

ARB MINUTES

March 26, 2007

The ARB held a regular meeting on Monday, March 26, 2007 at North Royalton City Hall, 13834 Ridge Road. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Ed Kundla at 6:01 p.m. Roll called.

Members Present: Ed Kundla, Joe Kapitan, Frank Castrovillari and Ray Priest
Donna Babinec (Secretary)

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Tony Sandora

1. **New Business:**

A. **Premier Eye Care:** Chairman Kundla called for applicant. Bill Kelleher from Century Sign Company representing Dr. John Porter and Premier Eye Care was present. Chairman Kundla asked Mr. Kelleher if anything had changed from the original application submitted. Mr. Kelleher replied no. Mr. Kelleher stated that the application is for a red faced sign on aluminum raceway which is painted to match the building. Premier Eye Care is located in a plaza and most of the businesses have signs which are the same color. Only Subway's sign is not red. The Board had a short discussion concerning the exact location of Premier in the plaza. Chairman Kundla asked Mr. Kelleher if the two red colors on the application are the same. He replied that they were. Mr. Priest asked Mr. Kelleher the size of the transformer for sign. He replied 2.0, 9060 and 7560 red neon 30 milliamps; 9030 volts and 6030 volts. The sign will have one double stroke neon tube in each letter. The transformers are ground fault. The sign will be on a timer.

Chairman Kundla moved to approve the sign as submitted. Mr. Kapitan second. Motion carried 3/0.

B. **Gary Moyse:** Chairman Kundla called for applicant. No one present.

- C. **Bill-Mar Specialty Co.:** Chairman Kundla called for applicant. Tom Tekesky present for All Type Fence Co. representing Bill-Mar. Mr. Tekesky stated that he had received approval from the Planning Commission and had been told to provide the ARB with a sample of the slat material for the fence. He showed the Board a brochure with a picture of the “feather lock slat” which was being used. He further stated that it would provide 80% view block. The fence colors were on the back of the brochure. The fence will be 6 foot tall . The client had no preference as to color and has agreed to take the recommendation of the Board. The property is located south of Mr. Divits which is also east of them. The Board reviewed the plans submitted and had a brief discussion as to the location of the fence in relation to the neighboring businesses. Mr. Divits’ building is dark brown and the stockade fence located in front of the volleyball courts is painted beige. The Bill-Mar building is also brown. Mr. Castrovillari suggested they use the same color beige. The fence will be used to enclose vehicle storage. The fence is 35 feet from the property line and 25 feet on another side. Mr. Tekesky showed the Board where asphalt is located on the plan. He further stated that there is a buffer of 10 to 15 feet of trees on the Gross Builders side.

Chairman Kundla moved to approve the fence as submitted using beige for the color. Mr. Castrovillari second. Motion carried 3/0.

2. **Old Business:**

- A. **Joseph A. Golubic:** Chairman Kundla called for applicant. Carlo Chiuchiarelli present as general contractor, Don Plunket as designer and Joe Golubic, property owner. Mr. Plunket stated that they had already been to the Planning Commission and they needed variances which they have received. The building is all split face block, two tone in color - dark gray and a lighter gray (smoked marble) color. There is belt material to accent. The small roof on the front facade of the building will be gun metal and there are storefront windows as well. There are glass block windows all around the building. The building is located next to DiGioia. There are two houses and a small garage on the property now which will be razed. The building will be set back 70 feet from the right of way which was the need for the variance. The glass will be low E tinted glass. The lighting consists of two wall packs on the building which will light the parking lot in the front of the building. There will also be two lights in the metal roof (can lighting) to light the sidewalk in front of the entrance. The existing sign will be reused. There was a brief discussion regarding a landscape plan for the sign and landscape mound. They will

provide a plan for the mound which will be mostly grass and for landscaping surrounding the sign. Mr. Plunket further stated that you cannot see the back of the property because of the elevation change from the road. Mr. Castrovillari suggested tabling the monument sign and then moved to table the sign until a landscape plan is submitted. Mr. Kapitan second. Mr. Priest asked Chairman Kundla if, after a motion is made and seconded, he would then ask for comments before asking for the roll to be called and he should ask the secretary to take the roll. Mr. Kapitan asked Mr. Priest if he had comment and he replied that he didn't since the vote had been taken. Mr. Castrovillari stated that he had not yet voted. Mr. Priest again replied that he had no comment. Mr. Kapitan asked Mr. Priest if he had any advice to give the applicants regarding their landscape design and he declined. Mr. Castrovillari then voted aye on the pending motion. Motion carried 3/0.

