

convinced that there is not a path they can take to rehabilitate the house. Childs said that they should have an architect here. Clemens said they need to present a plan for saving the house. He said that rehabilitating the house isn't wildly unrealistic. He said they have a walk out lower level and that it could potentially add to the house in the rear.

King opened the meeting up to the public for discussion about the demolition. Brett Davis 60 South Main Street said just for the record the comment was made that neighbors have been calling about this project and he has not called. He said he has no problem with what they've proposed here.

Mark asked what portion of the house they were trying to save. Clemens said that it's the main structure. Mark said they know the garage needs to come down and the front and back porch. Clemens said that it's the primary form of the structure. That everything else has come and gone. Koepf asked if the cost estimate was to restore the house and Brad said it was. Koepf pointed out that they have no plans to restore the house, so what did they base the cost estimate on? Brad said that the cost is for what it would be to restore the house and that's what it would take to make that happen. Koepf said that based on what they are hearing they think there is historic value in restoring the original structure. He said the original structure is a tiny Greek Revival Hall & Parlor type home that was moved there and that everything else is up for grabs. He said if you can save the original structure and try and use the garage as a way to get down the hill, what would that cost. He said to do what you want to do behind the house and come back to the Board and tell them how much that would cost. Brad said that what he is hearing is that the Board wants them to keep the original box and that if they can get to the rear of the home the Board would be open to an addition on the back. Clemens said that they would prefer restoration of the box instead of rebuilding it. Childs said that when they add to it, they need to break up the composition of the home, so it has the looks and feel of Chagrin. Brad asked if they came back with a proposal for the house that looks the same but is very expensive to renovate, would the Board be more open to demolishing the house. Clemens said that they are trying to save this house and that they should try and find ways to save it.

Summation-motion by Naylor seconded by Childs to table this discussion for the following reasons: Requesting drawings for rehabilitating the existing house; the historic Greek Revival Hall and Parlor type house should be saved; the later garage addition could be removed; suggestion of a rear addition. The proposed new house plans are not compatible with Chagrin Falls historic architecture. Roll Call: King-yea, Naylor-yea, Childs-yea. Motion passed.

2. Hall

264 Miles Rd.

Exterior Alteration-Final

John Hall (Homeowner) presented these plans. He said they are replacing the windows on the east elevation. He said they are keeping the same height and width. He said he is just lowering the window to line up with the other window. He said on the west side he has a single double hung and he wants to add a double there. Clemens said he would stay away from the shutters on that window. Clemens and Childs said to keep the shutters off the double hung window.

Summation-motion by Naylor, seconded by Childs for final approval of plans for replacement of three windows with no shutters on the paired window. Roll Call: King-yea, Naylor-yea, Childs-yea. Motion passed.

3. Kaminski

110 May Court

Exterior Alteration-Preliminary

King read the Historical Significance Report (HSR) and said that the house at 110 May Court does meet the standards of a Historically Significant Property as defined in Codified Ordinance Section 1146.03(C)(2) the structure is presumed to be an Historically Significant Property because it is more than 100 years old. The proposed exterior changes #1-4 alter the appearance of 110 May Court, and do not follow the Codified Ordinance Section 1146.04(d)(1-3) "guidelines" for "preservation of features," "replacement of features," and "compatibility," and in that regard have an adverse effect on the design and historical significance of the house and of the adjacent, contiguous, and neighboring period building. Clemens said another point that was made was that the rear addition does not step in on both sides and he said the existing addition doesn't step in on both sides. He said their addition does work with the existing foundation. Naylor said she thought that the HSR was talking about the new roof ridge line needing to be brought lower than the ridge line of the existing home. She said that the massing of the proposed addition needs to disappear a little more and is overwhelming from public site line views. Motion by King, seconded by Naylor to receive the HSR report. Roll Call: Childs-yea, Naylor-yea, King-yea.

