

**CITY OF CLEVELAND HEIGHTS
ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
DECEMBER 27, 2018**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Melissa Fliegel, Chair
Greg Goss
Jonathan Kurtz, Alternate

STAFF PRESENT:

Richard Wong, Planning Director
Alix Nouredine, Asst. Law Dir.

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Wong called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM at which time three members were present.

Presenters and those planning to comment were sworn-in by the Assistant Law Director.

**PUBLIC HEARING
DECEMBER 27, 2018**

The following was a request for preliminary review. No action by the Board was taken.

ABR 2018-514: Flaherty & Collins Properties, northeast corner of Cedar Road and Euclid Heights Boulevard, request a preliminary review of 10-, 5-, and 4-story interconnected apartment buildings some with commercial uses on the first floor and multi-level parking deck.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION:

- Flaherty & Collins Properties' Vice President, Preconstruction & Design Services, Brandon Bogan, One Indiana Square, Suite 3000, Indianapolis, Indiana, 46204, presented the historical context of the project site and a summary of the development process.
- Mr. Bogan gave a historical review of the project site showing a photo of the 9-story hospital building that had been there. He also discussed various developments proposed after the hospital was demolished.
- Mr. Bogan described the previous public meetings and noted the input incorporated into this proposal.
- Eppstein Uhen Architects' Principal and Senior Design Architect Chris Gallagher, 333 East Chicago Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 53202, discussed the uniqueness of the site, including geometry, grade changes and community requirements.

- Mr. Gallagher noted that it was a goal to have a contemporary or modern design to the development.
- Mr. Gallagher discussed placement of parking, retail, housing, and residential community space. He discussed the proposed materials, massing, scale, and the fit into the neighborhood.
- Mr. Gallagher described the drawings. All of the buildings had masonry bases with increased metal paneling closer to the point along Cedar Road. On Euclid Heights, masonry will be the colors and tones of the existing apartment buildings.
- Ms. Fliegel asked why the parking structure needs to be open-air. Mr. Gallagher explained that it is cheaper to passively ventilate the structure and it allows parking on the roof. Ms. Fliegel said being open-air does not preclude screening of the parking deck. Mr. Gallagher agreed.
- Mr. Gallagher discussed the solar study and described the effect the development will have on sunlight to neighboring buildings.
- Mr. Gallagher brought masonry and paneling samples, explaining their locations.
- Mr. Nouredine asked the presenters if they would like their presentations entered into the record. They both responded in the affirmative.
- Ms. Fliegel asked the presenters for their timetable. Mr. Bogan stated that once they receive design approval, they will complete the construction documents, bid and award the project, and apply for permits. He estimates that this process will take nine to ten months. Their goal is to begin construction in late 2019.
- Ms. Fliegel remarked that the ABR will only be reviewing the preliminary design at this point and that the applicant may need to return to the ABR once construction documents are created that will likely impact the appearance.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mr. Wong noted that public comment was submitted by letter and email and were included in the ABR's packets. Comments were received by John Roush, Micah Kirman, the Cedar Fairmount Special Improvement District Board of Trustees, FutureHeights, Paul Volpe, Steve and Joyce Rajki, Reverend Don King, Lute Quintrell, and Bruce Rose. Mr. Wong requested that this correspondence, as well as the applicant's application, be entered into the record.
- Ms. Fliegel asked that comments be limited to four minutes.
- Mr. Nouredine asked that those wishing to comment state their name, address and confirm that they took the oath stating that their comments are truthful.

