* * * *

Approval of the June 26, 2019 Meeting Minutes

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

Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion Carried

* * * *

Certificate of Appropriateness: 18421 Scottsdale Boulevard— As-built front porch columns, shutter installations, and rear window to door alteration. Richard Tynes, property owner, and Jill Giacomo, consultant.

Mr. Roberts stated that the application is for several as-built alterations at 18421 Scottsdale Boulevard. The house was built in 1929 and designed by the architectural firm Fox, Duthie, and Foose as a Master Model Home, which is why the property is a locally designated landmark. The house is one of eight Master Model Homes that were built along Scottsdale Boulevard during the 1920’s. Mr. Tynes, the new property owner, acquired the property in June 2019 in order to renovate the house for resale.

Mr. Roberts explained that the application includes three components: a new design for the front porch columns, the installation of new shutters to the front and west facades, and the alteration of a rear

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

window to a door entry. He noted that the work is already complete, but did not receive design review or permit approval from the City. The application is to review the as-built conditions of the alterations.

Mr. Starinsky asked whether the point-of-sale process flags properties that are landmarks.

Mr. Feinstein answered that the point of sale inspection form states that the property is a designated landmark and explained that regardless of landmark status, any exterior changes would have had to go through the Architectural Board of Review.

Ms. Moore mentioned that in addition to the components of the evening's application, there were vinyl windows that were mistakenly approved on the house.

Mr. Feinstein explained that the house already had vinyl windows when it was sold. Replacement of those vinyl windows with new vinyl windows was approved by the city in error before recognizing that it was a landmark property. The applicant is not being asked to replace those.

Mr. Roberts presented the altered design for the front porch columns. The original front porch columns were wood and painted white with a lattice-type design. The applicant shared that the columns were in very poor condition and not structural to the overhang above. Considering those conditions, the applicant replaced the columns with a simple column design. The new columns are constructed of cedar wood and painted white; however, the design is significantly different from the original.

Mr. Roberts presented the new shutters. He said the property owner installed new shutters on the front and west facades of the house. Paint markings on the brick exterior and several remaining shutter dogs indicate that the home originally had wood shutters, which led to the applicant's decision to reapply them. The new shutters are vinyl and black with a wood grain texture. Every shutter is 15 inches wide, while the window opening width varies throughout the house. During a site visit, staff noticed old shutter dogs on the east façade, indicating that there were once shutters on that side as well. Lastly, the applicant installed vinyl flower boxes below the two first-story windows on the front façade.

Mr. Roberts presented the rear window to door alteration. A rear window, which was said to be rotting and deteriorating, was replaced with a vinyl sliding door and wood trim. The addition where this alteration occurred is assumed to be non-original to the house due to a brick exterior that does not match the rest of the house.

Mr. Roberts explained that in staff's typical review of applications, the Landmark Commission Design Guidelines and existing precedent are relied upon to make a recommendation. He presented several previous Landmark Commission applications similar to the proposal.

Mr. Roberts shared that the Landmark Commission previously reviewed one similar proposal for front porch columns. The application was for 18520 Winslow Road in August of 2018. The property was being renovated by the Cleveland Restoration Society and they proposed replacing the front porch lattice columns with a more simple and solid design. During the review, Landmark Commission members stated that the lattice design was likely original to the property and also a unique feature for the property and neighborhood. Based on those remarks, the Landmark Commission required that the columns be replaced in-kind.

Mr. Moore noted that the review was also before any work had begun. Mr. Roberts confirmed.

Mr. Roberts said that the Landmark Commission has reviewed one similar proposal for shutters. At the April 28, 2010 meeting, the Landmark Commission reviewed as-built vinyl shutters that replaced previously installed vinyl shutters at 17620 Winslow. The previous vinyl shutters never received city approval. Although the prior shutters were vinyl, the Commission discussed that one of the intents of Landmark designation is to preserve or gradually return the house to its original condition. As a result, the Landmark Commission required that all shutters be wood and appropriately sized.

Mr. Roberts said there are no specific precedents for the rear window to door alteration. However, the Landmark Commission has approved this type of alteration numerous times. In regards to the approvals, the originality of the feature and its location on the house have both been deciding factors. Mr. Roberts did note that vinyl has never been approved by the Landmark Commissions as an appropriate material for these alterations.

Mr. Starinsky asked whether that has applied to non-contributing additions as well. Mr. Roberts confirmed that it has.

Mr. Roberts proceeded to present the staff recommendations for the application. For the front porch column design, he said the Architectural Board of Review and Landmark Commission should discuss whether the new column design is appropriate. For the shutters, staff recommends replacement of the new vinyl shutters with wood shutters that are the same height as the window and exactly half of the window's width. Staff also recommends adding shutters to the east elevation for a consistent appearance and removal of the vinyl flower boxes. For the rear window to door alteration, staff recommends replacing the vinyl door with a wood door that is more appropriately sized for the opening.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Feinstein whether he had any additional information to share for the Architectural Board of Review.

Mr. Feinstein said that he had similar comments from the Architectural Board of Review's perspective, but noted that the Board is less focused on the historic materials of the property. Rather, the Architectural Board of Review is more focused on the general appropriateness of design.

Ms. Moore asked the applicants, Richard Tynes and Jill Giacomo, whether they had any information to share.

Mr. Tynes communicated that he has put over \$100,000 into the renovation of the property. The point of sale inspection required scrapping and painting of the front porch column, but it was in such poor shape that it began to fall apart upon being scraped. The rear window and sidewall of the addition was infested by carpenter ants. The house is completely constructed of steel I-beams and caused significant renovation cost. He noted that there were no shutters and vinyl windows already existed when he bought the home. This is why he thought that new vinyl windows would be acceptable. He also noted that the vinyl sliding door was selected to match the new vinyl windows. He expressed that the house looks much better for the investment that he put into it. Neighbors have expressed the same to him.

