

VILLAGE OF CHAGRIN FALLS

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 15, 2020

Members Present: Bill Childs, George Clemens, Steve King, Phil Koepf, Wendy Naylor

Also Present: Harry Edwards, Joan Andersen, Kristy Holmes-Facilitator

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion for approval of minutes from the September 1, 2020 meeting after amending the word tablatore to entablature on 231 E. Washington project. Motion by Naylor, seconded by King. Roll Call: Naylor-yea, King-yea, Childs-yea.

1. Marquette

25 Wilding Chase

Exterior Alterations-Final

George Clemens (architect) presented plans for a second-floor renovation to the master suite. He explained that they are adding a couple windows that will match the existing ones. They are adding a couple quarter round windows adjacent to the fireplace & then on the front elevation they are adding a window that will match the existing ones. He said they are adding a couple little windows on the rear elevation to illuminate the large walk-in closet.

Summation-motion by Childs, seconded by Naylor to approve the plans as presented.

Roll Call: Childs-yea, King-yea, Naylor-yea. Motion passed.

2. Coley

44 Bellview

Accessory Building-Demo/Rebuild-Preliminary

George Clemens (architect) presented plans to demolish an existing garage & replace with a new garage. He explained that this project was before the board a couple of years ago & had received preliminary approval at that time. George said they were moving the garage further back on the property, changing the drive to a new entrance on Bradley St. which allows a rear yard area. Building & Zoning Inspector Harry Edwards explained that there is a sanitary sewer right where they are proposing putting the new drive, goes right thru back yard. Harry said to check where the line for the sewer is. Harry also wanted to know if they staked out where the new driveway was. George said the existing driveway to south on Bradley St. is about 5' from the property line. George said the issue they are dealing with & they asked the surveyor to add the existing driveway to the south on Bradley. He said they aren't allowed to put driveways closer than 6' from each other, they could make a 1' adjustment & since the surveyor couldn't get the information in time for the meeting, he said they would make a commitment to have the driveways 6' apart. Building & Zoning Inspector Harry Edwards said they would have to submit a grade plane since it shows some drainage on Bellview here & his concern is everything drains toward Franklin St. George said they are aware of it & have a civil engineer working on project. Harry also asked about existing drive, he explained that it's against zoning code to have a drive that does not connect to a

garage & is only being used for parking. He said they would have to get a variance. George said they would probably go for the variance since the neighbor really depends on that driveway.

Summation-motion by King, seconded by Naylor to approve demolition of existing detached garage.
Roll Call: Childs-yea, King-yea, Naylor-yea. Motion passed.

George Clemens (architect) proposed a new garage to be built on the south elevation, flipping it around from where it is now. They are matching the roof pitch of the house & it's under 22" & over 18" so they need to be further from lot line. On the west elevation that faces neighbor's house on Bellview, shows the pool room they are going to tweak it a little by removing the pergola & adding a copper element. They are adding columns on all 4 corners of structure & have the entablature all around. On the east elevation, facing Bradley, there is a window above & a door & window below for balance. George explained that where it changes to copper they added a pergola element. Childs asked if on the south elevation he could pull the hood out a little, making it a little pure would stick out & George said it wouldn't that it would just be a little copper element. Naylor asked what the size of the garage was & the color of the shingles, whether they were painted or raw stain & how it would tie in with the house. George said it would blend with the house. Heather Davies (Clemens Architecture) said the garage was 20 by 18 1/2 wide.

Summation-motion by King, seconded by Naylor to approve demolition of existing detached garage based on the preliminary submission of the attached garage & based on variance & zoning issues that might come to light. Roll Call: Childs-yea, King-yea, Naylor-yea. Motion passed.

