

**CITY OF CLEVELAND HEIGHTS
ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
MARCH 1, 2022**

ABR MEMBERS PRESENT:

Joseph Strauss, Chair
Denver Brooker
Terry Saylor

STAFF PRESENT:

BreAnna Kirk, Planning Technician
Eric Zamft, Director of Planning
Karen Knittel, Assistant Director of Planning

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Kirk called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM with all the above-listed members present via WebEx.

APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 15, 2022, MINUTES

Minutes were approved as submitted and signed by Mr. Strauss.

**PUBLIC HEARING
MARCH 1, 2022**

ABR 2022-26: Walter Ginn, 2341 Roxoboro Road, requests to install roof-mounted solar panels.

- Dan Hinman of Better Together Solar, 3821 Prospect Avenue, 44115, described the solar panels. They will be mounted to the flat garage roof and small gable portion in the rear yard. The conduit will run underneath the eave, behind the downspout, and follow the communication and internet lines that are existing.

ACTION: Mr. Strauss moved to approve the solar panels as shown on Better Together Solar's plans, received January 19, 2022. Seconded by Mr. Brooker, the motion was unanimously approved.

ABR 2022-27: Daniel Waters & Christine Jellis, 2590 Fairmount Boulevard, request to install roof-mounted solar panels.

- Daniel Waters described the solar panels that will be mounted on the flat roof portions of his home and garage. They should not be visible.

ACTION: Mr. Saylor moved to approve the solar panels as shown on Better Together Solar's plans, received January 19, 2022. Seconded by Mr. Brooker, the motion was unanimously approved.

ABR 2022-28: Jon Taylor, 2509 Wellington Road, requests to install an addition and deck in the rear yard.

- Eli Mahler of Eli Mahler Associates, 3947 West Ash Lane, 44122, described the addition and deck. The porch will be converted to a mudroom and open out to a deck. The materials for the addition will match the rest of the home.
- Mr. Saylor asked if there will be an overhang or if the first and second floors are aligned. Mr. Mahler said there is a slight overhang.

ACTION: Mr. Saylor moved to approve the addition and deck as shown on Eli Mahler Associates' plans, dated October 5, 2022, with the option of aligning the first and second floors. Seconded by Mr. Brooker, the motion was unanimously approved.

ABR 2022-29: David & Irene Strachan, 2603 Fairmount Boulevard, request to renovate and install patios and walkways, install a concrete basketball pad, and construct a retaining wall, outdoor fireplace, masonry grill, and steps.

- Bill Hance and Matt Supler of New Vista Enterprises, P.O. Box 21313, 44121, described the project. The materials will match with the home.
- Paul Volpe, a direct neighbor of the project, stated that the area between their properties is very wooded, obstructing most of the view into their property. He said he is delighted with this project. His only concern would have been the basketball court, but it is on the opposite side of the property.

ACTION: Mr. Saylor moved to approve the patios and walkways, concrete basketball pad, retaining wall, outdoor fireplace, masonry grill, and steps as shown on New Vista Enterprises plans, received February 9, 2022. Seconded by Mr. Brooker, the motion was unanimously approved.

ABR 2022-30: Allison Tyson, 3089 East Overlook Road, requests to construct a two-car, detached garage.

- Steve Mazzone of Godfather Garages, 3601 Clark Avenue, 44109, described the garage. It will have a 7:12 gable roof and platinum grey siding to match the house.
- Mr. Strauss asked if the 7:12 pitch is a result of trying to match the pitch of the roof on the house. Mr. Mazzone said that the main reason for the steep pitch is to create a storage area.
- Mr. Saylor noted that the neighboring property's garage is right next to this garage and the gable orientations match. He did not have any problems with the proposal. Mr. Brooker agreed.
- Mr. Strauss said that the roof pitch seems out of proportion with the garage and informed the applicant that the ABR typically tries to match the garage to the house. Mr. Saylor said he would be hesitant to flip the gable because of the close proximity to the neighboring garage that has a standard gable.