Mr. Starinsky asked whether the property has a plaque to identify it as a landmark.

Mr. Tynes confirmed that there is a plaque, but he did not know what it meant.

Ms. Moore asked Mr. Tynes what his plans are for the property.

Mr. Tynes said that he plans to sell it. He explained that he has been a Shaker Heights resident since 1981 and currently owns multiple properties throughout the city.

Mr. Sullivan asked Mr. Tynes whether he was aware of the city's design requirements.

Mr. Tynes said that he was not as he had never done any extensive exterior work to his other properties.

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

Mr. Starinsky asked whether replacement of the lattice columns was ever priced.

Mr. Tynes said it was not and that he could not find a contractor to do the work. The general recommendation he received from contractors was to build new columns.

Mr. Starinsky stated that he is not supportive of the new column design. The lattice columns were a character defining feature and the new columns are not appropriate in terms of scale or from a historic preservation perspective. He said that if anything in the application should be replaced, the columns should be it.

Ms. Hays asked why only the window replacements were brought to the City for permitting and review.

Mr. Feinstein clarified that the applicant has received permits for all interior work as well. He said that the windows received design review because the window contractor, likely already aware of Shaker's requirements, acquired the permit themselves.

Ms. Madison noted that architecturally the proportions of the new column design is wrong. She explained that the columns appear too large for the opening.

Ms. Hays said the lattice columns are a unique feature on the house and it would be a shame to lose them permanently.

Mr. Sullivan suggested that the non-bearing-load lattice columns were an intentional testament to the home's steel frame. The strength of the steel frame creates enough support on the porch overhang to allow a non-structural column design. He said he would recommend reverting the columns back to the original design even if the application was only being reviewed by the Architectural Board of Review. Regardless of landmark status, it is a unique feature on the home.

Mr. Brown said he thinks the new columns dilute the character of the house. He also mentioned that he would be supportive of wood shutters on the house. He stated that this is an opportunity for the Commission, collectively as a team, to work and fight against landmark properties in the city that have deteriorated over time and never had the opportunity to be brought back to the table to be restored.

Ms. Montgomery noted that she would also like to see the lattice porch columns rebuilt.

Ms. Moore asked staff to expand on their recommendation for the shutters.

Mr. Feinstein explained that when staff looked at the house it was clear that three sides of the home originally had shutters. It made sense to either have shutters on all three sides or maybe only have shutters on the front. He noted that the sides of the windows do not have a very evident shadow, which leads staff to believe that the shutters have been missing for some time.

Mr. Tynes asked whether he could remove the vinyl shutters and only install wood shutters on the front.

Ms. Hays said that she thinks wood shutters only on the front would be a good compromise. Mr. Starinsky and Mr. Sullivan agreed.

Mr. Feinstein noted that shutters for the windows on the front of the house might not be able to achieve the exact width required due to the existing chimney location, but they could extend until they reach the chimney line.

Ms. Montgomery said she would prefer to see wood shutters on all three sides as a compromise for the vinyl windows.

Mr. Brown said he would be fine with wood shutters only on the front.

Ms. Hays asked whether staff could do anything to better inform property owners about landmark property requirements before these types of situations occur. The information to property owners should be extremely clear. Clearer than it is now.

There was a brief discussion on the current Point of Sale process and methods in place to inform property owners about the landmark status of their home.

Mr. Feinstein explained that staff is also looking to be more proactive in these measures. Planning is currently working with the Building Department to ensure that a one-pager of information is attached to any Point of Sale Inspection Report that is generated for a landmark property. This would be in addition to the text that is already printed on the report and the biennial mailing packers to landmark property owners.

Mr. Brown said that he recommends rebuilding the columns to replace the original lattice and only installing wood shutters on the front. He told the applicant that he appreciates the work that he has done and apologizes for the troubles, but the Landmark Commission is charged with preserving the home to the best of their ability. He finds his recommendation to be an acceptable compromise.

Mr. Tynes agreed with the statement.

Ms. Madison expressed that it is also important to uphold these standards because there are other property owners of landmark homes and approving inappropriate changes can create a precedent. She told the applicant that she appreciates his investment in the community, but the creation of a precedent is Landmark Commission's concern.

Ms. Moore asked the Board and Commission whether they have any additional comments before discussing the rear door alteration.

Mr. Starinsky moved to approve the application with three conditions:

1. Replace as-built front porch columns to exactly match the original lattice-type design; to be approved by staff.
2. Remove the new vinyl shutters. Install wood vinyl shutters on the west, south, and east facades to meet the Window Shutter Dimensions Guidelines; to be approved by staff.
3. Remove the two vinyl flower boxes on the front facade.

Ms. Hays seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: 3
 Nays: 2

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

Mr. Feinstein told the applicants that staff would follow up with resources to help them with the reconstruction of the lattice columns and shutters. He mentioned that the Planning Department would need to review the details for design review before work can begin.

* * * *

2020 Certified Local Government (CLG) Grant Application Update

Mr. Roberts mentioned that the City is submitting one grant application to the Ohio Historic Preservation Office. The application is to request funds to restore wood windows in the second floor firehouse at City Hall. This is part of a larger effort to renovate the interior of the space and eventually move the Building and Housing Department into it. The application deadline is February 10, 2020 and the city will know by early to mid-April whether the project was awarded.

* * * *

Staff Approvals

Ms. Moore mentioned that there were many staff approvals since the last Landmark Commission meeting in June 2018. She asked whether there were any questions. There were none.

* * * *

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m. The next meeting will be February 26, 2020.



Cameron R. Roberts, Secretary
Landmark Commission