Eric Kaminski (Homeowner) presented these plans. Clemens said that it looks like the ridge line is in fact below the existing ridge and Eric said that it was. He said he took the recommendations from the Board and brought the ridge line down and bumped in the corner. Childs said that the E wall should be 6' and Eric said that it is 7' with the dormer addition. Childs said the dormers on the back were too heavy for the composition on both sides. He said the homeowner needs to look at the muntin patterns on the shed dormers, that the muntin pattern needs to have egress. He said if he is going to do the windows, he would put them together as a dormer. Clemens said that it looks like the only part of the house that they are looking at historically is the front of the house and Eric said that he is taking the vinyl siding off the front of the house and leaving the windows. Naylor asked if he was open to reconfiguring the porch the way Perspectus is recommending. Eric said that the only thing he is proposing on the porch is that right now the stairs go straight out into the driveway, and he wants them to come out in front of the house. Naylor said the existing porch is only three columns and he's proposing four. Clemens said if he left the three columns and moved the steps that would be a problem. He said to reestablish the door and move the steps and leave the columns. Childs said he needs to make the dormers smaller and more of a secondary element. Clemens said the dormer needs to be combined with the front or go away. He said that he's creating a valley for the water. Koepf said there are a lot of issues that need to be worked out. Eric asked if in terms of refining do they mean to make the dormer smaller, more details on some of the sections, move the columns to a three-column porch, the way it currently is. Clemens said that as far as the Western Reserve returns need to be shown and incorporated in the design. He said that would change the appearance of the drawing.

Summation-motion by Naylor, seconded by King to table this discussion for the following reasons: suggestion to restudy rear dormers are too heavy/side dormer create a valley; window muntin on

dormers are running horizontally; look at proportion of windows; composition is too heavily weighted to the rear; needs to show final design details on architect drawings. Roll Call: Childs-yea, King-yea, Naylor-yea. Motion passed.

4. 97 Williams LLC

97 Williams Street

Exterior Alteration-Final

George Clemens (Architect) presented these plans. He said that the Board has seen these drawings before at the preliminary form and that they are here with final drawings and there have not been any substantial changes to them. Naylor said that this was a unique site topographically and that it is interesting because it is part of a commercial section of town, also with a 3-story new condo complex next store and a lot of space tucked to the rear. George said that they are being sensitive to the slope issues and making sure they are doing it right in terms of grading. He said they went through the Board of Zoning Appeals and received a variance for the rear addition that is in the front yard setback. He said that he is okay with the lot coverage and that the garage conforms. He said that they think they are making the house a positive livable space and maintaining the historic value house. Naylor and Childs asked what had changed since the preliminary. He said that they are not changing the porch and at the recommendation of the Board they are leaving the front door where it is and adding a door in the mudroom.

Summation-motion by Naylor, seconded by King for final approval of plans as presented. Roll Call: Naylor-yea, King-yea, Childs-yea. Motion passed.

5. Raftus

106 Church Street

Exterior Alteration-Preliminary

Becky Pantuso (Architect) presented these plans. Becky said that she is conceding on everything in the Historic Significance Report (HSR). She said she was leaving the windows. She showed the evolution of her plans from what she initially proposed to what they are doing. She said if the addition of the fireplace is controversial, they are taking that out. Becky said that they are doing an addition that is less than 700 square feet and that she dropped the dormer per the recommendation of the ABR. She said she is willing to concede on the front door but thinks a front door should face the street and if the Board disagrees, she will leave it walking right into the family room. She said that she has tried in extensive effort to appease the six people in front of her, the five Board members and the person from Perspectus. Becky showed the site line, trees, person and thinks this is a modest addition at best. Building and Zoning Inspector Dominic Cribari said that she needs a variance for the steps on the rear because they extend 10' and they are over 64 square feet when you add in the landing. He said that they are looking at zoning clarification and variance for the lot coverage in the rear for the pervious surfaces compared to the non-pervious and if that counts. He said they are looking at improved parking because usually they don't count pervious surfaces as improved land. Becky said they need a front yard variance for the porch that they are extending per the Board's recommendation and possibly for driveway coverage. Becky said she is removing the detached garage which has a certain amount of impervious roof. She said she has tucked the entire garage into the house and that there is no foundation addition and she said she would leave the ugly front porch on it. She said she is challenging the rear yard setback for the stairs. Naylor asked what the extent of the variances are before the Board votes. Naylor said that the variances are

