

ARB MINUTES

October 8, 2007

The ARB held a regular meeting on Monday, October 8, 2007 at North Royalton City Hall, 13834 Ridge Road. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Kundla at 6:00 p.m. Roll called.

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

Members Absent: None

Others Present: None

Chairman Kundla moved to place the application for Edward Jones on the agenda. Mr. Kapitan second. No discussion. Roll taken. Motion carried 3/0.

Chairman Kundla moved to place the application for David Sabol on the agenda. Mr. Kapitan second. No discussion. Roll taken. Motion carried 3/0.

1. New Business:

A. Mount Royal Villa, Sign Approval.

Chairman Kundla called for applicant. Mrs. Babinec stated that she had received an email from Brenda at Planning that Mount Royal wanted to be tabled to appear at the October 22, 2007 ARB meeting. Chairman Kundla moved to table Mount Royal Villa. Mr. Kapitan second. No discussion. Roll taken. Motion carried 3/0.

B. Tanland, Sign Approval.

Chairman Kundla called for applicant. Jason Grimes present as co-owner of business with wife, Michelle Grimes. The application is for a new building sign for Tanland and Gearin Up. The business is located at the corner of Ridge and Royalton Roads. It was formerly Dental Labs. Gearin Up is a children's resale store attached to the tanning salon. The application showed two versions of the same sign. Mr. Grimes stated that the bottom version has opaque ink/paint which will not illuminate the purple and orange colors at night. At night, just the lettering lights up which he feels gives a more upscale look to the sign. On the Gearin Up portion of the sign, the colors are purple, black and gray and the orange and purple colors are the logo colors for Tanland.

The sign box is new. The Tanland business was formerly next door for two years and had a yellow sign with a purple and white outline. The box is 22 feet wide and 3 feet tall. It was approved by Planning Commission and is in keeping with the building frontage. The building is about 50-60 feet from the road. Someone had driven into the old location next door. Gearin Up is in the same building with Tanland. They use the same color scheme for both businesses. There is only one store which has two front entrances with an 11 foot opening between them inside. There is one door for both in the back. Each sign is about 11 feet by 3 feet. The sign face is fully lit but they only plan to light the letters at night. The sign is Lexan. Mr. Castrovillari stated that he appreciates the colors not being illuminated at night. However, he would rather see two signs than one for the reason that, if one of the businesses were to close, there would be an issue if someone wanted to reuse the box sign. Mr. Grimes stated that, legally, the building does not meet the requirements to have two signs. Both businesses are run by the same employees and the City told them they cannot have two different businesses in the same space. Mr. Castrovillari stated that, when he looks at the sign, he sees two different signs and two different tenants. He asked Mr. Grimes if the City said he cannot have two separate signs. Mr. Grimes stated that it was not discussed. The reason he didn't want two separate signs was, if one business didn't do well, they would have a blank sign space above one door when they can now have one sign face that can be easily altered without major expense. He argued that, even though looking at the front of the building, it looks like two businesses, the make up of the building doesn't allow for two businesses because of fire exits and restroom requirements. Mr. Castrovillari suggested that a door and restroom can be added. Mr. Grimes stated that, if that was done, the tanning salon would be so small it would be unusable. They originally wanted two businesses and couldn't meet the requirements. Mr. Castrovillari and Chairman Kundla agreed that they think the scale of the sign is too large and two smaller signs would be better. Mr. Kapitan asked Mr. Grimes if one of the businesses went out of business would they blank out 33 feet of the sign or make the other one bigger. Mr. Grimes stated that the old business next door is empty and has a blank sign - the new tenants can take it down or put a new face on it. They didn't want two signs when only one business can be in the building. All the brackets, wiring will come out of one spot. Chairman Kundla asked what will happen with the sign if one of the businesses fails. Mr. Grimes stated that he will reapply for a new sign face and may possibly have to change the sign structure. Chairman Kundla stated that the design of the building is deceiving. Mr. Grimes said that the dark roof shingles are at an angle and are taller than they appear. He feels that, if the sign face must be replaced, they can more easily make the change with only one electric connection and brackets than to remove two signs and put one in the middle. Mr. Castrovillari asked if zoning is allowing such a large sign. Mr. Grimes stated that the proposed sign is under the requirements for the size of the building. Chairman Kundla advised Mr. Grimes of a current situation where a company has gone out of business and has signs remaining and the ARB is being asked to approve keeping the old signs. The current sign regulations have to apply. Mr. Grimes