3. Coley

44 Bellview

Exterior Alterations-Preliminary

George Clemens (architect) presented plans for a new covered porch. He explained that they were raising the deck slightly & adding glass doors from family room, making the deck more of a porch, adding about 6'. They want to connect the indoor & outdoor space with the family room. Jody McCue (Design Group LLC Landscape Architects) explained that they are transitioning the existing deck, centering the pool house & minimizing the paving & making it an informal walkway from garage to deck. They will make a retaining wall with plants, making it feel like a courtyard. They want to keep the existing fence. Building & Zoning Inspector Harry Edwards explained if the fence wasn't 6' high then it would have to change & comply with our new ordinance. He also asked if the fence was board on board or privacy. He said if it's a whole fence it needs to have 25% light & air. King said they need to make sure the fence is attractive & Naylor agreed it needed to be attractive. George asked if they could just keep the existing fence around the pool only. Koepf asked about moving the fence in & add vegetation instead of running to front turn it back by stoop. Childs thought doing that was a good solution. He said make it a low picket fence then transition to a higher one. Jody asked if they could use abbeviates around the property & Harry said they can't get higher than 6' since they are using it as a fence. Jody asked if they could just use the existing one. Childs & Koepf both said they liked it. George said they are also replacing the French door & making it a single door. Childs thought the columns looked a little thin

& George said he could fatten the columns. Childs said he knows he's fighting with the transoms but maybe he could bring the entablature down to where the glass starts so it feels a little heavier & fatten up columns would work. Childs also asked if they could do anything with the rafter tail & George said it was a real challenge but they would study it. King asked what the screening under the porch was & George said the screen under porch will be white painted boards with a gap.

Summation-motion by King, seconded by Childs to approve preliminary plans as presented with suggestions to modifications to the rear of house & comments about the fencing. Roll Call: Naylor-yea, Childs-yea, King-yea. Motion passed.

4. 17 River Street Grill 17 River Exterior Alterations-Commercial Building Preliminary

Rick Siegfried (architect) presented plans for preliminary design approval for a new pergola structure to replace the round awning on front entrance of the building, it's a covered pergola roof on the side where the existing deck is & putting solid roof structures over the 2 decks in the back, & adding a trash enclosure. They are trying to add more outside dining. On the front door they are adding a structure that mimics what is going on across the street at the W Design office, adding stained durable brackets that will be buried in concrete, matching the pergola on side & adding a trash enclosure & the back will have a low sloping roof & are proposing adding skylights to them. They will add new treated Douglas fir trellis & a stained wood pergola structure. King asked about the 17- sign on the front of the building. Rick Doody (owner) said the sign wasn't important, thinking of just making it an open steel structure. Clemens said he would like it better opened. They added a new trash enclosure with vertical siding & asphalt shingle roof that matches the existing siding & that the awning will remain. Rick said that because they are a non-conforming building they have to go to the Board of Zoning Appeals for all the stuff. Clemens asked about the pergola front entrance stoop, thinks it's too close to the parking. Rick said they are a good distance off the sidewalk & its more comfortable than it actually looks. Rick Doody said they pulled it back & Joe Rackozcy (architect) said its 2' 8" off the curb. Childs likes everything & thought it was a good solution & he likes the material. He said on the front entry he would define it a little more, instead of going straight define it & have pediment read as the entry instead of flush connection & the skylights do 4 by 4 to get more natural light. Naylor asked what color the wood was & to consider a browner color instead of orange. Rick Doody said that they whitewashed the brick so the color doesn't look bad.

Summation-motion by Naylor, seconded by King for preliminary approval of plans as presented on the exterior renovations with comments about the gables, color, pergola canopy, & trash enclosure. Roll Call: Naylor-yea, King-yea, Childs-yea. Motion passed.

