

**CITY OF CLEVELAND HEIGHTS  
ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
JANUARY 18, 2021**

ABR MEMBERS PRESENT: Joseph Strauss, Chair  
Denver Brooker  
Terry Saylor

STAFF PRESENT: BreAnna Kirk, Planning Technician

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Kirk called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM with all the above-listed members present via WebEx.

**APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 21, 2021, MINUTES**

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

**APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 4, 2022, MINUTES**

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

**PUBLIC HEARING  
JANUARY 18, 2022**

**ABR 2022-8: Lee Price (Jowharah Muhammad), 1156 Erieview Road,** requests to construct a two-car detached garage.

- Duane Schreiner of Shannonwood Homes, 1635 Wood Road, 44121, described the garage. It will have a reverse gable roof to match the home. The shingles will be slate-colored and the house roof will be redone to match. The siding will be light gray.

***ACTION: Mr. Saylor moved to approve the garage as shown on Shannonwood Homes' plans, received December 8, 2021. Seconded by Mr. Brooker, the motion was unanimously approved.***

**ABR 2022-9: Hans Struzyna, 1702 Coventry Road,** requests to construct a three-car detached garage.

- Duane Schreiner of Shannonwood Homes, 1635 Wood Road, 44121, described the garage. It will look very similar to the existing garage and have black shingles with pearl siding. There will be a reverse gable roof with a 4:12 pitch.

***ACTION: Mr. Saylor moved to approve the garage as shown on Shannonwood Homes' plans, received December 8, 2021. Seconded by Mr. Brooker, the motion was unanimously approved.***

**ABR 2022-10: Calvin & Scott Easter, 1211 Oakridge Road,** request to install new windows.

- Mark Polomsky of Empire Window Company, 29695 Pettibone Road, 44139, described the windows. The homeowner previously replaced some of the windows with a slightly different grid pattern that is more rectangular than square. They would like to replace the original windows to match the new rectangular grid pattern.

***ACTION: Mr. Strauss moved to approve the windows as shown on Empire Window Company's plans, dated December 13, 2021. Seconded by Mr. Brooker, the motion was unanimously approved.***

**ABR 2022-11: Mike Lyford & Sonja Rajki, 2170 North Saint James Parkway,** request to construct a screened porch.

- Sharon Sanders of SKS Designs, 2372 Delamere Drive, 44106, described the porch. It will be on the right side of the west (rear) elevation. It will have a gable roof that matches the slope of the large gable above it. The south elevation will have paulownia trim and slats.

***ACTION: Mr. Saylor moved to approve the porch as shown on SKS Designs' plans, received December 22, 2021. Seconded by Mr. Brooker, the motion was unanimously approved.***

**ABR 2022-12: Jonathan Karn, 2268 Coventry Road,** requests to install roof-mounted solar panels.

- James Brown and John Wittine of Third Sun Solar, 762 West Undon Street, 45701, and Jonathan Karn described the solar panels. They are on the back of the home and should not be visible from the street.

***ACTION: Mr. Saylor moved to approve the solar panels as shown on Third Sun Solar's plans, dated December 14, 2021. Seconded by Mr. Brooker, the motion was unanimously approved.***

**ABR 2022-13: Margaret Calkins, 3345 North Park Boulevard,** requests to install roof-mounted solar panels.

- James Brown and John Wittine of Third Sun Solar, 762 West Undon Street, 45701, and Margaret Calkins described the solar panels. Trees on the property block most of the view from the street. The conduit will be mounted underneath the soffit and painted dark brown to match the side of the house.

- Mr. Saylor said he does not have a problem if the solar panels are visible from the street. He said the home is mid-century modern and the panels are not inappropriate.