ACTION: Mr. Brooker moved to approve the garage as shown on Godfather Garage's plans, received February 11, 2022. Seconded by Mr. Saylor, the motion was unanimously approved.

ABR 2022-31: Heights Medical Building LLC, 2446 Fairmount Boulevard,
requests to install an awning and signage.

- Mike Bizjak of CESCO Imaging, 4330 North Bend Road, 44004, described the signage. The upper window will have a channel letter sign, a black awning will be installed over the lower windows, and a blade sign will be installed adjacent to the upper window.

ACTION: Mr. Saylor moved to approve the signage as shown on CESCO Imaging's plans, received February 16, 2022. Seconded by Mr. Brooker, the motion was unanimously approved.

ABR 2021-304 (Continued from 12-21-2021): Flaherty & Collins, Cedar-Lee-Meadowbrook Redevelopment Site, bounded by Cedar Road, Lee Road, and Meadowbrook Boulevard, and bisected by Tullamore Road (PPN 687-06-009, 687-06-010, 687-06-013, 687-06-088, 687-06-089, 687-06-090, 687-06-091, 687-06-092, 687-06-093, 687-06-094, 687-06-095, 687-06-096, 687-06-159 and 687-08-001), requests design approval of the proposed Cedar-Lee-Meadowbrook redevelopment.

- Mr. Strauss introduced the project and said that the ABR may be taking action tonight. He described how the public comment portion will work.
- Mr. Zamft gave opening remarks, describing how this meeting fits into the approval process and explaining what the meeting is about.
- Brandon Bogan of Flaherty & Collins, One Indiana Square, Suite 300, 46204, introduced himself and handed the presentation off to John Wagner and Alex Pesta of City Architecture, 12206 Larchmere Boulevard, 44120.
- Mr. Wagner started the presentation by discussing the site and site plan. He then went into the building floor plans and elevations, followed by 3D renderings.
- Looking at the Cedar Road elevation, Mr. Strauss asked some clarifying questions about the materials. Mr. Wagner said that there are two materials boards, one for the Cedar Lee building and one for the Meadowbrook building. The Cedar Road façade has the redder brick color. The aluminum siding is in two different gray colors. It has a very minor V groove and will look more like lap siding with a slight shadow line. It comes in 4- or 6-inch panels. Mr. Strauss said it looks dark and Mr. Wagner said the photographs are just examples of the products being used and might not be representative of the exact colors, which can be seen in the swatches at the bottom of the page. Mr. Strauss noted the materials board shows the aluminum siding in a vertical pattern. Mr. Wagner confirmed they intend to use it horizontally as the elevations and renderings show. Mr. Strauss said he is not crazy about it. He asked about the approach with the copper material and said he doesn't think it does anything for the project.
- Mr. Strauss said that overall, he likes the massing and the articulation of the vertical massing and relationships. He said the cornice at the top of the building helps finish it off. He said there are a lot of positives, but his two

concerns are the aluminum siding and copper material. He asked the other ABR members for their opinions.