5. Finley 70 East Summit Attached Garage

Halley Novak (architect) presented revised plans for the garage. She explained that the main change was they added some fenestration & articulation to side of the new garage addition & are asking for a variance for the door & windows. They are reducing the lighting on porch & garage. On the east

elevation they added a door & 2 windows. King asked if they were replacing the windows on the front elevation & Halley asked what the board would prefer. Childs thought they should continue the double hung concept & add a small 2 by 2 window, keep the same geometry & fenestrations. Koepf said he liked the door on the side of garage & on the east elevation he would use just one window. He would put a new double hung in the dining room addition because what is there detracts from the house. Naylor said to do less, more simplified on the east elevation & spend the money on the front façade windows. Clemens agrees, he said to prioritize the vertical windows on the front elevation. Halley asked about the windows in the dining room, there is no roof line terminates over window is lower & thinks pediment might be squeezed in. Koepf said to try & push the window height as high as they can get it & Clemens said to do a new header & move them up to cornice & not be concerned about pediment heads. Childs said he wouldn't touch the bathroom window.

Summation-motion by Naylor, seconded by King for final approval of plans with comments about simplifying the casings around the garage, the window heads, centering the composition of the east garage elevation of windows & doors, possibly removing a window to address the existing dining room. Roll Call: Naylor-yea, King-yea, Childs-yea. Motion passed.

6. Wolfe

237 North

Accessory Building-Final

Phil Koepf (architect) presented plans for demolition of the existing garage & adding a new one. Phil said it's a simple boxed garage. There was a discussion at the 8/18/20 meeting about centering the doors but since it's a tight space & sets back from property line they couldn't do it. Naylor said you can't see the garage from the street. Clemens asked what the height of the garage was. Phil said it was 18', trying to make sure they are not going to have to get a variance. Clemens said he was satisfied with the garage door not being centered & Childs agreed.

Summation-motion by King, seconded by Naylor to approve plans as presented.

Roll Call: Childs-yea, King-yea, Naylor-yea. Motion passed.

7. Rooney

291 North

New Dwelling-Final

Todd Clarke (architect) presented plans for the home. Todd said that since the preliminary review at the front elevation there was a discussion about the front windows. They took the boards advice & they reduced the scale of flanking windows, they brought them down in scale & matched the ones that flanked the door on either side, added a smaller window at top of stairs by the sitting area. They added a covered entry on the driveway elevation on the north elevation along with reverse gables. Childs, Clemens, & Koepf said they liked that it breaks up the façade & gives you a little shelter. Childs thought they should have a little more traditional picket railing. Koepf & Clemens didn't think it needed to be traditional. Todd said the black aluminum railing ties in with the black windows. Clemens & Koepf said they were happy with the side elevation. Todd said they elevated the deck that is in the courtyard to give the homeowners privacy, using aluminum perforated panels that have 40% transparency & sits on driveway side but allows for privacy. They wanted to control the view in the back but also allow privacy

for the homeowners. Clemens & Childs think it might be too tall & a little aggressive. Naylor thought maybe something that is more a wood material. Todd said he would find pictures of the panels. Clemens thought maybe they could potentially approve the house & garage but not approve the railing or screen on the deck so they could get the project going. Koepf said he doesn't have a problem with the concept just the material, they need to make it tall enough to give them the privacy they want. Todd said they have a lot of epoxy horizontal screening, skirting, columns on the deck surface & they could possibly bring in a complimentary product & adding some transparency. King said that black windows work in a contemporary homes & that this is a traditional home, so he doesn't think it works. Childs & Naylor agree with King about the windows. Clemens thinks they should look at different color windows. He said that they should raise front door & have glass as high instead of head lining up. Childs said to add columns give more of a pattern or staccato feeling. Todd said they could do that.

Summation-motion King seconded Childs for final approval of the house based on comments about the width of the columns & to revise & resubmit the material & height of the rear privacy issue on the back of the house. Building & Zoning Inspector Harry Edwards said he is still waiting for approval from the Village Engineer.

Roll Call: Naylor-yea, King-yea, Childs-yea. Motion passed.

