

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Mayfield Village
Aug 12, 2021**

The Architectural Review Board met in regular session on Thurs, Aug 12, 2021 at 6:00 p.m. at the Mayfield Village Civic Center, Civic Hall. Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann presided.

ROLL CALL

Present:

Mr. Steve Varelmann, Chairman Pro Tem
Dr. Jim Triner
Mr. Matt Phillips

Mr. Daniel Russell, Building Commissioner
Ms. Deborah Garbo, Secretary

Absent:

Mr. Carmen Miozzi, Chairman
Mr. Tom Lawler

CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES: July 22, 2021

Dr. Triner, seconded by Mr. Phillips made a motion to approve the minutes of July 22, 2021.

ROLL CALL

Ayes: All
Nays: None

**Motion Carried
Minutes Approved as Written.**

PROPOSALS

1. Canopy / Awning
Mayfield City School District
Center Elementary School
6625 Wilson Mills Rd.
The Awning Company

2. Montebello Subdivision
Skoda Construction, Inc
Meld Architects, Inc
 - (a) New Single Family Dwelling
Kevin & Paly Koehler
6482 So. Cobblestone Rd S/L #29
(ARB Tabled 7/22)

 - (b) New Model
Montebello Daisy
587 Magnolia Ct. S/L #22

OPEN PORTION

**Center Elementary School
6625 Wilson Mills Rd.
Canopy/Awning**

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann called the meeting to order. Our first item is a canopy/awning for the Mayfield City School District, Center Elementary School, 6625 Wilson Mills Rd. Is this fixture showing an existing mounting somewhere else?

Dave Cerveny with The Awning Company replied, it's new. There's nothing on that building now, that's a rendering that we show on that building.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, you submitted colors, do you have a preference?

Dave Cerveny replied, they want to go with Forest Green, passing out a color sample.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, the columns that are in the sidewalk area, you're calling out a 3" diameter, 1/4" thick wall columns. Are they steel or aluminum?

Dave Cerveny replied, aluminum. The whole frame would be aluminum.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann asked, and the columns?

Dave Cerveny replied, square.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, 3" square.

Dave Cerveny said, we could adapt if you want, we could go steel if you'd like.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, my question was if it's going to be strong enough to support the weight to the center of the column, that span, if it's going to be strong enough, but it seems like 1/4" aluminum would be.

Dave Cerveny said, there's 3 columns 12' apart, that's typical of what we do. With steel, it would have to be painted, then the maintenance and rust, things like that.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann asked, it's a mill finish on there?

Dave Cerveny replied right, anodized.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann asked, why was the Forest Green color picked?

Dave Cerveny replied, the customer picked it, that's their school color.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann asked, any other questions or comments?

Mr. Phillips asked, the whole width of this, it's not just over the door, right?

Dave Cerveny replied, correct.

Dr. Triner asked, does that stay up all year?

Dave Cerveny replied yes, it's stationary, everything's welded in.

DECISION

Mr. Phillips, seconded by Dr. Triner made a motion to approve the Canopy/Awning for Center Elementary School at 6625 Wilson Mills Rd as proposed.

ROLL CALL

Ayes: Mr. Varelmann, Dr. Triner, Mr. Phillips

Nays: None

Motion Carried

Drawing Approved

**Montebello Subdivision
New Single Family Dwelling
Kevin & Paly Koehler
6482 So. Cobblestone Rd S/L #29
(ARB Tabled 7/22)**

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, the next item are revisions for the new single family dwelling at 6482 So. Cobblestone Rd, S/L #29. We have Ed Parker here representing.

Ed Parker with Meld Architects, Inc said, Chris is actually selling another unit right now. It's someone from Florida that's in town. This was the only time they could meet.

Ed Parker said, I'm sorry for the late update, things move fast here. Were you able to get the latest version that I just sent this afternoon? There are just some minor changes.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann asked, is this the one you sent late?