- Mr. Saylor said his first thought was that it seemed a little dark. He said he likes the consistency of the Meadowbrook Building, but along Cedar Road, the bays are broken up by materials; some are brick, some are aluminum siding. He said it seems like it would be more consistent with the Lee Road elevation if the Cedar Road elevation bays were all done in brick. Mr. Strauss agreed that the Lee Road elevation is more consistent and comfortable and said that the Cedar Road façade looks like it was designed by a different person.
- Mr. Saylor recalled having concerns with the street level on the Cedar Road façade at the previous meeting and said this is an improvement. Mr. Strauss agreed.
- Mr. Brooker said it seems like two buildings are intentionally different. He acknowledged that the ABR members preferred the Meadowbrook Building over the Cedar Lee building and said that part of that is the Meadowbrook building has a more disciplined use of the language and materials which is consistent and harmonious. He said the Cedar Lee building is larger and has a more irregular, playful quality because it is less disciplined. In some ways, it is reflective of the neighborhood in terms of the irregularity and variety that exists between buildings and it's trying to bring that vitality to a singular building. He said he has mixed feelings and likes the development and refinement of both buildings. He does not like the Cedar Lee building as much as the Meadowbrook building but appreciates its eclectic, irregular qualities. He thinks it might be a good thing in this neighborhood to have two different voices at play. Mr. Saylor agreed and said he is not opposed to the variation between the two buildings. He wondered if the building would appear less dark if all of the bays had brick up to the third floor. Mr. Brooker said if the middle bay had brick, it would simplify the elevation a bit. As for the darkness component, he pointed out that in sunlight, the gray will not feel dark and that this color actually seems brighter and sharper against grey skies than a lighter building would. Mr. Brooker thought that perhaps simplifying one or two things would simplify the Cedar Road façade enough while retaining the vitality and eclectic nature of the building.
- Mr. Strauss asked Mr. Saylor and Mr. Brooker's opinions on the copper elements. Mr. Brooker said his opinion on the copper goes back to his earlier comments; this building is eclectic and irregular and the copper is one ingredient that allows it to be so. He said it might be the element that is one step too far, or it might be the aluminum. Mr. Saylor said it certainly draws one's attention to the center, which he likes. He is hopeful that it will not feel dated down the road, Mr. Strauss agreed.
- Mr. Saylor asked about the detailing on the Cedar Road façade. Mr. Wagner said the detailing on this building is much more simplified and modern than the Meadowbrook building. He said they are trying to create two separate moments, one with the Lee Road façade and all of the brick buildings in that zone, and one that is more bold, modern, playful, and different. He said there is brick detailing, but it is done in a simple way. The three-story sections are capped with a soldier and roll out and the windows have precast

sills. He said there are moments that reference historic architecture in the City.

- Mr. Saylor asked about window treatments. Mr. Bogan said that the punched openings and smaller window areas will have horizontal blinds and the larger windows typically have a roller shade.
- Mr. Strauss asked exactly what they allow on balconies. Mr. Bogan said tables, chairs, and some plants. They do not allow grills, bikes, couches, or anything to that extent.
- Mr. Brooker said the cap on the far left of the Cedar Road façade at the roof level appears to project over either side of the glass and over the first longboard-sided fourth-floor element. He said the capping on the opposite corner, above the copper cladding, appears to be flush with the longboard-sided elements. Mr. Wagner said that is a glitch in the rendering and they will be consistent.
- Mr. Brooker said the Cedar Road façade has a wide range of materials and colors and also a wide range of fenestration patterns and spacing. He said that some soft nudges to bring some level of consistency back should simplify it a bit but not so much that it becomes boring. Mr. Bogan asked if changing the middle bay to be brick through the third level would alleviate some of the ABR's concerns. Mr. Strauss said that would be an improvement and Mr. Brooker agreed and added that having consistency with the windows would accomplish the same thing as an alternative. Mr. Saylor agreed and said that the simplification would accomplish the development team's goal of highlighting the corner with the copper.
- Mr. Saylor said one of the concerns from the last presentation was that the corner was highlighted with the copper but there was nothing unique in that section; he asked how that was resolved. Mr. Wagner said it used to be a series of punched openings and they adjusted the proportions to make them better related to some of the corner elements with thicker mullions.
- Looking at the shared street elevation, Mr. Strauss asked about the addition of copper elements. Mr. Wagner said the copper section on the right end is a residential entrance and the middle section exists at the turn of the corner units.
- Mr. Saylor said the shared street elevation is well delineated. He noted the elevation serves as a transition from the brick-heavy Cedar façade to the aluminum siding-heavy back of the building. He said it does not feel dark or foreboding. It has a good balance of irregularity and consistency.
- Mr. Strauss questioned the use of brick for all 4 floors for the bays at the corner section. Mr. Saylor and Mr. Brooker felt that the building would not lose anything if it changed from 4 stories of brick to 3 stories. Mr. Bogan said he would like to get away from 4th story brick to avoid contraction-expansion issues.
- Mr. Brooker said the south end of the Meadowbrook building is well resolved, though it feels like there is a gap in the streetscaping. He'd like to see something that holds the corner. He's not sure if the two colors of gray are necessary, but he is okay with them. The terracing on the east end still feels like a gesture to walk up there even though it does not lead anywhere. Mr. Wagner said the terracing is meant as seating and that as they continue