8. THE Housing

480 Somerset

Exterior Alterations-Final

Wayne Conway (project manager) presented plans for the exterior of the house. Wayne said from the last meeting there was concern about the keeping the dentils, fillisters, & gables because they were going to side it. Instead they are scraped & painted the brick, matched the trim, replaced rotted wood tying it into the existing features of the home. Also wanted to tie the siding into the existing windows, matching it on both sides, enhanced the siding to tie in the J channel with the window. They wanted to enhance the look of the house. Childs said he wouldn't do Dutch lap siding he would use horizontal or regular. Clemens appreciates what they are doing on front pediment, the brick & creating a sub sill on the window. Koepf said he wouldn't do the Dutch lap either, likes the pediment & gable, they've done a nice job. King asked about the pilaster with J channel & Clemens said ideally he wouldn't do it but understands. Childs thought to hire an architect might have made things easier & more cost effective. Wayne said they checked houses in neighborhood & they thought they were in line with the siding & they are trying to enhance the look of the home. Building & Zoning Inspector Harry Edwards said at the last meeting Childs suggested they use an Azak trim around the window. Clemens said that the aluminum wrap is a less expensive product & the things they are doing is a vast improvement. King said he appreciates them showing the material they are using but that's not what the goal is & asked if there was a better way to do it. Koepf thinks it's a cost effective way to do the project & thinks except for not using the Dutch lap siding he's happy with the project. King asked if this was as good as it gets without spending a ton of money. Wayne said they wouldn't do the Dutch lap but a traditional siding.

Summation-motion by King, seconded by Naylor for final approval of plans based on comments about not using the Dutch lap siding but using a 4" siding that matches the existing siding. Roll Call: Childs-yea, King-yea, Naylor-yea. Motion passed.

9. Bloch**231 E. Washington****Exterior Alteration-Addition-Final**

Sue Zala (architect) & Rick Siegfried (architect) presented plans for a screened porch. Sue explained that from the last meeting it was determined that the porch didn't match anything on the existing home so they redesigned the screen porch to match the front porch as much as possible. They matched columns & centered the French doors. They matched the existing house's siding & trim. Childs said he thought it looked much better with the columns. Koepf said he thought they did a nice job but maybe add a railing. King asked about the post/architrave & Childs said he understood it because they were matching the columns on the front. The board thought maybe they could thicken the board on the rear elevation.

Summation-motion by King, seconded by Naylor for final approval of plans after beefing up the architrave.

Roll Call: King-yea, Childs-yea, Naylor-yea.

10. Huntington Bank**88-92 N. Main****Exterior Alteration-Commercial Building-Final**

Dale Markowitz (Village Law Director) explained that there was some reference to vinyl windows & vinyl siding at the previous meeting. He said the history of this as he recalled was in the early part of the pandemic that the contractor for Huntington Bank obtained a building permit from the State but did not obtain a permit from the village & did not submit to the Architectural Review Board for approval & then went ahead & replaced the vinyl siding & put in new Pella Windows & then one of our consultants to the board happened to notice them doing work & they told them they needed to get approval for it. The work had already been done & now they have come in with the plans. Koepf said he would like to clarify the timing on this. Koepf said what he stopped them from doing was not the Sassy Cat Building it was the Huntington Bank building, which they proceeded with after they had already been told that they needed to present to the Architectural Board for the Sassy Cat building, so they went ahead & did this after Building & Zoning Inspector Harry Edwards discovered that they were proceeding with the Sassy Cat building. This was knowingly after they were told to cease & desist on the Sassy Cat building, they came in on a Saturday & did this without permission, without a permit on the Huntington Bank building itself & it is half done & poorly half done. Steve King also stated before that this board said to them "you don't have a permit" & he said well I called the state & nobody answered, they didn't get back to me so I just went ahead. Steve King said that was almost a quote from what he said, so this idea that he got his permit but he didn't get from Chagrin that's a change from what he told us, nobody got back to me because of the COVID so I just went ahead & that's sugarcoating what he told you. The contractor told Dale Markowitz that he had his state permit & he clearly did not seek or obtain a permit from the Village. The assertion that has been made on their behalf was that we were closed & that he would not be able to get a permit & that of course was actually incorrect & was not a valid assumption, we have never been closed & they could have easily submitted as many other's had in the months since March of this year. Dale thanked Phil for the correction & Steve's point that they admitted that they did not get a permit. They are here now seeking a permit & it's up to the board to determine now if it was something that had been presented to you in the first place if you would have approved & they are at