Ed Parker confirmed, yes. This one's the updated from last version. We went back to the client and took the suggestions and comments from the Board to let them digest some of them. They really liked the suggestion on the front elevation of the larger window on the left versus what used to be a smaller window being designed more by equity, which I agree it does look better aesthetically with the stacking of those 2 windows. The 3 windows kind of went to 2, it was just a comment, I don't want to say suggestion, but they are aligned and when we dropped them to 2 they said no, we want 3 in our laundry room. At least the 2 windows are aligned but they're not in the same plane as the door. You really never would put that alignment 100% together, but they are aligned now, so we added the one to the right side.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, this is what I looked at prior to the meeting and this is the one you changed.

Ed Parker said yes, they just added one window, they did want the 3rd window. That's a laundry room up top. That was the only change from what was submitted.

Replatting S/L 29 & S/L 30

Ed Parker said, let me step back. There were a couple questions on the subplot also, on the actual breaking of the lot. S/L 29 & S/L 30, the gross width between the two are going to stay the same. The line between S/L 29 & 30 are being replatted. There are no variances being sought on either property. That's why this one is a little bit larger property. That right there is to show you the original platting, 29 is a smaller lot and 30 is the larger lot.

Ed Parker said, I just met yesterday with S/L 30, we'll be talking to you guys soon about that. Sublot 30 is actually S/L 29's Father. They're both taking that lot and then shifting the line between the two. Because it's a replat, my understanding is and correct me if I'm wrong, because it's a replat it doesn't have to go back to Planning. We're not redoing any lots, all we're doing is changing where the line is between the two lots. I don't know if that's a question for Tom.

Mr. Russell said, it's probably a question for the Engineer.

Ed Parker said, the point for this meeting is we're not seeking any variances for this. Once it's replat, there would be no variance needed. The house at S/L 30 will probably skew the garage entry face more towards the circle. The frontage of the building will be more parallel to the frontage of the lot.

Mr. Russell asked, how do we know there's not to be any variances for sideyard, front and/or rear setbacks when we don't have that information?

Ed Parker replied, the quick answer to that is, if you go down to the bottom left, the intent of that was to show you how it plats out. The statement that we're not going to be seeking variances, we would not be breaking anything that would need a variance. To your point, you will get a final plat that will show it. Honestly, I thought you'd have that by now, it's between Chris and his Civil Engineer.

Mr. Russell said, we'll decide that at that point, I'll review it for variances.

Ed Parker said, the point of the site is, it's a larger house of the whole unit but it's not larger than the buildable area.

Window Placement

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, my personal opinion is the way it was with the 2 windows looked better than with the 3 because now it's off center again. That's what we talked about last

time, that those windows weren't centered above the door and they didn't have a relationship. And now what you've done-

Ed Parker said-

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, excuse me, I'm speaking please. What you showed before, you took our comments and did what we said and it looked better.

Ed Parker replied, I disagree. The comment with the alignment, the windows actually were just a tad off alignment last time, the jamb wasn't aligned.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann asked, and here they are with the 3?

Ed Parker replied, correct.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, this window is aligned above the door, it's centered, and this one, they are not.

Ed Parker said, there's an alignment there. Those two walls are not in the same plane. You're looking at an elevation, you'll never actually see it like that. You're aligning two things that aren't in the same wall plane. It's good for practice and what we do it in a drawing, but in reality and perspective, those aren't aligned themselves. It seems a little overstepping to tell someone how many windows they're allowed to have in their laundry room.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, I really don't appreciate these kinds of comments.

Ed Parker said, it's overstepping.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, our job is to review the design and I don't appreciate you judging what we can approve or not.

Ed Parker said, you can review and make comments, but you don't get to say that you're right.

Dr. Triner said, we cannot approve, too.