Chairman Kundla then moved to approve color, material selection and placement of building on site as submitted. Mr. Castrovillari asked the Board if any of them thought the building was too monotone as the building is gray and darker gray. Chairman Kundla replied that it is industrial. Mr. Castrovillari stated that the building is very close to the street. Mr. Golubic stated that he is spending extra to use split face on the entire building, carrying the banding all the way around and using glass block. Mr. Chiuchiarelli stated that the sides of the building are obscured by DiGioia on one side and a house on the other. Mr. Plunket stated that the business owner's trucks are gray. Mr. Kapitan stated that he has no problem with color in that zone and area. Mr. Kapitan seconded the motion. There was no further comment. Roll was called. Chairman Kundla aye, Mr. Kapitan aye and Mr. Castrovillari nay.

Mr. Priest advised the applicant to use Latin name and common name of plantings and use circles on the plan as to location.

- B. **Southwest Industrial:** Mr. Tony Farinacci present as applicant. He stated that he had received approval at Planning Commission and had returned to show the ARB the elevations for Building A. He pointed out changes that had been made to building. He pointed out quoining that had been added to eastern face of building to match other structures on site. The quoins will be 1-2 shades off of the building color. The shingles are light to medium green - green, white and a light gray blend to match the existing buildings. He stated that he will return to ARB with the landscape plan for Building A as well as signage. All the rest of the property is concrete. There is 60 feet of concrete between the buildings, 50 feet of which is already in. At Planning

Commission he agreed to a 10 foot side and rear yard set back. The prints show 5 feet but they will be doing 10 feet and will made the change on plans before giving them to the building department. They have not yet decided but will probably move the building back 5 feet so there will be 55 feet between buildings. There is more than enough room for the various vehicles using the space to maneuver. The doors are white and 12 feet wide and 14 feet high. Mr. Kapitan stated that he liked the consistency of the buildings and the fact that they did not have flat roofs. Chairman. Kundla asked for further comment. After no further comment, Chairman Kundla moved to approve the building plan and site plan with the colors and materials as submitted, exclusive of the east elevation sign of Building A. Mr. Castrovillari second. No discussion. Roll taken - motion carried 3/0.

Chairman Kundla explained to Mr. Farinacci that the ARB should have reviewed both the building and site plan at applicant's first appearance. He had been advised by Brenda at Planning Commission that, if Planning Commission reviews site and building, ARB should too. Mr. Farinacci suggested that the agenda list both building and site plan.

Chairman Kundla stated that there is no one else present with business before the ARB. Mr. Castrovillari asked if there was anything that could be reviewed by Board without applicant. The Board then reviewed the Gary Moyses application, however it was noted that Brenda at Planning Commission had advised that the applicant needed to go before BZA for a variance. Mr. Sandora stated that he believed that they were appearing before BZA tonight. He further stated that applicant's lot is less than an acre as required and that there is some problem with set back. The applicant had wanted to come to Planning Commission first to see what needed to be done, then would go to BZA for variances. They only have an option to buy and they are trying to see if they can make it buildable before they do anything.

Mr. Castrovillari then inquired about the Eagle scout that was to appear before the Board. Chairman Kundla advised that he had asked to appear before ARB to get input regarding a sign for the North Royalton Cemetery.