risk because they have not obtained permits & approvals before they did the work. They have some positions & information to present to you & they are entitled to a fair hearing on what they did & what might be required, what you would approve or conditionally approve & might require them to have to resubmit. Dale asked Harry Edwards if he missed anything & Harry said he had summed it up. It was Building & Zoning Inspector Harry Edwards who saw them re-siding the Chagrin Arts Sassy Cat building in March & at that time Harry talked to the contractor & he said he thought we were closed & he tried but couldn't get thru to us. Harry told him they needed to go to the state & Phil is correct that they did come in on a Saturday & do something over at the Huntington Bank building after this had taken place. They have been to the ARB once in July & it was a revise & resubmit & the plans they are presenting today are the revise & resubmit. Dale asked if when they were at the meeting in July if it was for just the Sassy Cat building & Harry said that was correct.

Childs asked if what they were presenting today was one portion of it & Harry said that they were looking at the front elevation & that their architect clouded his revisions per the board's request. Koepf asked if what they were looking at is a resubmission on something they had never seen before & Harry said that was correct. Clemens said he thought it was to change some of the details based on the board's conversation. Koepf asked if the jam & head details are the rake that's going up the front of the building. Jerry Weber (architect) said that the detail is the rake on the front of 88 North Main St. & they are removing what was reinstalled & they want to end up with a trim board 5 1/2" wide a crown molding that's around 5" & then some trim to trim it out using a Certa trim which is like an Azak type product & would give it something that would look original to the building. He went with the larger crown molding. Koepf said it appeared as if there is no overhang at all on the gutter edges, soffits, molding & Jerry said along that fascia along the gutter line is flush to the wall & that's the way it's been according to the photo's he has seen. Childs said he thinks it's headed in the right direction as far as the casings but he thinks the board should request how is the return detailed, how the flat roof above the return is it metal or asphalt shingles & how it hits into the crown & the top part of that return are all very important details. Childs said that since this is a visible building in Downtown Chagrin they should really be looking at all the details. Koepf asked if the roof line carries out now & does it extend out, are they adding to it, asked if the roof material was shingles. Childs said he would like to get the details on this building right since this is an important building in Chagrin Falls. Clemens thought if there was a way to build that roof line out, since the fascia board is flush with the siding & bring the flush eave down a few inches. Jerry said that at the side elevation fascia board comes close to the windows & he might have a problem doing that. Clemens thought if they overhang by a couple inches it will be more successful. Jerry thought maybe they could put a flat 2 by 6 treated lumber & run some flashing & put the fascia out 2". Koepf said anything to get it built out a little & stop the water from coming in will also help the front gable visually. He said they have crown molding that looks like its returning on itself & it wouldn't have to do that if they pushed it out a little bit. Jerry would see what he could use, maybe a grate metal that would contrast with the white trim. Clemens said when they have a little return on the front pediment with a little cap, it really would look better if it's a metal cap to match the trim color verses anything that's shingled or contrasting color. Childs also suggested maybe doing it in copper. He suggested getting the book Get Your House Right because it gives you step by step directions on how to do the returns. Jerry said he took the details from the last meeting & tried to apply them to the existing conditions. Clemens said that the stealth detail and also the sub rate detail should not apply to the front

elevation, since they are using hardy siding. He said they should use more traditional trim details with the hardy siding in front. Childs said they should look at the elevation & see how the crown should be a bed mold, 5 ½ big. Koepf agreed with Childs that trim panel below it and going up the rake should read more substantially. Naylor said looking at hardy siding on the front elevation & the side elevation has vinyl siding, she would not be in favor, it would be hard to match the vinyl with the hardy. She asked how it was going to blend since this is a very visible building. Jerry said they would match the color & sheen with the painting of the hardy siding. She said that what you are telling us is that you can get an identical siding that would match the hardy board & everyone disagreed. King said they should approach this like nothing has been done & treat this like this is a new submission & presented & approved, having these discussions in March. It's a very visual side wall. They should just do it right.