said, what if there were two signs and Tanland was no longer operating, there would still be a blank sign. Economically, a single sign makes more sense. Chairman Kundla asked if the inside space is equally proportioned. Would each business get as big a sign all by itself? Mr. Grimes replied that he would have to find out but he believes that they can because he initially contacted the building inspector because they had proposed channel letters 11 feet by 2 feet for just Tanland and he was told it would fit the requirements. Mr. Castrovillari stated that it is out of scale. Mr. Grimes stated that his sign is the same height as Mr. Hero. Mr. Castrovillari replied that does not make it right. Mr. Grimes stated that the sign is centered on the roof and he thinks there is 1 and ½ feet above and 1 and ½ feet below. Mr. Priest stated that, if the sign meets the Code, it shouldn't be an issue for the ARB. Mr. Castrovillari replied that it is an issue for the Board. Chairman Kundla said it is within the allowable sign area but the aesthetics of the sign is something the Board can address. Mr. Grimes stated that he is confused by this as well. He thought the Board may have a problem with the colors of the sign but, if it meets the City's size requirements, what are the rules for. Chairman Kundla stated that their sign is below the square footage but if, for argument's sake, they were allowed a 60 square foot sign, where would you put a sign that large. Mr. Grimes stated that he wouldn't. Mr. Priest stated that he would rather see one sign centered than two signs. Mr. Castrovillari asked Mr. Priest if he would like a sign 11 feet long and 6 feet high. Mr. Priest stated it isn't a sign like that it is a long narrow sign on a long narrow building. He likes one sign. He thinks more than one sign junks up the building. He thought the Board may have a problem with the color. Mr. Castrovillari stated that he hasn't gotten to the color yet. Mr. Priest said he thought that because there was a problem with Den Too's sign with the purple and red. He has seen that sign now and the purple and red together are colorful and he thinks the sign looks good. When you plant flowers you go for color. Mr. Castrovillari stated that the sign is still too large for the building. Mr. Grimes asked the Board if they would rather the sign be 32 feet long and a foot shorter so there is two more feet of orange. Mr. Castrovillari stated that these are two different signs and the Tanland sign should be proportionate to the square footage of Tanland. These are two different companies. Mr. Grimes stated that this is like BP having a Subway inside it. Their business is a tanning salon with a resale store and Ebay store all in one. It is a multi function building. Mr. Priest stated that the City approved one sign and they will give one permit for one sign. The ARB is in conflict with the City. Mr. Castrovillari stated that the City hasn't seen the ARB's point of view on this issue. His opinion is that these are two different signs and they are out of proportion. Mr. Grimes stated that the building inspector said "one business, one sign." Mr. Castrovillari said fine, if you want him to comment on one sign give it one color and don't make it look like two signs. Mr. Grimes said okay do you want orange all the way across because that is their key color. They were trying to break it up. Mr. Castrovillari said, if you want orange submit it in orange and he will look at it. Mr. Grimes said he doesn't understand. He realizes that there are signs out there that are eyesores but this sign is not an eyesore. It is professionally designed. Mr. Castrovillari