- Joan Mallick, 2197 South Overlook Road, stated that her home is 100 years old. She and her husband wanted to convert a second floor porch to an enclosed porch at the rear of her home. They came to ABR three times. The requirements were that it fit the house and neighborhood and that it was aesthetically pleasing. She does not think that this project keeps with the spirit of the neighborhood. She asked why the building at the point needs to be as tall as it is. She said this project does not look much different than other projects happening in University Circle or at Van Aken. She feels the design is dull.
- Eric Silverman, 2884 Fairmount Boulevard, was on the School Board for 12 years and the Library Board for seven years. During that time they did several projects. He is not an architect or designer but is aware of the process. The process for this project has lacked public participation. He said that even though there is a list of 20 meetings, you cannot find the materials on the City's website. He stated that the three meetings in 2018 were merely updates with unstructured Q&A. He stated that there hasn't been a design charrette. He believes that the special committee appointed by the City has created a feedback loop. He believes that from a finance and site plan standpoint, they have done an excellent job. He doesn't have a problem with the parking garage. He doesn't understand why there's a funding gap. He has a problem with the building design. He feels that infill housing in this neighborhood has always used traditional materials and he doesn't understand why this project doesn't. He doesn't feel that the design has changed much from conception until now. He is concerned about the sun's reflection off the building onto drivers on Cedar Glen Parkway at rush hour. He likes that there are changing facades however he dubbed the style "Developer Modernism" with no variation. People wanted traditional design. He'd use "Streamline Modern" along Euclid Heights Boulevard, Art Deco for the tower, Italianate for two buildings (pointing), and Federalist or Romanesque for the townhouses. He said the City is so desperate to develop this site that they will support anything.
- Irene Snow, 2185 South Overlook Road, stated that she will see this building all the time when she pulls up to the stop light in her car. She stated that people who own businesses go home to their houses and won't see this building on a regular basis. She thinks that the tall tower is too imposing. It comes right up to the curb-- it seems odd. She understands the project is going to go through no matter what. It is a hodgepodge; none of it matches. She wondered why the style transitioned from Nighttown to the point. It doesn't make sense to her. She does not like the modern aspect on the end. It started as four or five stories. This is the first opportunity to comment on design. She asked two questions at a prior meeting and nobody got back to her. Her questions were how this was going to be financed and what will be

done if there are cost overruns. Tim Boland replied to her saying that the City and developer would work on it. She doesn't feel that this should be the City's problem.

- Nancy Bennett, 2450 Derbyshire Road, said that she's relaying a message from Lil and Bill Carter. It was addressed to Joyce and Steve Rajki. They said that the reason the ABR is meeting two days after Christmas is because many residents will be away and this will limit the amount of information being put out into the community. They understand how important this piece of land is to the developer and to the future of the well-being of Cleveland Heights. The nine-story building will be one of the highest in the Heights and at the point it will look more like 12 or 15 stories that will loom over a European style building that currently draws many to the neighborhood. This area is a gem for Cleveland Heights- a major reason we chose to move to the historic Alcazar three years ago as did I and a few others here. The landscaping lacks specific setbacks and particular landscaping details. Ms. Bennett does not care for the density and the materials. She is concerned that a big, shiny building will be difficult on many motorists, particularly those with vision problems.
- Dick Dawson, 2450 Derbyshire Road, believes that the taller this building is, and the greater the density. You are going to see much more gridlock. He witnesses gridlock on Surrey, Euclid Heights and Cedar. He thinks three or four stories is reasonable.
- Steve Kordalski, 2218 Middlefield Road, said he is an architect definitely in favor of development. We need to compete. This is likely the only chance this community has at a development of this size over the next 100 years. He stated that he doesn't believe that this project is any more compelling than any of the previous proposals that the presenters showed in their slideshow. He acknowledged that the reason the tower is so tall is to "make the numbers work." That is just a fact. That doesn't mean you can't do a tall tower that is elegant. He cited Downtown's Key Tower. He asked if this is better than projects in Little Italy, UCI or Crocker Park. The solution looks like it was designed by separate firms. There is no continuity. This proposal is pre-value engineering and will worsen. He stressed that this project is the community's one shot and asked if it is good enough for Cleveland Heights.
- Eileen Beal, 2375 Euclid Heights Boulevard, stated that she is a social historian and agrees with what most commenters have said. She stated that the whole purpose of the Top of the Hill project is to increase the City's tax base. She deems this project a "Hope Project" in that the City hopes it will increase its tax base. She believes that the demographic that this development is designed for are empty-nesters and retirees who don't generate income tax revenue for the City. She could not see them wanting to move to this development. She questioned the downtown area the

presenters were talking about; the respect of scale of the current architecture; the real integration into the neighborhood; and the transition point. She asked if anyone had thought about what nine to ten months to get costs under control means in a world that is undergoing tectonic level catastrophes that will tie up building materials for decades. The cost of this project is going to skyrocket because of what is happening in the rest of the world. She said she is a social historian who has focused on housing trends.