upwards, the gaps will widen and would have to be climbed to be reached. There is also a gate and ground cover at the top to signal it is not a cut-through. Mr. Strauss agreed that the south end of the building has a nice finish and is well-articulated.

- Mr. Strauss said he really likes the Lee Road façade and does not have any comments. He said it is simple and works well.
- Mr. Saylor asked where the signage will occur along Lee Road. Mr. Wagner said the signs will be zoning compliant and come back to the ABR for final approval. They are looking at a series of canopies that create places for signs to be mounted.
- Mr. Brooker asked where the trash comes out of the Meadowbrook building. Mr. Wagner said there are 2 locations, one for residents on Tullamore Road close to the corner of Lee Road and Tullamore. The other location is for retail tenants, which will be taken out to Lee Road.
- Mr. Strauss said the northwest corner of the Meadowbrook building is very well-resolved. He said it is not a symmetrical façade but there is a tremendous amount of consistency in how it's handled. It is interesting but it works within a framework of design.
- Mr. Strauss asked about plans for handicap parking and Mr. Pesta said there are accessible parking spaces along the shared street and in the garage. They are providing double the amount of accessible parking spaces as required by code. Mr. Saylor wondered if the garage would provide adequate parking for football games at the high school and Mr. Pesta said that the City is looking at parking throughout the entire district and will review the results of the parking study.
- Mr. Brooker asked about how move-ins and trash service will happen at the Cedar Lee Building. Mr. Wager said the striped paved area is where trash service and move-ins will occur. Mr. Bogan said they have a coordinated scheduling effort for move-ins and move-outs for efficiency.
- Mr. Strauss asked about the safety of the shared street, he said it is not clear to him where people should walk. Mr. Wagner said the intention is not to have people go wherever they want. To calm traffic, they put a kink in the street, visually narrowed it with the gray bands, and created a raised speed table done in different materials. The speed table/crossing area is also banded by lighted bollards and there is other lighting and activity nearby. He said they wanted to make it as highly visible as possible and reduce people's ability to speed through the area. The intent is for the striping to alternate between stamped/stained concrete and pavers. Mr. Strauss had concerns about the uneven nature of pavers for pedestrians with mobility or visual challenges. Mr. Wagner said each "stripe" is about 8 feet wide and the smoother concrete stripes can easily accommodate pedestrians. Mr. Strauss said he is okay with the crossing area.
- Mr. Brooker said that he likes the crossing on the shared street and particularly what means in terms of pedestrian movement. He said the challenge is that this is both the primary pedestrian crossing and the primary service point and there are other maintenance issues with snow removal, etc. Mr. Brooker said he likes brick and concrete together, but in his experience, the concrete tends to erode at the seams. He said it could have been a

construction issue but it is another maintenance consideration. He said the crossing area is a fun place he'd want to be, but noted they have to make sure it is maintainable. Mr. Bogan said he shares the maintenance concerns and will evaluate the maintenance required for this area.