stated that is his opinion and that practically everyone that comes to ARB has a sign that is professionally designed. He then stated they are beating a dead horse. They should put the sign to a vote. Mr. Grimes asked for the Board's feelings on color so he doesn't have to come back eight times. He is losing business without a sign. Mr. Grimes stated that they can put a black line between them. He tried to make the sign appropriate for the City by using the different day/night on the sign. The ARB would never tell National City that their lime green sign isn't a good color. CVS is right across the street from him and their sign is orange and white. He never thought the Board would question the proportion of the sign since it is well within the City's recommendation. Mr. Castrovillari said that doesn't make it right. Mr. Grimes stated that it does. Mr. Castrovillari stated that just because the City says you're allowed to have a big sign, it doesn't make it proportionate to the building. Chairman Kundla said that, when Mr. Grimes says the "City" he doesn't seem to understand that the ARB is one third of the approval process. Mr. Grimes stated that their rules are written down and the ARB is judgmental. Mr. Kapitan thinks that a solution similar to Den Too would work. Mr. Grimes asked what that was. Mr. Priest stated that it was one sign with a separation between them which, in that case, was brick. He further stated that you can't give one permit for two signs - it's like a panel sign. Mr. Kapitan stated that a healthy divider can make it look like two signs that are butted against each other. Mr. Grimes stated that is not a problem. Mr. Kapitan stated that, if they put a divider between them they would have to shrink down the lettering. Mr. Grimes stated that he isn't against that. He didn't come to argue - he thought the problem may have been with the color orange because with his old sign, the Mayor stated that she hated orange and wanted the sign to be yellow. He thinks the old sign was an ugly sign. Mr. Kapitan stated that this will not be resolved tonight. Mr. Grimes asked what he has to do to resolve it. Mr. Castrovillari stated that there are two many opinions. Mr. Kapitan stated that there are two options: to keep a single sign with a divider to make it look like two signs and the lettering may have to be adjusted or to split the signs, actually do two signs but keep the same area. Mr. Grimes asked if Tanland has an 11 by 3 sign won't it be disproportionate. He doesn't understand how that changes anything. Mr. Castrovillari said that, if he wants him to comment on one sign, he will - there are too many colors, get rid of something. There's yellow, black, purple, blue ... Mr. Grimes stated that he is not the one who wanted one sign-the other third wanted it. He told Mr. Castrovillari, if he was a small business owner, he would understand. Mr. Castrovillari stated that he is a small business owner. He further stated that Mr. Grimes' sign person can easily remove some of the colors and can decrease the size of the sign. Mr. Grimes stated that the larger the sign, the better - it's a 44 foot building. Mr. Kapitan stated that it is a legal question. Mr. Grimes said that he is frustrated that the building inspector told him it had to be one sign and then the ARB tells him that it should be two. This is a loss of money for him. Mr. Castrovillari told him that he can put up a temporary sign, Mr. Grimes replied that he cannot do that as he had just received a letter that told him to remove his temporary sign within 7 days. The City does not allow banners. Mr. Grimes