Mr. Castrovillari inquired about ABC Fire. Mr. Sandora stated that they were to appear before BZA later this evening. Mr. Kapitan affirmed that he had received information that they were appearing at BZA and that BZA wanted a member of ARB to appear tonight to give the Board's feelings on the sign. He could not go. Chairman Kundla asked what time they meet and Mr. Priest said that the caucus is at 7:30 p.m. and the meeting is at 8:00 p.m. Mr. Sandora stated that the ARB member can appear at caucus and probably doesn't have to be at the meeting itself. They want to know how the Board feels about ABC Fire and also

want to inquire about Stevens Painton. Mr. Priest stated that he had been contacted by one of the BZA board members about ABC Fire and Stevens Painton. He told him that he did not agree with the ruling of the other ARB members on both signs and suggested that he talk to one of the other members. Mr. Priest further stated that BZA felt funny overturning the ARB but they had read the ARB minutes and were confused about why the ABC sign was not approved.

Mr. Castrovillari asked why Stevens Painton was going to BZA. He was not present the second time they appeared at ARB. He was advised by the other board members that they had been tabled again but only for the building sign. The site plan, building and monument sign were approved. Mr. Kapitan stated that they had agreed to bring the ARB more sketches with other options for the building sign. Mr. Priest stated he doesn't understand why they are going before BZA when they were only tabled at ARB. Mr. Priest stated that he thought that the height of the lettering was a problem and that the applicant's position is that it is in a commercial area screened by the turnpike and, even if you could see the sign, which they believe you can't from the top of the hill, it's a mile away. He said that the BZA members didn't get a good feel why the ARB would not approve and they were confused as to the ARB's problem with the sign. Mr. Sandora then stated that they have to go to BZA for the size of the sign. They are allowed 75 square feet for the sign and are asking for three times that amount. Mr. Castrovillari stated that, technically, the ARB shouldn't have even talked about it because they had to get a variance first. Mr. Kapitan stated that the ARB could not have approved the sign but could have talked about it. Mr. Sandora stated that he thought they just want to feel everybody out to get what they wanted. Mr. Priest stated that he hopes they understand that, even if they are approved for size, they have to come back to ARB - it's still not approved. Mr. Sandora stated that he would make sure that they know that. Mr. Priest stated that he thought the ARB had suggested 3 foot letters and Mr. Kapitan stated that he doesn't know if that will get them within size limitations. Mr. Sandora stated that 3 foot letters times 25 feet would be 75 square feet - a large sign. Mr. Kapitan stated that it will still give presence to the turnpike but not be overwhelming to others. Mr. Castrovillari said that he had driven down the hill, drove onto the property, drove up and down the street and he actually walked onto the property. He thinks that the sign may be seen coming south on Rt. 82 but residentially it won't be seen. Therefore, he's inclined to say "who cares?" but, first and foremost, whatever the City allows as an increase - maybe not three times but double - he may be inclined to say okay. Both Mr. Castrovillari and Mr. Kapitan stated that they would like to see what it looks like. Mr. Priest stated that he told the BZA member that he thought the Board's problem was with the size of the lettering on the building and he thought "who cares?" - no one will see it unless you're up close and it's industrial so who cares? Mr. Castrovillari stated that the ARB was concerned about whether or not it could be seen and, if so, its way too big. Mr. Priest stated that, even if you can see it, it's industrial and, if you see it on the hill, it's so far away. It

can only be seen from the turnpike. Mr. Priest thought the bigger issue was ABC Fire. Mr. Kundla stated that he would be at BZA for both signs.