***ACTION: Mr. Strauss moved to approve the solar panels as shown on Third Sun Solar's plans, dated December 14, 2021. Seconded by Mr. Saylor, the motion was unanimously approved.***

**ABR 2022-14: Aharon & Mindi Garfunkel, 3391 Blanche Avenue,** request to construct a rear addition and deck.

- Tatiana Tate of Levine Architecture & Design, Ltd., 3716 Tolland Road, 44122, described the addition and deck. The addition will be built over a new basement and contain a one-story bedroom and bathroom. The basement will have an exit door on the west elevation (side) with stairs up to grade. The deck will be wood. The addition will have a shed roof. There will be a trim piece at the beginning of the addition to hide the siding joints.
- Mr. Saylor said that if he were doing the project, he would replace most of the siding on the west elevation so that the trim piece is not needed, but this is a recommendation and not a requirement.
- Mr. Brooker said the addition feels pretty seamless with the house.

***ACTION: Mr. Saylor moved to approve the addition and deck as shown on Levine Architecture & Design's plans, received December 22, 2021. Seconded by Mr. Brooker, the motion was unanimously approved.***

**ABR 2022-15: Integrity Real Estate (Overlook Partners LLC), 2235 Euclid Heights Boulevard,** requests to install signage.

- Kevin Holiday of A Sign Above, 8882 Dutton Drive, 44087, and Jeff Gold of Integrity Real Estate described the signage. There will be two signs for Reserve Overlook Apartments, one at the main vehicular entrance on Euclid Heights Boulevard and one at a pedestrian entrance on Euclid Heights Boulevard. Both will be mounted on the existing stone wall. The signs are black with gold writing and details.
- Mr. Strauss asked why the signs differ in size and Mr. Holiday said his customer wanted one sign to be the primary entrance sign and the other to be a smaller, secondary entrance sign.
- Ms. Kirk said that a zoning variance is required for this project because the maximum area for residential identification signs is 12 square feet and this project has 20 square feet.
- Mr. Strauss said that from an aesthetics standpoint, he would make the two signs the same size. He felt the differing sizes compete with each other.
- Mr. Strauss said that the 96" long vehicular entrance sign seems very large and questioned the need for a sign this big. Mr. Saylor agreed and said that it seems excessive for what they are trying to accomplish. He thought the

design was nice but the sign is too large. Mr. Strauss agreed and said it actually makes it harder to read at this length.

- Mr. Strauss's preference would be to see 2 signs that match. He could see supporting 2 signs that looked like the pedestrian entrance sign but noted that would still need a zoning variance.
- Mr. Saylor said that a 4-foot sign at the pedestrian entrance was still large, and felt that 18" by 36" might fit better. Mr. Gold said the sizes were selected so the signs can be read while someone drives by. Mr. Strauss said that a larger sign at the vehicular entrance is warranted but still felt that 96" is too large.
- Mr. Brooker observed that the rendering of the sign on the stone wall is not shown to scale and requested drawings that had a better context photo and the sign placed in scale. He said that if the sign will look as it's being presented and be 50% of the wall height, he agrees that it is way too big.
- Mr. Brooker said that the signs are speaking two different languages. The first sign emphasizes "Reserve Overlook" and has "Apartments" written much smaller underneath. On the smaller sign, though, all 3 words are centered and have the same weight. He said that on a branding level, it doesn't feel like the signs are doing the same thing.
- Mr. Holiday asked if a 6' by 18" primary entrance sign would fit.
- Mr. Gold said they could also reduce the size of "Apartments" on the secondary sign for a more consistent message. Mr. Strauss said this was a good idea to unify the message. He felt the primary entrance sign has a stronger message and also noted that many apartment signs don't include the word "apartments".
- Mr. Saylor said that if they are rethinking the sizes of the signs, they should be shown in context and scaled. He also said if they reduce the primary sign from 96" wide to 72" wide, the height should be resized proportionally to keep consistent spacing. He said that if the resubmission shows the signs in context and more accurately in size and scale with the relationship to the wall, he would be more amenable to the size. Mr. Strauss agreed, saying that the proportions of the sign are good, but it is oversized.
- Mr. Holiday said they will come back with something smaller.

***No Action: Continued to future meeting***

## **Old Business**

## **New Business**

## Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:03 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

BreAnna Kirk  
BreAnna Kirk, Secretary

2.1.2022  
date

Approved,

Joseph Strauss  
Joseph Strauss, Chair

2/1/22  
date