said he wants to know exactly what the Board wants. Mr. Kapitan stated that the legal question must be answered. Mr. Castrovillari stated that this Board has given him 3 or 4 things they request and if he brings them back there is a good chance this can be resolved. Chairman Kundla stated that the Board cannot design their sign for them. Mr. Grimes stated that they are. Chairman Kundla replied that they are making suggestions and, based upon those suggestions and the applicant's research of the how the Code is currently written, they can choose to make the changes or not. Mr. Grimes asked what happens if he doesn't agree with the Board's recommendation and still thinks his sign meets the requirements. Chairman Kundla said that he can appeal to BZA. Mr. Castrovillari stated that he has no right to appeal yet. Mr. Priest stated that Mr. Grimes' application will be tabled - the Board is not voting no. If it's tabled, they can do the research and when he returns, hopefully someone from legal and Planning Commission will be present and the Board can get answers. Mr. Castrovillari stated that, if the Board goes ahead with a vote and reject it, it will take a lot longer to appeal than for the applicant to return with the 3 or 4 items requested. Mr. Kapitan stated that, if the application is denied tonight, they have to go to BZA or start the process over. He also stated that the Board has yet to fail to come to some sort of an agreement. Chairman Kundla stated that one proposal is to put a divider on the sign and they would then have to reduce the fonts on Tanland and Gearin Up. The Board has been unhappy with the color of other signs and have even told Howard Hanna to change their sign color so his argument about National City doesn't hold water. The Board may suggest that they put a white border around the sign. If the amount of orange is reduced it may become tasteful. Mr. Grimes asked how the Board feels about reducing the orange to an outline with a black background. Chairman Kundla replied that it would be well in line with signs passed before. Mr. Castrovillari stated that they still have to return with a proposal for that sign. The next meeting is in two weeks and he should return with letter sizes and as much an information as possible along with a picture of the sign. They can take the ARB's recommendations or not. Mr. Grimes asked what the Board recommends for color. Mr. Kapitan stated that dropping the amount of orange down and bumping up the white would be better. Chairman Kundla suggested he bring a sample of the orange color. Chairman Kundla then moved to table Tanland/Gearin Up and recommended 1) that the sign be divided with a marking down the center to delineate separate signs even though they are in one sign box, 2) to reduce the orange on one half of the sign which says Tanland and 3) to bring actual samples of colors and a new rendering of the sign. Mr. Kapitan second. Chairman Kundla asked for further discussion and Mr. Castrovillari asked if the Board should also recommend two separate signs and for applicant to bring a picture of that. Mr. Grimes stated that it would be much more expensive. Mr. Castrovillari stated that he will be contacting legal and advising them of the Board's feelings regarding the proposed sign. Therefore, on the off chance that the City thinks ARB is correct and wants two signs, he should bring that picture as well. Mr. Grimes asked if he would then need two sign permits. Mr. Kapitan replied that will be addressed

with legal. Mr. Grimes agreed. Chairman Kundla amended his motion to include Mr. Castrovillari's suggestion. No further discussion. Roll taken. Motion carried 3/0.

Chairman Kundla asked for a two minute recess.

C. **Valco.** Signs Approval.

Chairman Kundla called for applicant. Wendy Kaminski present. Ms. Kaminski stated that her client owns businesses in the industrial park. There are three separate parts to the building and he wants three signs. All of the signs are identical but the signs in front of buildings one and two are set back 25 feet. The sign in front of building three will be set back 18 feet as it is replacing a current sign which is landscaped and he doesn't want to replace the landscaping. The Board inquired about landscaping on the other two signs. Ms. Kaminski replied that her client was doing the landscaping for those signs down the road. The Board stated that he cannot do that and he must submit a plan now. Mr. Kapitan stated that the application should have had a sample landscape plan attached and they need that plan for all of the signs. Mrs. Babinec provided Ms. Kaminski a copy of the sample plan. Mr. Castrovillari stated that they should have some plantings for both summer and winter. Mr. Priest stated that the Board doesn't want them to hide the sign. Mr. Castrovillari stated that there is plenty of room underneath the signs for shrubs. Mr. Priest stated that they should also have a plan for the sign with existing landscaping showing what is already there and the plantings for all signs should complement each other. Ms. Kaminski showed the Board samples of all materials for the signs. The signs are beige Alumicor. Mr. Castrovillari asked if they are one panel or two. Ms. Kaminski replied that, due to the angle of the signs to the road, they are only one sided. Mr. Castrovillari asked about exterior lighting and Ms. Kaminski replied that there is none. Mr. Castrovillari suggested the Board table the signs for landscape plans. Ms. Kaminski stated that she has not gone before Planning Commission yet but will do so this Thursday. The Board noticed that there is a large transformer beneath the existing sign. Ms. Kaminski stated that it will be removed. Mr. Priest advised Ms. Kaminski that the landscape plans should have year-around interest - that you should landscape the signs like you landscape your yard. Chairman Kundla moved to table the signs for landscape plans. Mr. Castrovillari second. No further discussion. Roll taken. Motion carried 3/0.