Ed Parker said, I don't understand why we're even having this argument. You don't like the way it looks but the owner loves this house. Let me step back a minute. This owner grew up in Mayfield Village, they've moved 20 times in the last 19 years. They and their families are seeking to build new homes in Mayfield Village and they're being given a hard time about building beautiful homes because you don't like the alignment of a window to a door.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, my task in this committee is to review the design and approve a design that's aesthetically pleasing and durable and etc, etc.

Ed Parker said, you have a vote towards that.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann replied, right. We as a committee, that's our task, that's how I view our task. I'm not speaking for everyone, I'm speaking for myself.

Ed Parker asked, where is the whole committee on this?

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, and it is true that we've had other projects that we tabled the project until the windows were revised.

Ed Parker said, because you made the comment, the comment of the windows is something that you would say, I don't like the way that looks, right? For example when you make a comment like it's ugly, that's not constructive, that's a criticism, right? What is the point of making criticisms that are not productive?

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann replied, the field of architecture involves a lot of criticism, there are critiques. When you went to architecture school-

Ed Parker said, please don't lecture me-

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said exactly, so I don't know why you're saying the same thing to me, architecture is-

Ed Parker said, let's talk about the project.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, we are critiquing the design, that's our job.

Ed Parker said, right. Ugly is not a critique.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, I don't know why you're saying ugly, I didn't say that word. The words were balance, symmetrical and in line with everything else. Those were rational design comments.

Ed Parker said, and we responded to your comments. We saw what you said and we said okay look, the windows aren't actually aligned, they weren't aligned at all, let's take that into perspective and go okay, he wants alignment. That makes sense, it's a fair comment. We aligned them, we gave it back to the owner, the person who is actually going to live in this house. They said, we really would like to have 3 windows in our house. I then am supposed to say, due to my years of experience of architecture, you should only have 2 windows in your laundry room. You're saying you don't like it, so it's not justified.

Dr. Triner said, I don't think that's what Steve is saying, he's saying the 3 windows need to be symmetrical.

Mr. Russell said, I think everybody should just look at the plan and present it and if you don't like it, then you could table it or deny it at the end.

Dr. Triner said, we had a situation like this a couple of Architectural Review Boards ago, we went through three reviews over the thing. It took us to finally get him to realize that a balanced design is what we're after.

Ed Parker said, I disagree with the comment that it's not balanced. Just because there are 3 windows doesn't mean that they should be centered on the two doors below them. I just don't agree with that. Also, just knowing that the client is so happy with it, it's really hard to then go back and argue with them that their opinion of their own space doesn't matter. The client is incredibly happy with their house. I can't center those, it would go into the closet.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann asked, does anybody have any comments or questions?

There were none.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, there are 3 Board Members tonight, we have a quorum, but we need an affirmative vote of all 3 to approve for this to pass. So I'd just like to take the temperature of the members of the committee, if you have an opinion, I'd like to hear it.

Dr. Triner said, I agree on the symmetry comment, the balance comment.

Mr. Phillips said, I'd probably move on a motion to approve it. Yes, it's not balanced, but if you look at this one here, it looks like it's unbalanced the other way. A lot of it has to do with how you're going to view it throughout the home. Ideally yes, you'd like it to be all centered, but it isn't something I would drive by and slam on my brakes and say wow, I can't believe they approved this. I think right now, as it is I would approve.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, I agree with that. It's not what we asked for but it doesn't look that bad. Like I said, if we don't all agree to it, it won't be approved.

Materials & Colors

Mr. Russell asked about materials & colors.

Ed Parker said, the colors for S/L #29 are;

Stone

Pheasant Alpine LedgeStone

Asphalt Roof Shingles

Pewter

Accent Metal Roof

One update to bring to the Board about materials from the last time, he added a charcoal gray standing seam metal roof just to give a little bit of variety when you have maybe the same siding but not the same palette. That's the accent roof over the office area.

Window Color

White

Vinyl Siding

White

Board and Batten Accent

White

Trim

White

Mr. Phillips asked, are you going to be the Architect on all these homes going forward?