- Brendan Ring, 12387 Cedar Road, stated that he was asked to publicly read a letter by Paul Volpe at the meeting. Mr. Volpe reviewed the proposal and he is pleased with the evolution of the project's design. The massing, building transitions, composition, use of materials, and proposed detailing are sufficiently articulated for the community to assess the proposed vision and value of this investment. Mr. Volpe possesses the understanding that a significant amount of research and discussion still needs to take place. He urges the ABR to approve this project on a conceptual level. He is unable to attend the meeting and intends to be very engaged as the project moves forward. Mr. Volpe noted the receptiveness of the developer and is confident that the end result will be a project that the community can support. Mr. Ring commented that as the treasurer of the Special Improvement District and owner of Nighttown he is appreciative of the developer and the process. He noted that this district was originally designed as a dense urban environment. It was not meant to be townhouses along Cedar Road. He likes the density and vibrancy of the neighborhood. He says that as a landlord, younger professionals are locating downtown, on West 25th Street and University Circle and he feels this project is necessary to allow Cleveland Heights to compete.
- Mary Kelsey, 3107 Meadowbrook Boulevard, echoed Mr. Silverman's comments. She is concerned with the design of the tallest building at the westernmost part of the site. The metal and glass will be outdated. Architecture that tries to be bold and exciting usually ends up looking provincial. We need something better than that.
- Stephen Rajki, 2328 Stillman Road, an architect and engineer, stated he is concerned with the site planning of the project. The project would be more acceptable if the ten-story structure facing Cedar were moved to the northwest corner of the property. He feels the tall structure serves as a wall or barrier rather than a welcome to the City. He feels it is contradictory to the stated goal from October 15, 2018, "Item B – provide a visual and symbolic entrance to the City." He feels due to the steep slope of the point that it should be terraced and landscaped and structures moved east. He also urged the ABR to have their alternates participate in the discussion because so much will rely on the ABR's input.

- Bob Olayas, 2285 Bellfield Road, said that Cleveland Heights is a suburb and not downtown and not urban. He also expressed frustration with the requirements of the ABR and the Building permit process. He stated that the neighborhood likes it not being dense. It's hard getting across the street now. Smooth and modern means cheap and doesn't blend with the neighborhood. He said the shade drawing doesn't mean anything.
- Nancy Thrans, 2991 Coleridge Road, expressed her appreciation for the ABR and its efforts for keeping Cleveland Heights at the standard or level that we are at. Coming up the hill, the tall building represents a wall and not a welcoming space. She liked the suggestion of terraces. She said that, being an accountant, she understands the economics of the development but hopes that a more traditional design would prevent the building from looking outdated in short time.
- Mark Johnson, 2836 Corydon Road, works in University Circle and is a landlord who cited the glut of empty apartments that there are excess vacant apartments in the neighborhood and that population loss and the building boom in University Circle are the reason. He is concerned about adding to this problem with this project. He expressed support of the ABR's work with housing renovation projects in character with the neighborhood and doesn't feel that this style represents the style that ABR has worked to try to preserve. He was not against such a style but it was a divergence. He also stated that the building at the point feels like a wall.
- Mark McCleod, 1625 North Park Boulevard, called attention to the developer's statement that they were given direction for the design to be modern. He asked the ABR to make clear who gave that direction. He feels that the community feedback has been that the project should blend in with the current design of the neighborhood. He is of the opinion that modern design does not age well and that projects developed in the 1960's are now poorly thought of. He also feels that modern is not consistent with Cleveland Heights. He moved here four years ago, retired, and could have lived anywhere but chose Cleveland Heights. He loves the old community. He feels that the tall building at the point is not consistent with the community, the large homes, and the feel of this neighborhood. Pointing to the proposal, he said he could have gotten this in Washington, D.C. where he lived, or LA, where he lived. He chose Cleveland Heights—the community that we have—for its beautiful, old homes—the wood, the stone, the brick—not shiny, glass and steel. That's downtown New York, not Cleveland Heights. Coming up the hill, Top of the Hill was to say who we are. That says who we are not. He believes that the parking requirements are too low for the demographic of the prospective residents. He also was concerned about the financing and this project never being fully completed. He appreciated the wood and the

brick on the proposed buildings Two and Three that start to get to our direction but building One does not represent us.