D. **Edward Jones,** Sign Approval.

Chairman Kundla called for applicant. Jim Briola of Northcoast Sign and Lighting Service present. He advised the Board that they are proposing installation of a single face sign box, internally illuminated on the facia of Edward Jones' building. The Board had a short discussion as to the location of the business. Mr. Briola knew that it was at 10200 Royalton Road but did not know what other businesses it was near. Mr. Kapitan

stated that it was in an industrial area. Mr. Priest asked if there are other tenants in the building. Mr. Briola stated that his client was not the only tenant. He showed a picture of the directory sign and the Board then realized the building was located on the north side of Rt. 82. Mr. Castrovillari stated that he believed that the signs across the street were mostly white signs with green and red. Mr. Briola stated that the green color on the proposed sign is a very conservative shade of green. Mr. Castrovillari stated that he has no problem with the sign. Mr. Priest asked him if he had any problem with not knowing what the other signs on the building look like - they could be all blue or all red. Mr. Priest asked Mr. Briola if the color is significant for the company and he replied that it was their corporate identity. Mr. Castrovillari stated that the Board tends to want all of the signs on the same building to match. Mr. Kapitan stated that, since he has not been to Planning Commission yet, he cannot be approved by ARB. Mr. Briola suggested that application for signs should indicate that the applicant should provide photos of adjoining signage. He then asked if the Board could approve the sign pending approval of Planning. Mr. Kapitan stated that he would not necessarily need to return to ARB but could just provide photos of the other signage. Mrs. Babinec suggested that he provide the photographs to Brenda at the Planning Commission meeting on Thursday and she can give them to ARB before the next meeting.

E. **David Sabol**, New roof for existing building.

Chairman Kundla called for applicant. Mr. Sabol present for Florence Carlson. Mr. Sabol stated that the application is for a new roof to an existing building. He further stated that he was told that Planning Commission was not required to approve first as there was no additional space added to the building and it only required a review by ARB with their comments provided to Planning. He then went on to describe the roof as a hip roof structure over the main portion of the building and a reverse gable on front over an overhang. There is no business proposed for the building yet - this is just an upgrade of the existing roof and roof structure - a new asphalt shingle roof. The building is 65 x 42 feet, approximately 2900 square feet. There are two brick piers in front which are out about 5 feet in front of the building. The front and cemetery side of the building are brick and the other two sides are painted concrete brick with a 6 foot brick return on the west side. The brick is a clay color. He showed the board a sample of the shingle which was Weathered Wood. Mr. Castrovillari asked Mr. Sabol where the business signage for the building will go. He replied that he had discussed that with the owner and they determined that they will use a wall mounted sign. Chairman Kundla stated that the Board will give its advisory opinion to Planning Commission. Mr. Kapitan stated that Mr. Sabol shouldn't have to return to ARB.

2. **Old Business:**

A. Royalton Skin Care, Signs approval.

Chairman Kundla called for applicant. Mr. Brian Becker of Becker Signs present. Mr. Becker advised that the business is located in the Pucher Building at the corner of Ridge and Royalton Roads. The existing signs are Puchers and Zeppe's. Puchers' sign is blue lit face channel and Zeppe's is open faced channel with exposed red and green neon. The proposed sign is a cabinet sign 84 x 24 which is aluminum, fluorescent lit, painted to match fascia of building. The face is Lexan vinyl and blocked out to prevent blue from being illuminated at night. All you would see would be the white letters and light blue hands. The existing pedestal sign could be blocked out as well. Mr. Priest asked about the Puchers sign. Mr. Becker stated that it is a blue lit face channel with blue letters that are almost the same color as the proposed sign. Mr. Kapitan stated that the monument sign shows a strong precedent for a white background and does Mr. Becker think his client would have a problem with reversing the blue and white of the proposed sign. Mr. Becker did not believe that would be a problem. Mr. Kapitan also asked Mr. Becker about a landscape plan. Mr. Priest stated that there really isn't much there in the picture. Chairman Kundla explained to Mr. Becker why the Board is mentioning landscaping to him stating that he will have to tell his client that the sign is tabled because the landlord must landscape the sign. Mr. Castrovillari stated that he has no problem with the sign but landscaping is an issue. Chairman Kundla moved to table the sign for a landscape plan. Mr. Becker asked if they could approve the building sign and table the monument sign. Mr. Castrovillari stated that he can go ahead and build the sign but can't get approval without a landscape plan. Chairman Kundla stated that the Board is okay with the colors on the signage but the monument sign is tabled for landscape plan. Mr. Kapitan second. Mr. Becker stated that they will submit a landscape plan but it is then up to the landlord to follow through. Mr. Castrovillari said they will deal with the landlord if necessary. No further discussion. Roll taken. Motion carried 3/0.