Ed Parker replied, correct.

Mr. Phillips asked, is it possible to bring samples? The last one, you had a copy that looked black but the sample looked green. If you could drop off a sample two weeks before, it would help seeing the real life thing. If you show us a color that we can't really tell because it has a shadow on it, we're approving it on just taking your word for it.

Ed Parker said, what happened was, the first meeting we had, it was kind of a kickoff meeting, we had all the color samples, it was a Covid mtg. Anyway, do you want them dropped off? Every time we come, do you want that palette?

Mr. Phillips replied, ideally drop them off 2 weeks before and if we do table, you take them and bring them back the next meeting.

Ed Parker said, they're all hung up on their walls. Just so you're aware, this was the compliance of what we actually had previously done for materials, but I completely understand your request.

Mr. Phillips said, that would help, I'm more visual.

Ed Parker said, that's not a problem.

Submission Timeline to get on the Agenda

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann asked Debbie, when are the materials supposed to be here prior to a meeting?

Ms. Garbo replied, the ARB meets the 2nd & 4th Thursday of the month. The application and six sets of drawings are to be submitted two weeks in advance.

Section 1305.11 (c)

“A schedule of exterior materials, finish and colors, must be shown on the drawings submitted. The Board shall request samples of exterior materials.”

Ms. Garbo said, if the Board requests materials, as long as we receive them in the Building Dept prior to the scheduled meeting date, we can have them available for review at the meeting.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, today you sent a submission that was late. In the future it's got to be the two weeks because we need time to review it. You sent something out today at 3:00 pm., a lot of us probably wouldn't have time to review that because we have jobs. In the future I think your submissions need to be timely and per our requirements.

Ed Parker said, the only comment on that is it goes back to what we talked about last time because of his sale process. The thing that we had talked about was we would be able to submit a marketing sheet as the submitting process. Whatever the process is, that's fine. I'm just sitting here thinking that I'm following the process. With the materials, Debbie & I had a conversation that no, we don't need to bring them all over. I'm not trying to throw Debbie under the bus, I'm just saying we are trying to do the right thing, I want you guys to know that. Whatever we say hopefully from this meeting, this is what we're doing going forward. I have no problem, we'll comply.

Dr. Triner said, like this, this was in my packet, I looked at it and said this looks great. I come to the meeting and now it's changed. You have a lot of homes to be building and if it keeps coming in like this then we have to keep postponing the thing.

Ed Parker said, it's not uncommon for people to update their work. It's very common in the field to submit, get on the Board and then keep working with the client. But I understand that's the rules you guys have and I have no problem.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, in my role in my job I used to get other Architectural Review Boards in other cities and the requirements are pretty hard lined. They want them to get materials in two weeks or so in advance and there aren't any revisions. I think we need to follow the protocols.

Ed Parker replied, no arguments on that.

DECISION

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, here's the dilemma I have. If we vote to approve and it's not approved by all three of us, it doesn't get approved. If we vote to table it, then revisions can be made and submitted. I'd like to entertain a motion at this time.

Mr. Phillips made a motion to approve the New Single Family Dwelling for Kevin & Paly Kohler at 6482 So. Cobblestone Rd. S/L #29 as noted.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann asked for a second on the motion.

Dr. Triner said, I'm a little bit upset with what was submitted and the change that was made tonight. I'm upset with the drawings I got and then the change now and the arguments going back and forth that that's what somebody wants so we have to approve what somebody wants.

We went through this before on two review boards ago and we went around and around about before they finally changed it. They were arguing that that was what the customer wanted, that was what the Architect wanted. We didn't approve it until they came back and we finally approved it.

Ed Parker asked, can I ask you a question?

Dr. Triner replied, yes.

Ed Parker asked, what is it not complying with? What can you point at and say that should not be allowed because it is not in compliance with-

Dr. Triner replied, it's an unbalanced situation looking at it. You can argue perspective and everything else. I'll make a comment, the way this thing is sited on the site plan, it looks like that house is really jammed into where that lot is going to be.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, if it complies with the zoning then it's fine.

