



**Landmark Commission / Architectural Board of Review Minutes
Wednesday, August 26, 2020
7 P.M.
Via Zoom Webinar**

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

Others Present: Cameron Roberts, Planner
Daniel Feinstein, Senior Planner
Greydon Petznick, Architectural Board of Review, Member

The meeting was called to order by Chair Moore at 7:07 p.m.

* * * *

Approval of the June 24, 2020 Meeting Minutes

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

Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion Carried

* * * *

Certificate of Appropriateness: 3756 Lee Road (Lee-Scottsdale Building)—Wireless Antennae.

Ronald Gainar, representing T-Mobile.

Mr. Roberts stated that the application is for the installation of new wireless antennas on the rooftop of 3756 Lee Road, also known as the Lee-Scottsdale Building. He introduced Ronald Gainar as the applicant for the case, representing T-Mobile.

Mr. Roberts explained that 3756 Lee Road is a local landmark building. It was designed by the architects Fox, Duthie, and Foose and construction for the building was complete in 1930. The building was designated as a landmark in 1998.

Mr. Roberts shared pictures of the existing rooftop conditions on the building. He explained that the building has a long history of wireless antenna installations that have been reviewed and approved by the Landmark Commission. For these approvals, some of the design elements that the Commission has

CITY OF SHAKER HEIGHTS

previously required included: a brick vinyl wrap on the antennas to blend into the existing penthouse structure, painting all associated equipment brown to blend into the brick exterior, and requiring that all cabling be located at the bottom of the penthouse structure to reduce visibility from the street. In 2003, the Landmark Commission also approved a faux brick addition to the top of the penthouse, which houses more antennas. However, Mr. Roberts explained that the proposed antennas for the application would all be installed on the exterior of the structure.

Mr. Roberts presented the existing antenna layout on the exterior of the penthouse structure. He explained that the applicant intends to remove four existing antennas and relocate one existing antenna.

Mr. Roberts presented the proposed antenna layout. He said the applicant proposes to install seven new antennas and identified the location of each, in addition to the location of the relocated antenna. He said the applicant intends to use a brick vinyl wrap on the antennas that matches what currently exists and all associated equipment will be painted to blend in with the brick exterior.

Mr. Roberts said the applicant provided several photo simulations to illustrate the change in view from the ground with the additional antenna installations. Looking north at the building from the City of Cleveland, several additional antennas may be seen, but the change in view is not significant. The vinyl wrap and painted equipment help reduce visibility by blending into the penthouse structure. Looking south at the building, one additional antenna may be seen. Mr. Roberts stated that maybe most importantly, the antennas will not be visible at all from the front façade view, which is where most of the unique and historic architectural details on the building are located.

Mr. Roberts briefly covered the Landmark Commission design guidelines and existing precedent for the application. He shared that the design guidelines do not specifically cover wireless antennas, but they do cover general exterior alterations. In those cases, the guidelines state that alterations should not destroy historic materials or impact the historic character of the property. Regarding precedent, wireless antennas have been previously approved on several landmark buildings. For those approvals, design elements such as vinyl wraps, stealth housing, or painting the equipment were required to make the equipment as inconspicuous as possible.

Mr. Roberts said that staff recommends approval of the application with one condition that all of the cabling remain near the bottom of the existing penthouse, which has been a standard condition for past antenna proposals on the property.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Feinstein if he had anything to add from an Architectural Board of Review or Zoning perspective.

Mr. Feinstein stated that for zoning, antennas on top of a building are allowed as an accessory use. That is done to encourage antennas on existing building, rather than the building of separate antenna towers. The Architectural Board of Review has reviewed many antennas in the City and routinely require that the equipment incorporate design elements to make them as inconspicuous as possible.

Ms. Moore asked Ronald Gainar, applicant, whether he would like to add anything.

Mr. Gainar explained that the new antennas are a response to the recent merger between Spring and T-Mobile. He mentioned that the cabling condition is not an issue.

Mr. Brown asked whether the additional equipment is temporary due to the merger.

Mr. Gainar shared that eventually the equipment for both companies will be integrated. Once that happens, he imagines that they will be back sometime within the next two years to either remove some of the antennas or change the existing system.

Mr. Reed stated that the application seems straightforward and moved to approve the application with staff's one condition:

1. All equipment cabling must remain near the bottom of the existing penthouse.

Mr. Brown seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: 4
 Nays: 0

Mr. Feinstein mentioned that since there is not a quorum for the Architectural Board of Review, the application will be reviewed at their next meeting. He said he would follow up with the applicant with more details.

Preliminary Review: 2540 North Moreland Boulevard—Rooftop Pergola. Bruce Rose, tenant.

Mr. Roberts said that this is a preliminary review to provide initial input for a proposed rooftop pergola at the Shaker Park East apartment building within the Shaker Square Historic District. He shared that the applicant, Mr. Rose, is a tenant of the building and has access to a private roof patio on the southeastern corner of the building. Mr. Rose is proposing to install a pergola on the private patio.

Mr. Roberts continued, saying that the proposed pergola is constructed of cedar and eleven feet by thirteen feet in size. It features an aluminum louvered roof, which can be opened or closed for air ventilation. He said that based on the photos provided by the applicant, the pergola would be slightly noticeable from a street view and closely match the height of the existing bulkhead. He said that the applicant's intent is to anchor the posts of the pergola with cement-filled flower boxes, rather than bolt the structure to the building's rooftop. Based on this intent, the Building Department has said that the applicant will need a design professional to confirm that the building's roof can support both the live and dead loads of the pergola.