Mr. Castrovillari said that he was the one who had the problem with ABC Fire and wanted to give his opinion. He drove by the business the day after they appeared before ARB. He estimated it to be less than 75 feet from the street and there may be one tree between the front elevation of the building face and Rt. 82. There is a clear open shot to the front elevation. Both Mr. Kapitan and Chairman Kundla agreed. Mr. Castrovillari said it's extremely visible and if they were 100-300 feet away he would feel differently. The sign will be 4x4 feet of red and a huge flame and on all night. Mr. Sandora asked if they said it would be ground lighted. The Board members all replied no - that it was the Board's suggestion and the applicant said no. Mr. Castrovillari said that the existing sign is black on tan brick with a ground light and that, if they want red, they should take the black down and use red but don't illuminate from the inside. Mr. Kapitan stated that they told the applicant that, if they used ground lighting, it would be approved that night but they want to see the sign from 5 miles away. Mr. Priest stated that the size should be immaterial as it meets the City code. Mr. Priest further said that, in talking with Mr. Castrovillari after the meeting, he explained it was the intensity. If they would guarantee it was toned down so it's muted, not blaring. They haven't given the ARB any information regarding transformers, lighting foot candles so the Board assumes it will be a blaring sign. Mr. Castrovillari stated that they have come before the ARB twice with the same information and have been denied. He thought they were supposed to return after asking the owner if he would agree to the Board's suggestions. Mr. Kapitan said that a motion was made to approve with timer control and the ARB voted it down. Mr. Sandora stated that sometimes applicants go from one board to another without assuming that there's is communication between boards - thinking they can get approval. Mr. Castrovillari stated that the applicant keeps saying that red is their color. It's been black for many years and now they have a problem with people seeing them. Mr. Sandora recalled that a long time ago there was another business in there with ABC and they had a red sign at that time that said ABC Fire. Chairman Kundla stated that the ARB objected to illumination not color. Mr. Priest stated that he thought the problem was that they see other internally lit red signs being approved and don't understand why they can't do it if it meets the size requirement. In fact, one was approved today - red internally lit. Mr. Castrovillari stated that he understands that you have so many square feet per frontage but he feels they should have to make the sign proportionate to the distance from the street. There's no difference if the sign is 5 feet from the street or 400 feet from the street - but there is a huge difference visually or impactwise. Mr. Sandora stated that they have been asking for a master sign plan like some other cities that specifically spells out what they can have and can't have. Is there a way to control the illumination of a sign? Mr. Priest stated that he was working on a sign and talked with some lighted sign companies who advised that you can control, with the transformer, how much juice is getting to the lighting tubes. The sign

applicant at the meeting tonight said the only way to determine how bright a sign will be is easily calculated by how many foot candles will be at the road whether it is 5 feet back or 500 feet back from the road. Mr. Castrovillari stated that the ABC Fire sign would be 0 foot candles from the road because it glows - not projects. Mr. Priest asked if the light was muted would it be okay? He thinks the brightness of the sign can be controlled by transformers, number of tubes, if they want to. Mr. Castrovillari said that ABC Fire is 2 feet tall. Even emergency room signs aren't 2 feet tall and they are usually at least 100 feet from the road. Mr. Priest stated that the size meets the Code. Chairman Kundla stated that the problem is how it impacts your vision and its surroundings and how much it appears to glow or not glow. Mr. Priest stated, then it's brightness not size. Chairman Kundla stated that how far the sign is from the road plays into how it appears to glow - this is 75 feet from the road. Mr. Priest stated that a sign man told him that as soon as an illuminated sign is installed it begins to deteriorate and will be very deteriorated within 5 years. Mr. Kapitan stated that, by using that, you create a problem with enforceability. You'd have to run around with a light meter and, if a transformer burns out, they could put one in that glows more. Mr. Priest stated that, in Strongsville you have to use a lighting plan that shows foot candles all around a light pole. Mr. Castrovillari said that, when he and Mr. Priest discussed the brightness of a sign after the last meeting, they looked at CVS - a very bright red sign - and looking at Zeppe's the green on their sign is bright but doesn't glow like the red does. He further stated that, having the sign on a 2:00 a.m. won't cause someone driving by to call the following day. Mr. Priest asked why they didn't approve the timer. Mr. Castrovillari replied that there's no guarantee when it would be on. Mr. Kapitan stated that it becomes an enforcement issue. Mr. Sandora asked Mr. Priest if the light plan was required in Strongsville's code. Mr. Priest replied that he didn't know if it was in the Code but they did ask for a light plan.

3. **Update from Legal:** Remains tabled.
4. **Approval of Minutes of March 12, 2007 meeting.** Chairman Kundla asked if there were any comments on minutes. No comments. Chairman Kundla moved to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Kapitan second. Motion carried 2/0.
5. **Adjournment:** Chairman Kundla moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:02 p.m. Mr. Kapitan second. Meeting adjourned 3/0.

Approved: _____
Chairman - Architectural Review Board

Attest: _____
Secretary - Architectural Review Board

Date: _____