- Richard Bozic, 2405 Edgehill Road, an architect and former ABR member, expressed concern for those living near the western part of the site and the scale of the structure. He said if a tall building had to be built, it will fit better on Euclid Heights Boulevard, where tall buildings exist. The aesthetics have been talked about at every meeting. He feels that the only connection or transition to the rest of the City is at the Nighttown building and that there are many other buildings to which this project needs a connection. He encouraged everyone to walk the site more than once, in the daytime and at night, to evaluate the proposed scale and aesthetics. He said if anyone lives in this area across from this development and it moves ahead, he suggested putting one's house up for sale tomorrow.
- Anya Rudd, 2178 Harcourt Drive, said we are not sparkly—we are earthy. Citing the tall building, she said we like being behind the times by a hundred years. Seattle has many buildings like this that are outdated and vacant. She is totally for walkability to restaurants and services. She would need to apologize to international visitors not because the project was not cool and amazing but because it doesn't fit. It doesn't fit here.
- Joe Peter, 2221 Harcourt Drive, likes walkability and was concerned about speeding on the cut-through streets. He cited a bank that wanted to build a ten-story building in Ann Arbor but was denied. The company built in another city but the building is now vacant. We are not thinking this through.
- John Roush, 3096 Scarborough Road, supported development but echoed Steve Kordalski's and Rich Bozic's comments. He is concerned about the scale. He presented a photograph from the Cedar Fairmount website. This shows two-and-three-story structures and walkability. He expressed concern about a large parking garage. He also shared his concern of accessibility for people with disabilities and elevators only in the back of the house areas.
- David Bentley, 2641 Euclid Heights Boulevard, is concerned with the desirability of apartments in the two buildings that he manages on Lennox Road. It will be hard to rent his apartments facing the proposed garage. Many of his tenants rely on the public parking lot and he has concerns about parking for these tenants.
- Joyce Rajki, 2328 Stillman Road, echoed the North Park man's comments. She cited the City's stated goals for the project, including effectively incorporating community feedback in the design of the project. She feels that the community's input was not properly solicited or incorporated into the project. She referenced the Library's display of project documents soliciting community feedback. She said that many people left feedback. She said that once the City became aware of this, the City forced the Library to remove the pad of paper. She asked that those comments be made public. She also

pointed out that the original development agreement required 20 townhouses and a 5-story building height. This was what was required. On December 7 it was all changed and is not stakeholder friendly. She asked when and how the minutes for this meeting will be made available and how will the public be informed of their availability. She also asked when the comments from the library will be made available.

- Ann Iannarelli, 12621 Cedar Road, is very disturbed by this proposal. Traffic will be horrendous. A house the family owns at Overlook and Lee has so much traffic, people can't visit during the day. This is very unattractive. She's won many awards from Cleveland Heights for homes she has owned. She communicated support for many of the previous commenters. She collected over 100 signatures on a petition that is opposed to this project and submitted them to the ABR. She said we have wonderful designers right in Cleveland Heights.
- Mark McCleod, 1625 North Park Boulevard, wanted 360-degree views such as views from Fairmount and Cedar looking down Cedar Hill, from the fire station on Cedar Hill looking downhill, and Lenox looking down towards the hill. The parking garage will stand way over those apartments.

BOARD REVIEW

- Ms. Fliegel thanked the attendees for the feedback.
- Mr. Kurtz asked about the number of apartments. Mr. Bogan responded 275 units were proposed.
- Mr. Kurtz asked Mr. Bogan to confirm that the number was increased to achieve an acceptable return on investment. Mr. Bogan confirmed this statement and added that the proposed number of units has been above and below this number.
- Mr. Kurtz asked if that number will continue to change. Mr. Bogan responded that they are locked into this number plus or minus five percent due to the pro forma. He said that they are refining the mix of apartment styles. Mr. Kurtz asked about the tall tower's quantity of apartments per floor.
- Mr. Kurtz said the width of the apartment buildings proposed on the north section of the site looked wider than a width he said was typical. He asked if the square footage of the units have been determined and if the size of the units will fluctuate. Mr. Bogan said that the size of the units will not change much going forward. He said there may be room to make small alterations to some parts of the buildings.
- Mr. Kurtz wanted to understand where flexibility exists and where flexibility did not exist. Mr. Bogan responded that Flaherty & Collins does projects like this all over the country and that he wanted the units to work as well as possible for the target demographic.