Summation-motion by King, seconded by Naylor to revise & resubmit with comments about attention to exact detail, exact measurements, none of this, we are going to or sort of going to, we want to see exactly what is going to be built & the materials that are going to be used. Naylor said she wants to be clear that she will not approve vinyl siding on this building. Koepf said they need to add to the motion & approval. He said something has to be done & we need a timeline as to when they are going to undo the work that they did without permission on a Saturday on the even more historic Huntington Bank building. He said Huntington had redone the building 4 or 5 years ago & had done a nice job on it & this building has to be a part of this motion. He said it's the same contractor ignoring what they were asking for blatantly ignoring, going ahead & doing a project on a Saturday so they wouldn't get caught so this needs to be a part of it. Naylor said they should add to the motion that a timeline be presented for completion of work on this project as well as the Huntington Bank. Clemens said restoring the previous condition of the Huntington Bank. King said he accepted that addendum. Building & Zoning Inspector Harry Edwards asked if Dale Markowitz has any comments. He said he first wanted to know if there was anything in front of the board regarding the Huntington Bank building right now & Harry said there wasn't. Dale said the motion should be to reference the Sassy Cat building but also for the Huntington Bank building as well. He said to put a specific timeline when you want this back in front of the board without the Village to have to request taking action to enforce the building codes against the properties because right now they are in violation of our code & as long as they are continuing to move along in good faith, he doesn't see a reason to take enforcement action but if they don't meet the deadline he would recommend that the Village take action. He said that they should have a specific deadline & it was agreed that everything should be submitted by the October 9, 2020 deadline for the meeting on October 20, 2020. Koepf asked if a part of this submission would be that they have to submit a plan for when they were going to have to remedy what they did to the Huntington Bank building & Dale said yes. He also said that in their resubmission they should cite to those provisions in the Secretary of Interior Standards for Historical Buildings as to how they are complying to the spirit of those standards. He thinks it's something they would want to consider when the board votes for both these projects. Summation-addendum to the motion-motion by King, seconded by Childs to revise & resubmit with exact details & specifications for all materials & work done for 88-92 North Main & with compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards & within a timeline for submission to the October 20, 2020 Architectural Review Board meeting with a deadline of October 9, 2020. It needs to include resubmission or documentation of what both the buildings looked like before any work was done. This

will include 88-92 along with the Huntington Bank building. Also, we will hold in abeyance any enforcement action on 88-92 North Main as long as they resubmit for 88-92 North Main St. & submit for the Huntington Bank building at 98 North Main St. by the deadline of October 9, 2020. Roll Call: Naylor-yea, King-yea, Childs-yea. Motion passed.

Walk-In Daryll

47 Maple Street

He explained that they have several design professionals & civil engineers but they want to make sure they are doing things to board standards. He has 2 issues he wanted to discuss the first is the second-floor window on west side of house is not a code compliant window for an egress window if a bedroom is there. Building & Zoning Inspector Harry Edwards said that this isn't an Architectural Board decision, but a building code decision. Koepf & Clemens explained that if they are doing any exterior alterations he would need to present renderings with any changes they are making. The second is the removal of a door to nowhere. Koepf told him to get drawings together because they need to see the project before they can give their opinion. Harry Edwards told him to get the renderings together & that they would probably have to do a Historical Significance Report.

Meeting Adjourned at 11:30 AM.



10-6-20

Steve King, Chairman

Date