- At this time, Mr. Strauss opened up the floor for public comment.
- Joanne S. said that she is 100% in favor of this development and said the sooner the better. She liked the materials, specifically the copper and aluminum materials on the Cedar Lee building. She asked that it stay as proposed and nothing be replaced with brick. She said she loved the balconies and likes that there are rules regulating what can be stored on them. She suggested a low-maintenance climbing structure to be placed in the open space, perhaps designed by a local artist selected through a contest. She said there should be a greater grade change between the shaded picnic area and the grassy area. She said that the picnic area closes way too early and does not accommodate people who want to come to the district for dinner. Since there is a noise ordinance from 9:00 am to 9:00 pm, she suggested these hours at a minimum. She said if there are problems, deal with them, do not close the area off. She said the terraced area needs to be maintained so it does not get worn out.
- Gayle Lewin said that she is very much in favor of this project and loves the design. She thinks it is going to fit well into the neighborhood and will be a nice connection between the different styles of architecture. She said it will tie them all together with a modern flare. Her biggest concern is with the materials that actually get selected as the construction progresses. She said that sometimes it seems that the materials don't look the way they were rendered and she hopes that final materials are presented to the City for review. Mr. Strauss requested that the material samples be submitted for ABR review.
- Catherine Osborn, 3255 Cedarbrook Road, voiced her support for the proposed designs. She said it is a project that she will be able to see from her home and asked the ABR to approve the plans. She said that in researching her home's history, she found advertisements for the original Cedarbrook allotment, which encompasses the parcels of this project. The advertisement said that the future of this area cannot be overestimated and that "the homes of the newest architecture make it a neighborhood of increasing, rather than diminishing value." Ms. Osborn said the homes in her neighborhood were built to be modern in an area that has been forward-thinking for over 100 years and has a mix of people and materials and a variation of facades. She said this is what gives the streets and buildings their character, and that the project will add to the richness of the district and enhance the neighborhood with thoughtful designs, lighting, and landscaping. She likes the variation between the buildings and the proposed materials. She said it reflects the variation already at play and adds density and people, which is necessary to move forward. She said the project will help reclaim the modern architectural vision from over 100 years ago that did not include vacant parcels and an unsightly surface lot. She attended the preliminary presentation and appreciates how the design has been refined based on feedback from the community and ABR. She appreciates how the

designs calm traffic and facilitate pedestrian movement. Her only concern is the connection between the minipark and the shared street. She said the ramp and steps are not in the best condition and need to be maintained to make sure it is accessible.

- Joyce Huang, 2985 Corydon Road, said her family regularly walks to the district and is eager to see how this development will bring more residents and density to help support Lee Road businesses as well as invite new housing products. She likes the proposed terracing in the public space, particularly because she has a young child who likes to climb, so she appreciates a space tucked away from traffic where they can play, climb, and sit. She said that a permeable barrier along the picnic area, perhaps planters, would be helpful to show that edge and keep everyone safe. She is involved in Vision Zero with the City of Cleveland and stressed the importance of keeping the patio space safe from traffic. She and her husband are fully in support of the project and are excited to see it break ground.
- Amanda walks to the district frequently and said that she is excited about the new building and loves the design. She said the 3-story brick looks great with all of the other brick buildings. She likes how the gray recedes and makes the brick stand out. If anything, she thinks the Cedar Lee building is a bit conservative for Cleveland Heights, especially given its proximity to the library and its modern elements. She said it is a great way to incorporate the history of the community into a modern facility. She likes that the site will be very well-lit. She thinks the design process is going to be great for the City and will bring people and business to the district. She likes the 4-story brick on the shared street elevation. She is excited about the project and hopes everything gets approved.
- Jim Gehring, a 1979 Heights High graduate, and his wife Beth live within walking distance of the district and love what the project represents for this area. They had similar thoughts as the other commenters and said there is back-and-forth about how the buildings should look, and they just want to see it go up. He loves the submission and hopes it gets approved quickly.
- Mike Bechtel is a landscape architect and frequents the Cedar-Lee District. He fully supports the project and said they have the best team possible. His only comment is on the stamped concrete and pavers for the raised speed table. He suggested using clay pavers, not pre-cast. He said if they are going to use concrete, to stay away from stamping because it is a maintenance issue. He said that dyed concrete with a broom finish is easier to replace when the concrete eventually spalls.
- With no more comments to be made, the ABR looked at the back elevations of the buildings. Mr. Saylor asked about the transition from the west to the south. Mr. Wagner said it is very similar to the courtyard elevations with 1 story of brick, fiber cement siding above, and a series of balconies.
- Mr. Brooker mentioned the section of 4-story brick and Mr. Wagner said they can, and would even prefer, to reduce it to 3 stories of brick.
- ABR members considered the comments made by the public and deliberated on how to approve the designs. Mr. Strauss felt they had enough conditions regarding the Cedar Road façade that they should see the changes to ensure that the ABR members expressed themselves clearly and the design team