important because of recommendations to Planning & Zoning. Becky said they need a front yard variance for the porch. She said that they have been here three times before and every time she makes it less. Naylor said that she is just looking for the information and she does not want to make this process any longer either since they have already had four meetings on this and that they keep revisiting the same things. Naylor would like to know what the variances are at this point before the Board takes a final vote. Dominic said that there is a front yard variance because the porch is getting wider. Becky said the porch is into the front yard by 4' because you are allowed approximately 50 square feet. Clemens said it is a possible front yard variance since you are allowed 48 square feet. Clemens said the rear variance is for the paving. Clemens asked if they already approved the demolition of the garage and Dominic said they have not approved anything. Naylor said that they talked about this earlier today at the meeting that the ABR needs plans with complete information presenting the proposed design, so the process does not drag out. She said they need to know where the variances are and where the Zoning is when they get to this point in the process. She said that they are trying to respect the Zoning code and variances are very important to them. Becky said that in the last meeting they had the garage under the rear porch, and they forced the homeowner to lose that. Naylor said at the last meeting the ABR requested to finalize the drawings so that the Board could look at all the design elements and the variances that were needed. She said she appreciates the concessions that have been made but is to the point where she just needs to see what the drawings are and what the variances are before she can vote. Becky asked if Dominic could explain what the variances are. She said that if a deck is not considered part of an addition how can stairs to the deck require a variance. Naylor asked if there is a variance required for the steps and Dominic said yes because the steps extend out and the way he reads the code the steps are 64 square feet and go over and go over the 48 and exceed more than 6' into the rear yard. He said the deck is existing, but the steps are new. He said the other variance would be for driveway rear yard coverage pending the review from Rob Jamieson and the law director. Koepf said he thinks her design reflects the fact that she needs a retaining wall and Becky said she was just putting stairs on. Becky said every time she comes here there's something new and she didn't realize stairs were being counted against her. Naylor asked if there were any retaining walls required in the back and Becky said not more than 3'. Clemens said that they could recommend based on the use of permeable materials and elimination of the steps. Naylor requested again what the lot coverage is and what's the variance. Dominic said it is the pervious surface and he and Rob had discussed once they had talked to the law director, that pervious surface does not count as improved parking space which the code requires then there is no lot coverage issues and if they need to interpret it that way then it will be about 200 square feet. Clemens asked if the homeowners are willing to give up the steps, then they could vote for preliminary approval which is what is supposed to happen before they get to the variance issues. He said that they could recommend approval. Naylor said that is what she is trying to get to, what is the variance and what is she recommending. Clemens said that there are 3 possible variances, Becky eliminated one during the meeting because the steps are gone, the second may go away because of the permeable materials and the third is right on the edge of being a variance. He said he would characterize them as being minor variances. Clemens said he thinks they are asking if you are okay with the plans going forward based on the potential variances and no rear steps or are you not. He said he thinks the drawings give you enough to ask or answer that question. Childs said that the other thing is that Becky is here after 2 walk-ins where the Board had their comments, Perspectus had their report and had their

comments and now she is back a third time at preliminary and they've said the same thing. He said that he feels like this is a Greek Revival house that the shed dormers are Arts and Crafts and personally he would not vote for this. Becky asked if she could respond to that. Childs said that they've been doing this for 4 meetings and Naylor said that they have had the same comments through 2 walk-ins, 2 preliminary meetings and a historic significance report, and she agrees with Childs. Becky said she needs to know what the ideal process is of this Board because she has come in as a walk-in to get their feedback so that when she submits on a preliminary formal level, they are closer to what Perspectus is going to see in the end. She said that is what she is trying to do, and it seems like that was a terrible idea. Naylor said it was not and that they have told her the last 4 times the same comments and they get the same drawings. Becky said that they were not getting the same drawings, that every time she is making concessions. She said out of sixteen comments they've done all but one. Naylor said that the major comment was related to the massing and dormer, and she said they could take a vote. Becky said it is hard for her to navigate this Board and is trying to figure out what everybody wants. She said that we have architecture advisors and a historic consultant, both of which at some point have been supportive of this project, but she said she has 3 voting members that she needs to listen to too. King said he did not see the supporting part. Becky asked if Clemens and Koepf were in support of this project of the design of this. Koepf said when he looks at where the house is and the existing front proposed elevation and what they have talked about to try and accomplish the living space and he thinks it has come a long way. He said he has mentioned that he thought the front of the house should be pulled back from the shingles to expose the siding that they know is there and the trim detailing he is reasonably certain is there. He said he does not have a problem with the massing. He said that he told Becky that she could not take a rear porch on pillars and turn it into a garage on pillars and not consider that as an encroachment to the rear yard setback. He said he doesn't blame himself for telling Becky how to read the code. He said that was one of the things they argued about and forced her to give up for her client. He said he doesn't like being the bad guy telling her that she is not complying with the code. He said that he wants to save old houses, keep them from becoming mansions and maintain a house on a tiny little lot with architecture that reflects the fact that it is a tiny little lot. He said that they are asking her to pull the stuff back because you should not have to ask for a variance if you do not make the house so big that it requires it. Becky said that nothing about the house is asking for a variance. She said the porches are asking for variances. Childs said the porch is part of the character of Chagrin and part of the architecture and massing. Becky said they grew the porch per the recommendation of the Board, and they are good with that. Childs said that as architects when a project comes in, they can look at it and know right off the bat whether it is right or wrong. Becky said during this process at some point each of the architects said that this was a creative solution as far as the massing. She said that both of them had said that during this process. Clemens said he feels it is more contentious than needs to be and that he agrees that there are some things about the drawings that need to be developed. He said he is not upset by the height of the rear side facing rear gable form that is being proposed, so that portion of the massing. He said that the porch and the stairs are not an issue for him. He said the front porch roof is okay with him. He thinks the rear porch is existing so that is not an issue and if the rear steps are going away then are also not an issue and are probably not much of an issue by the code. He thinks the front porch roof needs work from the side elevation and that there are little things in the drawing that need to be developed. He said from a preliminary massing standpoint, it is a really low house, and they are trying to do something with the