Ed Parker said, they're all maximizing their buildable area.

Dr. Triner said, in all the times I've seen cul-de-sacs, I've never seen where the houses are, they're usually tilted to pick up the cul-de-sac. I've never seen a development where that was the case. I understand what you're saying, they're trying to maximize buildings. It's almost as if that house is too big for the lot.

Ed Parker said, it is stepping back a way so the mass is actually the majority off of the street. It's not symmetric, but if you do get that frontage at the street that's a little bit more of the smaller house scale, then it's going back towards the cul-de-sac curve is where it starts to actually get larger.

Dr. Triner said, so the reason that there's a step in this house is because it doesn't meet the zoning requirements. The step at the front is because it's pushed right up against the lot line. Is that correct, the reason that that step is shoehorning into that lot.

Ed Parker replied, there's a couple of reasons. The shoehorning is a part of it, they're maximizing that space. But they also are the only ones with a 3-car garage, and that's doing a little bit of shifting for what ends up happening with the rest of the house.

Mr. Russell asked, what is the sideyard setback?

Ed Parker replied, 10'.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, it's a Planned Unit Development so it doesn't comply with other subdivisions.

Mr. Russell said, so that was the standard, a minimal of 10'.

Ed Parker said, yes. The green lines there are basically representing what was established as their lot line. That curved green line is actually what's allowed to be the front of garage and not the front of the house. I'm sorry, it is the front of the house, that 5' typical is showing that it's 5' back from that line, we have to keep the garage 5' from the green line.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann asked Jim, for you to feel comfortable approving this, what would you like to see?

Dr. Triner replied, I would not approve it with the 3 windows.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, that's the dilemma I have here. If we vote to approve it and we don't get all three votes then it's not approved. I think our choice here is to table it for revisions, is that correct?

Dr. Triner replied, that's sounds like what we have to do.

Mr. Russell asked, all three of those windows are in the laundry room, correct?

Ed Parker replied, correct.

Mr. Russell asked, can you make them maybe thinner?

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, we could table it and you could choose to not make any changes and when we have more people here for our quorum then that allows two of us to not approve and then you still get your approval. I'm just trying to look at all options here.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, I'd like to entertain a motion to rescind the motion to approve S/L #29.

Dr. Triner, seconded by Mr. Phillips made a motion to rescind the motion to approve S/L #29.

ROLL CALL

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Rescinded

DECISION

Dr. Triner, seconded by Mr. Phillips made a motion to table the proposal for S/L #29.

ROLL CALL

Ayes: Mr. Varelmann, Dr. Triner, Mr. Phillips

Nays: None

Motion Carried

Proposal TABLED

**New Model C
Montebello Daisy
587 Magnolia Ct S/L #22**

Ed Parker said, this is subplot #22. We just have one sheet for this one. It fits onto any of those smaller lots. Sublot and address right now I'm presenting is S/L #22 which is 587 Magnolia Ct. This is another unit that you wanted to take a look at as being a two-story unit. Yes, this is the old version. To your point, I 100% understand, so you understand how this happened. This was a marketing sheet that he had, he decided he wanted to build it and so we submitted it. The focus on the marketing sheet at the time that we submitted was much more on the front rendering. So what I submitted today took a couple quick stats. I think it would be worthwhile to at least look at that one. If you look at the side elevation on this one-

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann asked, where do I find these documents?

Ed Parker replied, it was with the same one that I e-mailed today.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann asked, the late one?

Ed Parker replied, yes.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann asked, so you guys didn't see this, right?