- Mr. Kurtz asked of the target demographic. Mr. Bogan responded that they are looking at roughly 60% millennials, 35% empty-nesters and 5% other.
- Mr. Kurtz asked how many studies with this quantity of units have been done regarding massing. Mr. Bogan responded that they have done 40 versions.
- Ms. Fliegel liked the green space on Euclid Heights Boulevard which was for those apartment residents. She had concerns about the size and location of the green space between Nighttown and the commercial space. It was very tucked away. It was hidden and next to an unattractive parking structure. If it was along Cedar, it would be more viable. Mr. Kurtz agreed with Ms. Fliegel and suggested the green space closer to Cedar Road with retail frontage on the green space. The back of the commercial space that would have faced the green space has no windows. There are no eyes on that pocket park. Putting a great green space in front would give something back to the community. Mr. Bogan said a drive had been proposed next to Nighttown. It was removed and they would not be opposed to examining moving that space. It may make the retail space less attractive.
- Mr. Goss asked if the developer would be willing to examine increasing the number of units and the height of the buildings on Euclid Heights Boulevard and decreasing the height of the building at the point.
- Ms. Fliegel asked if Mr. Bogan could describe what the impetus for achieving height at the site was. Mr. Bogan responded that the desire for height came from the City and its feedback to create a monumental entrance to Cleveland Heights. As far as moving density north and east, Mr. Bogan said that they would not be opposed to examining it. We need to balance the economics. The nine-story structure is the most expensive component to this building. We are spreading that cost across the four story structures. Once you exceed four stories, you exceed what is viable in wood construction. We would not want to spread the cost across all the buildings so that we would need to build everything of steel or non-combustible structure. That would create a cost that could not be carried in the pro-forma. Moving all the tall structure to the northeast is possible but may not be the right answer.
- Eileen Beal, 2375 Euclid Heights Boulevard, asked for clarification about the green space to front on Cedar Road. She was in favor of the change. Ms. Fliegel responded that she was correct in understanding that they were discussing the possibility of moving the green space.
- Mr. Goss said ABR was not looking at parking and traffic but asked Mr. Bogan to discuss the developer's parking and traffic studies because the findings resulted in this proposal. Mr. Bogan responded that they had a very extensive traffic and parking analysis. However, without the consultants, he was unable to expand on the topic much further.
- Ms. Fliegel asked Mr. Wong if he could elaborate on the City's desire for a modern design. Mr. Wong summarized a discussion early on that the City had

with Chris Gallagher, the architect of record on the project. Mr. Gallagher had presented the concept of starting with the Nighttown building and designing something that was very compatible in design and scale. As you approach the point where Euclid Heights converges with Cedar, the scale and style would become more modern. The Planning Department has been supportive of that direction. He commented to a resident that he did not pretend to have this resident's sensibilities of design. This forum was for the resident to be heard.

- Mr. Kurtz said there's a bit of a conflict in terms of what Modern is, what Contemporary is, and what we are looking at and he didn't think those things were synonymous. There was a discussion about not imitating the past. The national standard of historic preservation says that if you are adding to a historic building that is over 50 years old, you don't try to imitate or pretend that you are of that building. That's not to say there isn't a lot of variation and opinion about how one could address that. His opinion and what he heard was that there is something generic about the type of Contemporary expression that this building takes on and that this community requires something much more specific and singular. Call it idiosyncratic. Looking up the street, the buildings that Mr. Roush showed—the Rockefeller buildings, the one that Starbucks is in—there's a clarity that almost makes those buildings more Modern than the buildings that are proposed. Kind of a clarity of base; there's a massing on top. Those buildings happen to have a silhouette because they were done at a time when the profile of the roofs were in keeping with the residential neighborhood. It's not right to mimic those but there are lessons in those buildings-- in terms of clarity of base and clarity of massing-- that is not addressed here. Some of the elevations have kind of a brick base and that is violated in different ways by things that feel stuck-on. He said as an example that the Alcazar is timeless. It is not incredibly historical nor incredibly Contemporary but it is all brick; uniform, well-proportioned openings. It is its own thing. If he was to push a direction, he'd push for these buildings to be their own thing. When the elevations are done, he suggested the architects prepare elevations all the way up Cedar, and also look at the rhythm and pattern of those existing buildings. He asked if they could build on that. He saw in the elevations and sections the four and five story mass is matching the adjacent building but there is something more to that. The wings of the "Y" feel fatter than the other buildings as you go up the street. A planimetric proportioning system exists that somebody should be aware of and drawing into. It is generative; you will come up with a better solution and it will help all the rest of us see how you are tying all of this to the historic context. It is an exercise that would be a great thing to share if you've done it. If you haven't done it, he'd love to see this exercise.