Mr. Priest asked if the landlord went out to replace the landscaping, took pictures and presented them to the Board, would Mr. Becker have to return to ARB? The Board agreed he would not.

Chairman Kundla stated that there are no other applicants present and went on to other old business.

B. Tonight, Tonight, Sign Approval.

Chairman Kundla stated that the sign was tabled on September 10, 2007 and no one is present. He then moved to approve the sign as submitted. Mr. Kapitan second. No further discussion. Roll taken. Motion denied 3/0.

C. **Ohio Catholic Credit Union.** Sign Approval.

Chairman Kundla stated that the sign was tabled on September 10, 2007 and no one is present. He then moved to approve the sign as submitted. Mr. Kapitan second. No further discussion. Roll taken. Motion denied 3/0.

D. **Salon Pink.** Sign Approval.

Chairman Kundla stated that the sign was tabled on September 10, 2007 and no one is present. He then moved to approve the sign as submitted. Mr. Kapitan second. Chairman Kundla asked for further discussion. Mr. Castrovillari stated that he is confused as the sign is already up. If the sign is rejected, what happens. Mr. Kapitan stated that it was tabled by Planning Commission for a variance. Mr. Castrovillari asked if they should be given an extension. When do they go before BZA? Mr. Priest stated that ARB cannot keep track of the applicant's schedule. Mr. Kapitan stated that he thinks that Ohio Catholic also needed a variance. Chairman Kundla revised his motion to give Salon Pink a two meeting extension. Mr. Castrovillari second. No further discussion. Motion carried 3/0.

E. **Timber Ridge Plaza,** Signs Approval.

Chairman Kundla stated that, at the last meeting attended by the applicant, it was decided that it was necessary to investigate previous action taken for other signs in the plaza. Mrs. Babinec stated that the Board has asked applicant to present a sign plan for the entire plaza. Mr. Castrovillari stated that they were not given a time limit to do so. Chairman Kundla moved to give Timber Ridge Plaza a two meeting extension. Mr. Castrovillari second. No further discussion. Motion carried 3/0.

Mr. Castrovillari then asked about Ohio Catholic. Chairman Kundla stated that, based upon further information he will place Ohio Catholic back on the agenda for further consideration. Mr. Kapitan second. No further discussion. Motion carried 3/0. Chairman Kundla then moved to give a two meeting extension to Ohio Catholic. Mr. Castrovillari second. No further discussion. Motion carried 3/0.

3. **Miscellaneous.**

Chairman Kundla asked the other Board members if they knew anything about a new large KFC ground sign. Does anyone recall it being approved when they appeared before ARB. Mr. Kapitan stated that their application was for a building change and building sign only. Chairman Kundla asked Mrs. Babinec to contact Brenda to see if she knew anything about the sign.

4. Approval of Minutes of 9/24/07 Meeting.

Chairman Kundla asked if anyone had comment on the minutes from the 9/24/07 meeting. No one had comment. Chairman Kundla moved to approve the minutes of the September 24th meeting as submitted. Mr. Kapitan second. No further discussion. Roll taken. Motion carried 3/0.

5. Adjournment.

Chairman Kundla moved to adjourn at 7:35 p.m. Mr. Kapitan second. Roll called. Motion carried 3/0.

Approved: _____
Chairman - Architectural Review Board

Attest: _____
Secretary - Architectural Review Board

Date: _____