Mr. Roberts said that staff recommended this preliminary review before the applicant spends too much time on the project in order to receive both the Landmark Commission or Architectural Board of Review's initial thoughts on the proposal. He mentioned that the proposal did go before the Architectural Board of Review several weeks ago for a preliminary review. He asked Mr. Feinstein to share the takeaways of that discussion.

Mr. Feinstein said that ABR members felt it would be best for the pergola to be located as far from the edge of the roof as possible to minimize its view from the ground. They indicated that this feedback was from looking at the project both from a historic and general design perspective. ABR members noted that the pergola does not match the character of the building, but they were less concerned about this if it was not noticeable to onlookers.

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

Mr. Brown asked whether the applicant intends for the pergola to be a temporary structure during his tenancy, or whether it would be grandfathered in with the property.

Bruce Rose, tenant and applicant, noted that he has no intention of moving anytime soon and that there are no decisions to sell the pergola to the landlord if he were to move.

Mr. Reed asked whether the pergola will occupy the location of the existing pavers.

Mr. Rose confirmed that the pergola would need to be on the pavers in their existing location.

Ms. Moore asked whether there is room within the existing pavers to move the pergola based on ABR's suggestion to move the pergola as far away from the roof edge as possible.

Mr. Rose confirmed that there is room to move the pergola, but not to the extent that it would be completely invisible from the ground. The pergola would be about the same height as the existing bulkhead and the very top of the bulkhead can be seen from below.

After some discussion, Landmark Commission members corrected that the pergola would be more noticeable than the bulkhead since the bulkhead structure is slanted and the tallest point of the structure is set back further from the roof.

Mr. Brown asked whether a precedent would be set if the pergola were approved and whether it could allow the landlord to install their own pergola structure above the communal patio.

Mr. Feinstein said that design review would still be required for other pergola applications, but approval of this application could help the case of future applications. Similarities in vantage points would need to be taken into account.

Mr. Roberts agreed with this.

Mr. Brown asked the applicant whether he utilizes the patio as much as possible as long as the weather in Northeast Ohio permits it.

Mr. Rose confirmed and said that is why he wants the pergola. He shared that the sun is too intense to stay on the patio for any long duration of time and the louvered roof would allow flexibility based on the weather.

Mr. Brown asked the applicant whether he has received approval from the building's landlord.

Mr. Rose confirmed that he has received permission from the landlord with the conditions that he be insured for any problems that could result from it and that he goes through any approval process required by the City.

Ms. Hays asked whether this review is required by the City even though it is a temporary structure.

Mr. Feinstein clarified that this type of structure always receives design review by the City, whether it is a Landmark or not.

Ms. Hays was thankful for the clarification and stated that she does not recall ever making a determination on a pergola during her time on the Landmark Commission.

Mr. Feinstein agreed that he cannot recall a pergola going before Landmark Commission, but that could be the result of other property owners not asking the City beforehand.

Mr. Roberts shared that he tried to find precedent related to the Landmark Commission's review of pergola structures and there was not much information available. There may be some that never went through the official process.

Mr. Reed commented on the aesthetics of the pergola and said the design is somewhat out of character for the building, as the Architectural Board of Review had mentioned. However, he said the cedar material is a good direction and he believes the light wood color will not be very visible.

Ms. Montgomery asked where the applicant was standing for his street-view photo of the rooftop.

Mr. Rose said he was located across the street from the building and that it was difficult to find any view where the bulkhead was visible due to the amount of tree cover on North Moreland.

Ms. Hays suggested that the applicant take a photo from a similar street view with an object that is the equivalent height of the pergola. That would help the Commission understand the difference in visibility between the existing bulkhead and the proposed pergola.

Mr. Feinstein suggested using a ladder or someone holding an object up to the approximate height.

Commission members agreed that they will want to see this depiction.

Commission members asked a number of additional questions regarding the dimensions of different features on the rooftop, including the bulkhead height, parapet height, patio size, and distance between the roof edge and the patio pavers.

Mr. Feinstein added that the applicant should use chalk to indicate where the pergola posts will be located on the patio pavers.

Mr. Brown suggested that the applicant look into smaller pergola options that may be less visible from the ground.

The preliminary review of this application concluded with the suggestion that the following information and materials be submitted prior to a formal review:

1. Photo of the roof patio with the intended locations of the pergola posts identified with chalk. The location should be moved as far away from the edge of the roof as possible.
2. Street/sidewalk view photo with an object at the approximate height of the pergola in order to illustrate the expected visibility from the ground.

3. Exact dimensions for the following building features: roof patio area, parapet height, bulkhead height, and distance between the roof patio and parapet.
4. Investigate smaller and less tall pergola options that still meet the applicant's needs.

* * * *

Staff Approvals

Ms. Moore asked whether there were any questions on the staff approvals provided in the meeting packet. There were none.

* * * *

Other Business

Mr. Roberts informed the Commission that he wanted to provide a brief update on the City's plans for the 2020 Preservation Awards Ceremony. He said that since the City is currently not allowing in-person events or meetings due to the pandemic, Staff have decided to substitute the awards ceremony for a pre-recorded video that will showcase the awarded projects on social media. He said that this is what the Cleveland Restoration Society did for their awards program and it was well received. He said that after discussions with the city's Communications and Marketing team, it was believed that a pre-recorded video would be the better method for viewership than a one-time virtual event.

Commission members were supportive of the alternative strategy for the awards ceremony.

Mr. Roberts said that like previous years, he would like to have Commission Members present the awarded projects.

Ms. Hays and Mr. Brown both offered to help.

Mr. Roberts stated that he would follow up via email with more information and an official request for volunteers to help voice the program.

* * * *

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:07 p.m. The next meeting will be September 23, 2020.



Cameron R. Roberts, Secretary
Landmark Commission