- Ms. Fliegel noted the generic nature. She said a proposed project in Lakewood seemed very similar. She expressed concern about the metal panels, staggered with slightly different colors as a tired detail that doesn't speak to longevity of materials. Newer materials *could* be used. Phenolic panels are a pressed fiber product used on commercial buildings. She wanted to see more masonry on the building at the point. Modern doesn't necessarily have to mean reflective glass. You could have a very Modern building in the articulation of the windows. She liked the bent top piece now being integrated into the mass of the building. It is still a work in progress. She liked that the scale at the corner was brought down at the amenities deck by creating a volume there. She found the corner looking cold—concrete. Relief from the street was needed-- more landscape or something needs to bring it together more. She asked to see development of the corner at a larger scale to understand what was really happening there.
- Mr. Kurtz said it was commented upon to get different views. The perspective rendering was the "money shot." When you see this other "thin facaded" other side to the building, he questioned if that would present a satisfying condition when coming up Euclid Heights. He understood the metal panel was probably slightly more costly than the other ones and the reason the front façade was changing. Notwithstanding the mass-- which he would love to see different ways of reducing-- he wondered if the building labeled "Building 1" could be one thing instead of many things. Maybe it's part of the market study and what you do, but it is not appealing to him—the overly "ticky-tacky" application of materials. The first bay on the cream colored building has a phenolic panel—kind of an infill wood panel-- in one of the glazed openings. When that masonry returns to balconies that are carved out, you transition to an alternative material. That would be a simple opportunity for that building to have more substance than a typical development building. If that brick turned back and was along that perpendicular face that is back in the balcony, suddenly the building would have mass and proportion. He'd stop seeing it as different "cake frostings." The same applies to the other building. The balcony was an opportunity to give that architecture substance and mass. Return that material back to the glazing. This is universally true. Creating an architecture that has mass and substance over an application that is going to feel less timeless.
- Mr. Gallagher responded by saying that in developing the design they generally erred on the side of simplicity. He pointed out some changes that were made that simplified the tall building. There is a balance to make the building more unique and less boring. In regards to landscaping at the point, Mr. Gallagher pointed out that they do not control the right-of-way and expressed a desire to work with the community and the City to improve the corner. Lastly, he spoke regarding the depth of the units. 62' is a common

number for housing above parking. He said that they, however, have flexibility to deviate from a standard 62' width. The extra space allows for units that have walk-in closets and some with utility rooms with washers and dryers. Most of the neighborhood's apartment buildings only have a community laundry room. If the units were shallower, the units get wider and he would be back to finding the density and he heard no resounding support for increased height. He cited the level of approval already in terms of the land use and the guidelines in the zoning.

- Mr. Kurtz clarified that he is seeking a building that takes a position and acknowledged that not everyone will like that position. He emphasized that he would like a building expressing mass and expressing depth—a little more monolithic. He cited the elegant Art Deco building on this block and the Alcazar. He would not mimic those but try to make this more singular in terms of the vision.
- Ms. Fliegel recognized that this development will bring vibrancy to the district. It moves us in a positive direction. She understood the concern over the sight lines for some of the rear units of buildings on Lennox. She also stated that to her, for the two buildings on Cedar, if they are intended to move in a different degree of style, they read only as different colors. If it is intended to be a movement, she would like to see that because it only reads as a changed color now.
- Mr. Gallagher divulged that some internal conversations argued over whether the materials of these buildings should be the same. Ms. Fliegel said that may be more successful. Mr. Kurtz said the floor to floor height was probably the same in each building. The different buildings read inherently differently because the topography drops off. He cited the setback that was further differentiating the two buildings. If it was tall, the window openings could be expressed with a different proportion than the building that is supposed to be squatter or lateral. A good starting point would be to assume that everything was one material—not to say that this is what they should be. Then you could get to some of the proportioning things or things that Melissa was talking about reading the scale and proportion and seeing if they are truly different buildings, then maybe they are different materials than each other or maybe they are the same material. There is a proportioning system that relates.
- Mr. Gallagher said that the pocket park was meant to be semi-public. Nighttown had brought up that they currently have weddings and parties and thought that space might work as a semi-public space where they might expand.
- Mr. Kurtz said the spirit of what that space could be is belied by the fact that the parking garage is adjacent to it and the plans show an opaque wall on the south wall of the commercial space. He cited a pocket park in Cambridge