heard them correctly. He said it seems like the development team is open to the comments/suggestions discussed tonight and suggested discussing any disagreements now.

- Mr. Wagner shared his notes and the direction he thinks they might take. He heard that the middle bay on the Cedar façade should be changed to 3 stories of brick and the window fenestration patterns should be harmonious. He said the sections of 4-story brick on the Cedar Lee building should be reduced to 3 stories. The roofline on the Cedar façade should be resolved. The ABR should review physical material samples. He asked the ABR's final opinion on the copper material.
- Mr. Brooker said that some buildings want to follow a disciplined architectural language, and some buildings, like this one, do not because of the nature of the district they are in. He said that having an unexpected material or color is a way of being a part of the neighborhood where unexpected things exist. Mr. Saylor said he is okay with this and it draws attention to the intended area. He hopes it is not dated in 20 years.
- Mr. Brooker mentioned the conversations about paving and acknowledged that there is another level of landscape development. Mr. Strauss said he would like to see the landscape materials, in particular the hard surfaces, to ensure it is consistent with the overall architecture of the project. Mr. Brooker said he'd like to see where they end on the crossing at the mini-park. He'd like to see a more consistent edge at the Meadowbrook corner, perhaps raised planters, because it feels like something is missing. Mr. Zamft suggested a condition of their approval be that before the Planning Director approves the landscape plan, details are to be provided to the ABR for review.
- Mr. Strauss said he thinks the development team has a good handle on the comments and agrees with the ABR. He noted that in their revisions, they might find something doesn't work the way they intended it to, so he looks forward to seeing the final version.

ACTION: Mr. Strauss moved to approve the design of the Cedar-Lee-Meadowbrook Redevelopment as shown on City Architecture's plans, received February 9, 2022, with the following conditions:

- 1. Cedar Road façade***
 - a. The first three floors will be brick***
 - b. There should be consistency of window fenestration***
 - c. Resolve roofline at east corner***
 - d. A revised façade design will be submitted for review***
- 2. Shared Road***
 - a. No brick at fourth floor***
- 3. Park at Lee and Meadowbrook***
 - a. Add definition to Lee edge (for protection from street traffic)***
- 4. Landscape review***
 - a. Prior to Planning Director approval ABR will be given design for review***
- 5. Materials Review***
 - a. Development team will submit building materials and hard landscape materials samples to ABR for review.***

Seconded by Mr. Brooker, the motion was unanimously approved.

Old Business

New Business

Ms. Kirk said there will be a policy shift coming soon where all City Council/Commission/Board members will have to pick up paper copy packets from City Hall. Mr. Zamft said that right now, each ABR member signs a copy of the approved plans. He said that in his experience, typically the Chair signs all of the copies. The ABR will be making this same transition. Mr. Brooker has had the same experience with the Chair signing everything and does not have any problems with the change.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

BreAnna Kirk
BreAnna Kirk, Secretary

3.16.22
date

Approved,

Joseph Strauss
Joseph Strauss, Chair

3/15/22
date