upstairs but that the side facing gable is a long way back from the street and he does not think it is overpowering. He said in that sense he is in support of these issues because they are trying to do the garage thing. He said that now that they are doing the existing basement, it is hard to argue with that. He said you need to look at permeable vs. impermeable coverage is something that needs to be sorted out and that he is neutral on that because it is not their purview. Clemens said that in the big picture for the preliminary is the massing works for him. Becky said that they call the house a Greek Revival and Perspectus is naming it vernacular, and she thinks that everyone on the Board would agree that there is a shred of truth to that. She said they have shake shingles and all of these quirky characters or details on the house that have pulled it away from Greek Revival. She said she wanted to get closer to that, representing in her drawings. Clemens asked if she was keeping the siding and Becky said if they take it off and find lap siding, she said she would come back to the Board and ask if they can restore it even closer to the original. She said she is not sure if that is what they are going to find. She thinks the house has had an evolution and there is only one original window and Perspectus said that was the one they didn't mention. She said that they are going to save the door. Clemens said he also does not have a problem with the front facing door and if she wants to save the old door, leave it where it is. He is that it is critical in the plans to have that front-facing door. Koepf said that they cannot vote without knowing what the variances are. Clemens said that they could vote preliminary based on potential variances. He does not think that they cannot vote on a preliminary basis since they only have 2 potential minor variances. Naylor said she wants to start a precedence where they have complete drawings and variances and information in the room so that when they vote they have the complete proposed design. She said she is trying to respect the code and the character of the Village and use the guidelines they were given to implement. She said the dormer and massing discussion are not new. She said they have talked about that from the beginning. She said she really struggles with the dormer and roof line, and she has from the beginning. Becky said that it changes every single time, they make it smaller, smash it down every single time. Naylor said that sometimes a house cannot accommodate the needs of an owner and she is hesitant to go with a design because an owner needs it. She said it is a tiny house on a tiny lot. Becky said that they have no lot coverage issues with the addition of this home. She said that she has two architects saying the massing seems fine and is wondering why it has taken her 4 times to get here. Naylor said she's been telling her for the last 4 times that this was her personal view. Becky said for them to vote. King said it is a square peg in a round hole and getting to the point of car turnarounds and at what point does it not work. Becky said it is an outdoor turnaround in Ohio that is allowing it. King questioned the turnaround as the manufacturer said it would need leaf cleanout and is not snow plowable. She said she could keep the existing garage but thinks this is a good solution. Naylor said that they have said that the garage could go. Becky said that they need a place for their cars. Koepf said he doesn't want to tell her how to do her job and he thinks they should vote. Becky asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to chime in, and the Board said that this was not a public meeting.

Summation-motion by Naylor, seconded by King for preliminary approval of plans as presented.

Roll Call: King-nay, Naylor-nay, Childs-nay. Motion failed.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:55 A.M.

Steve King

6-20-23

Steve King, Chairman

Date