or a Paley Park in New York City as parks to think of when thinking of this park. He used to live behind Chase Bank pointing to the map. He spent eight years there and always questioned why he couldn't get out of Starbucks and go into a small green space with his coffee instead of just being on the street. This project as was said earlier there is one chance to do it. It is very packed. It is very dense like a stuffed sausage. We have to find a way and find these moments where the commercial space; the public spaces reinforce the neighborhood and really give something back to the community that's not just revenues but it is appreciable space. He didn't know if it could be worked out—if you start pushing that north, you start messing up apartment units above. He thought if Brendan had a wedding there, it could be a great place to expose the restaurant and that activity. Mr. Kurtz imagined driving past the open space and seeing that activity going on. There are not that many places where that happens right now. Mr. Gallagher said it was possible that a retail tenant may want glass on all sides, too, but it was a way's out before understanding that level of detail.

- Ms. Fliegel pointed out that this community appreciates seeing one another in an active and engaged park.
- Ms. Fliegel asked if the parking structure would need to change if the number of housing units fluctuates. Mr. Bogan said that the parking ratio will need to be maintained. Mr. Kurtz asked if the parking requirement went down, could the number of units go down. He asked mostly in relation to the tower, if the tower could be eight instead of ten floors. It would cut off 20 units but you could also get rid of "X" number of parking spaces because those are amortized over the units.
- Mr. Bogan said because they will manage this long-term, 275 units is where they want to be in terms of what is viable in the market. It also balances out the overall quantity of amenity space in the building and amortizes everything in terms of the operations across the entire development. 275 is a targeted number they believe is optimal for this site.
- Ms. Fliegel encouraged more internal views to make sure it is understood more completely. Mr. Bogan said at the next presentation they could definitely provide additional rendering views throughout. They can do a lot of views at the SketchUp level versus the more polished ones. Ms. Fliegel said polished renderings make it look like the project is too done. She requested a walk-through at eye level. Mr. Gallagher said that they can but they will not be at the same level of finish as a rendering. Mr. Kordalski asked for a foam model. Mr. Gallagher said he preferred doing this on a computer model because a foam model would be more difficult for everyone to understand. Mr. Gallagher said the walk-through would not be as refined as a rendering. Mr. Kurtz wanted to look at renderings of the tower from South Overlook and from Delaware across the street. It is an important tool to assess the form of

the tower to see if the curve works and the massing works. Mr. Bogan said that they can work with Mr. Wong to list the views that the ABR would like to see at the next meeting.

- Mr. Kurtz asked if they could follow up with the developer as long as they make their comments public. Mr. Nouredine stated that the developer will work with City officials to develop their next presentation.
- Mr. Kurtz reiterated his concern over the north elevation on Euclid Heights and the width of those ends. The idea of brick base coursing as a consistent approach could be a nice way to create a base for those buildings. That would feel commensurate with the bases of other buildings in the community. He was not sure he would overly erode that brick and bring this other panel in front of it. He would also not take the brick around and have the same façade above because you will get to the point where we ask if you could do something more exciting with that. Regarding the first floor units he remarked that some separation and privacy was afforded those first floor units because of the topography.
- Mr. Gallagher said that earlier designs had projected balconies and that would necessitate different façade treatments. Ms. Fliegel suggested a more traditional appearance to the balconies similar to buildings farther east on Euclid Heights. She wanted to avoid a balcony looking like it was added on. Mr. Gallagher in response to a question from Mr. Kurtz said they made a choice not to make the buildings all brick. Mr. Kurtz suggested that they see a white building that is part of the original structure of the Western Reserve Historical Society that is a three-story, beautifully articulated white-on-white treatment that works well. It's a white building right on the corner, not the limestone buildings. It's okay to not make it all brick. He thought it could be a subtle secondary articulation.
- Ms. Fliegel asked Mr. Gallagher to discuss the similarities and the differences between this design and the design of similar buildings in University Circle. She asked what will draw a millennial to move up the hill. Mr. Bogan replied that walkability and neighborhood services are two aspects that are attractive to potential residents. Additionally, this development will have better amenities than the projects in University Circle. Ultimately, the community will draw people to live here. He said they were obtaining long-term financing to make sure it works. He said they were putting their money on the line.
- Mr. Wong asked the members of the ABR to summarize their suggestions for the developer so that they have a clear direction on what they need to address before they come back before the Board.
- Ms. Fliegel stated that the height of the building at the corner needs to be studied. Some final due diligence should be provided. Material refinement regarding the metal panel's reflectivity. She had thought it would have been

a matte panel. Over time, the metal panel joints streak and look dirty. Mr. Gallagher said the idea was that the metal panel would blend with the glass to show the elegance of the curved form.

- Mr. Kurtz said the metal panel curves but glass will not be curved. There would be a little bit of a chamfered wedge shape revealing itself. How you do that elegantly can kill that pretty quick. There is probably a solution to this. It is a long way from what I hoped it would be. I don't want to say that and leave you in this limbo. I do think there are some things like ground-level amenity space; whether that's little parks or how the commercial space reinforces real assets to the community. Really studying the context and—I would encourage you to not make it look more traditional—looking at the scale, proportion and rhythm of the street; do those studies. The materiality, sub-articulation, scale and proportion of openings—how you can use the depth already being given to the building to give the building more mass and substance... Even if you look at Nighttown, it doesn't have a lot of relief but it feels like a really solid building. Those are things I would like to build on. The corner, curved building seems like a real challenge in terms of its scale.
- Ms. Fliegel suggested moving it a little bit or breaking it down as you move the corner.
- Mr. Gallagher said they have explored it; compressed the footprint so the footprint is smaller. It was taller and felt proportionately like a good move versus less stories-- then the bulk goes down the block.
- Mr. Goss asked for elevations from Bellfield. He said the vertical phenolic paneling does not seem to work well.
- Mr. Bogan and Mr. Gallagher pointed out that addressing some of these concerns could result in more problems.
- Ms. Fliegel suggested having those alternatives available to explain that other versions were studied but didn't work. Not everyone will love this building. Her overall feeling is that she has positive thoughts about where you started, where you are heading and what we will see next.
- Mr. McLeod asked that the building be rendered from every side street from 100', 500' and 1000'. He was afraid that the nine-story building would be viewed from everybody's backyard all the way up and down the street. We don't want to see that building out of our backyard. It is going to clear all the treetops. It is ten stories. It is one hundred feet. It is taller than North Park will be so it will be visible throughout the city from everybody's backyard. You need to express that so city residents understand. Your building is something that everybody's going to get stuck looking at.
- Mr. Wong noted that the zoning for this site was approved by the Planning Commission and Cleveland Heights City Council. The height limit for any building besides the building at the point is six stories. The process for

changing this would be pretty time consuming because it would be like a zoning amendment.

- Mr. Gallagher stated that they examined limiting the height from five to six stories across the site and the pro forma did not work.
- Mr. Kurtz said if the tower came down to eight stories, those units would need a new place on the property. We all heard that that tower was the most contentious. It is worth looking at reducing the scale of that.
- Mr. Bozic asked if the alternative locations were looked at for the tower. He asked why it could only be on the corner. It's a killer for the neighborhood. Those people are going to be so disappointed to have this huge slab of wall facing them. It's a killer.
- Mr. Kurtz verified that Mr. Bozic had suggested putting the tower on Euclid Heights.
- Another unidentified person said that Doctors' Hospital sat on the site closer to Nighttown. She suggested moving the tower east, putting a smaller building to the west with a park at the point.
- Mr. Bozic said those were options. He asked if options were looked at.
- Mr. Gallagher said other options were explored. He said one of the challenges was placement of the parking deck. Putting the tall building on Euclid Heights would not be as appropriate.
- Mr. Bozic disagreed saying it would be closer to the garage and existing taller buildings.
- Mr. Gallagher said every discussion of the corner included the word "iconic." Just like "Modern," "iconic" means something different to everybody. The impression was that it was about scale and height at the corner. As we showed taller buildings at the corner it was supported and well-received. Placement of the tall building at the corner was not in a vacuum. There was a lot of discussion and a lot of support.
- Mr. Bozic said he believed him but he asked if Mr. Gallagher felt the strength of what all these people were saying—that this building is a real eyesore that you call beautiful. He said that Mr. Gallagher had to sell him on it.
- Mr. Wong interjected that we didn't want this to become a debate.
- Ms. Fliegel said that everyone has been heard. The next date has not been scheduled. The applicants will let us know when they will be ready. It may not be at a regular ABR meeting because the mass of people need not sit through the other regular cases. This way they can focus on the one project. She then thanked everybody.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:16 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Melissa Fliegel, Chair

date

Richard Wong, Secretary

date