

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION BOARD OF REVIEW

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

May 1, 2023

A meeting of the Design and Construction Board of Review was held at 5:00 PM in Council Chambers of Rocky River City Hall, with the following members present:

Jim Larsen, Chairman
Tom Evans, Member
Steven Jennings, Member

Also Present: Former Law Director, Andrew Bemer,
Legal Consultant for the City regarding
the Lake Road Rocky River LLC project.

Mr. Larsen opened the May 1, 2023 meeting by reading Section 1127.27 aloud, which contains the factors the Design Board must consider in their review of detailed development plans. He said that this is a public meeting but not a public hearing, so the audience can listen in but they will not be able to participate in tonight's meeting.

1. **LAKE ROAD ROCKY RIVER LLC**
19621 Lake Rd.

Pre-Preliminary Review
New Office Building with Attached Garage

Present: Denver Brooker, Vocon Architects
Mark Conzelmann, Developer

- Mr. Brooker explained what has been updated since the last meeting with the Design Board. Some of the feedback they received was to continue to evolve and develop the north elevation of the building, modulate its length and accentuate the entrance in a stronger way and they believe they addressed all of their comments.
- There have been various adjustments they have made such as adjusting the footprint of the building to respect setbacks and other planning considerations. Mr. Larsen suggested they go through the plan changes that were made to the building.
- Mr. Brooker referred them to page 7 of the submission. They changed the eastern setback and pushed the building in a little. They reduced the overall length slightly so that they maintain the required 10' setback from building to parking on the west side. They reconfigured the drive off of Linda and eliminated parking associated with it so that it respected the setbacks to the north and south. They moved the trash area from under the northwest corner of the parking area. They reconfigured the walkways in the front of the building and the landscaping associated with it. The low site wall was adjusted to be behind the building setback line. There were some slight technical adjustments around the parking deck as they continue to refine it.
- Mr. Evans commented on the traffic on Linda St. He thinks it is good to have more than one site egress for a project like this. There was a brief discussion about the underground storm water retention system.
- Mr. Jennings said commented on level one of the garage protrudes about half of a parking space out from the upper level, which he said seems awkward because half of the car would have snow on it and half would not. Mr. Brooker said that the surface parking

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION BOARD OF REVIEW

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

May 1, 2023

setback is less than a building setback and the ground level parking respects the required parking setback.

- Mr. Brooker said that people can enter the site from either drive, but they expect that since most of the parking is to the south, they will use the south entrance. The outdoor gathering spaces that are accessible to all employees were described by Mr. Brooker.
- Mr. Brooker said that the landscaping approaches stayed the same but it has all been adjusted to work with the new geometries that have been developed.
- Mr. Evans likes the heavier screening at the Linda Street driveway.
- The building exterior was discussed as the Board members were guided through the submission booklet. Mr. Brooker said that they resolved the geometry of creating the pulled out bays and inset bays that modulate the length of it. They are utilizing more of the industrial multi-paned windows and the insets that creates the divisions. They have adjusted how the sills and the heads of the black spandrels and eliminated the black band that used to exist at the top of the second floor. They expanded the entrance canopy to the full width of the recessed component and described the brick used to create texture on the building. They developed an enhanced cornice with a soldier course that pulls out slightly from what is below to create the stronger cap that was discussed at the last meeting. He described the special-shaped bricks that have a slight color shade darker and richer. He continued explaining the different directional views of the building in the submission.
- Mr. Jennings likes the change they made to the entrance. He said the vertical pieces and the top band seem a little odd because they don't necessarily relate to the spacing of the ones on the rest of the building and they are more frequent. Mr. Brooker explained the reason for that revision. Mr. Jennings said that he would understand if they lined up with the 2 columns (piers) below because they ideally want the top floor to disappear. More discussion was had relating to this. Mr. Larsen confirmed that they really want this to look like a 2-story building on Lake Rd. so they are trying to simplify it as much as possible. Mr. Evans said that what they have done has really reduced the visual volume of the building and makes it feel way more in context.
- Regarding page 25, Mr. Jennings asked that they show a point of view of the garage entrance because right now it is 2 separate things – he would like to see more of the garage.
- Mr. Evans said that the brick and the metal are both contextual in acknowledging the buildings around it and he is glad to see that.
- Mr. Larsen thanked the applicants for responding to the discussion they had last time and their concerns about making sure that Lake Rd. feels more in scale with what it is. He said that by adding the cornice, they have actually returned this building to the traditional roots that happen elsewhere on the street. He thinks it is a good beginning but he wouldn't mind seeing this with more strength to it because it actually has a more classical look now with the columns. He would like to see them consider adding one or two more rows of soldier course that were added to tell him that this building is intended to be a more classically defined building. He said that this is still a huge building and this has been addressed by the ins and outs of the elevations. The insets are a huge plus and asked them to think about putting the same darker brick in there because he will start seeing the building in concert with the continuation of what it is and break it down so it feels like it is a series of smaller elements that are linked together rather than a mass. Mr.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION BOARD OF REVIEW

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

May 1, 2023

Brooker said that they had that conversation internally but it made the building feel a little bit disjointed after they tried it, but they will study it again.

- Mr. Brooker presented samples of the exterior brick and metal.
- The historical significance of the site was brought up and Mr. Conzelmann said that they have met with Jenny from the museum and talked about some different options to incorporate into the project. They talked about doing something on the interior of the building like a feature wall that will respect the history for when guests come in. Once they have the interior layout of the building done, they will get together again.
- Mr. Larsen asked if they would consider adding something into the site that reflects Cowen Pottery, like materials that would be in concert with the colors or the texture that it its own visual element of interest, separate from the building. He said it could be some sort of intentional sculptural piece with elements we may have found in that genre. There was a short discussion of ideas between the Board and the applicant.
- Mr. Evans said that he feels compelled to re-emphasize the fact that this is a larger building and the steps they are taken and/or some of the suggestions that were brought up are attempts to modulate and break up the scale of the length of the building. The third floor setback and color are major steps in reducing the visual volume, which he has heard are some of the larger community concern, along with the reference to the Cowen Pottery history.

The applicants thanked the Board for their feedback. No vote was taken.