Ed Parker said, you saw a version of this with some minor changes that are worth noting. We put this together as a marketing sheet, he's selling this and this right now. We work in 3-D and then we started putting some windows in there, but once we submitted, we needed to clean some stuff up. Like this roof didn't have a good line, it's now bearing at the same height. Couple of changes, this is a stairwell. When it was first set up the windows were actually not aligned to other items.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, I think we have requirements for what's to be submitted for our review which would include elevations, roof plan, floor plans, I don't see those here. I think we need to table this until you get all the proper documentation to us.

Ed Parker said, okay.

DECISION

Dr. Triner, seconded by Mr. Phillips made a motion to table the proposal for S/L #22.

ROLL CALL

Ayes: Mr. Varelmann, Dr. Triner, Mr. Phillips

Nays: None

Motion Carried

Proposal TABLED

Applicant left the meeting at this time.

ANY OTHER MATTERS

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann asked, do we have any questions or comments about the meeting that we just had that you want to put on the record?

Dr. Triner said, I think before the Board gets to review it, the documentation packet should be complete with what's required along with samples and everything else.

Mr. Russell said, in that circumstance, Debbie is very diligent in asking for all this information that's being provided. If somebody doesn't want to provide it and doesn't provide it, I still think it's a good idea to have you guys look at it, you guys can table it or deny it. Sometimes we're trying to pull things out of people that either a) not that they don't want to get it to us, but they're kind of lazy on giving it to us when they shouldn't be. We're trying to work with the homeowners and the customers as best we can. I would be very hesitant on denying something from a submittal, Debbie's on top of it, she advises, we need this, this & this by a certain period of time. Yes, we do accept things that come in late because we're trying to comply with people and trying to help people out. But it's your duties if it's not there, like you did tonight, table it and everybody's on the same page.

Dr. Triner said, for example tonight, we had one set of drawings to review, we come to the meeting and then it's changed. How are we supposed to comment?

Mr. Russell replied, I understand. You table it or deny it. But I think tabling probably is the best way.

Mr. Phillips said, at least if you're handing it in that day, have everything that's needed, this had no measurements. I don't know what we're approving, colors aren't picked out. He's not just coming to the table late, he's not coming with everything. It's like turning your homework in late but not having it done, why even bother bringing it in late? We're picking on him because he's here but in general if somebody brings something in at the last second, if they have everything, I think we'd work with them. But to come last second and not have anything we need, technically nothing that we need. I got this at 3:00 pm, I don't know what colors I'm approving, I don't know what siding. He's tossing it in front of us and saying, approve it. It seemed like he was saying I want to get a blanket approval, not sure what subplot it's going to be, he made it sound like a sales pitch, not what they picked. In general, have everything you want and I'm okay if it comes in the last second, sometimes that happens. It's supposed to be here two weeks before. It's almost like as soon as he hands it to me, just say I want to table it because nothing's picked. Like you said, he brings it, then we could say that and then he knows. He knows what to do, it's not like this is the first time for him. It's not like he's an individual person building his own home and trying to figure it all out. Those samples are hanging in his office, he's close by, pick what you need and bring it here, we would have been fine with that.

Dr. Triner said, I think it's stressing the system, it puts stress on Debbie chasing after these guys. It's just not a good way to do business.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, especially when we have 48 homes to go. We should establish the protocol on this early.

Dr. Triner said, the other thing is, they keep asking for blanket approval, the ones that are coming.

Mr. Phillips said, he has his checklist, he has to check the boxes and bring that.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, at the last meeting we agreed that we would review every project.

Mr. Phillips agreed, right.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann said, I think we need to make our expectations known and stick to those and then eventually he'll get pressure from his client in getting the approval in a timely manner. His client was here last time we were together and was here when we all agreed, and the client said it would be okay to review every one of these because there's a two week turn around time and that would work within their schedule.

Mr. Russell said, I'll reiterate that to Ed.

Chairman Pro Tem Varelmann asked, are there any other questions, comments or discussions you'd like to have on the record?

There were none.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Dr. Triner, seconded by Mr. Phillips made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

ROLL CALL

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

Meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary