

ARB MINUTES

March 11, 2008

The ARB held a regular meeting on Tuesday, March 11, 2008 at North Royalton City Hall, 13834 Ridge Road. The meeting was called to order by acting Chairman Kundla at 6:02 p.m. Roll called.

Members Present: Ed Kundla, Joseph Kapitan and Ray Priest
Donna Babinec (Secretary)

Members Absent: Frank Castrovillari

Others Present: Donna Vozar, Tom Jordan and Tony Sandora

1. Approval of Minutes of February 25, 2008 meeting:

Mr. Kundla asked the Board if they had an opportunity to review the minutes from February 25th meeting. The Board members replied they had. He then asked for comments. No comments. He then moved to approve the minutes of the February 25, 2008 ARB meeting as submitted. Mr. Priest second. Roll called. Motion carried 3/0.

2. Old Business:

- A. **Italgranite.** Mr. Kundla called for applicant. No one present. He asked if anyone knew why they were at BZA. Mr. Jordan stated that he believed they were at BZA because they wanted to have two signs and needed a variance. Mrs. Vozar stated that the next BZA meeting is on March 31st and she said, under the circumstances, they should be given an extension. Mr. Kundla moved to extend the time on the application of Italgranite due to the BZA matter for two ARB meetings. Mr. Kapitan second. No further discussion. Motion carried 3/0.

3. New Business:

- A. **Nick and Rosa Carosielli.** Mr. Kundla called for applicant. Mr. Randy Matejka with Designwise present. Mr. and Mrs. Carosielli were also present. Mr. Matejka stated that the application was for an addition to the Carosielli's business across the street, Americopy. The addition will be to the back of the existing facility. The will remove a garage that is there now to add storage and

an additional warehousing area to the back of the building. He went on to say that the back of the existing garage is falling apart and it is not heated. He showed the Board a rendering of the existing facility and proposed addition. The existing building has cement block in back with a front facade of brick veneer with red brick at the bottom and golden/tan brick and another stripe of red at the top. The side elevation shows the drive of the nursing home. They want to put a base level at 2.4 feet to 2.6 feet above grade of Northern Rose, split face, with a band of the same near the top. The field would be smooth face Sierra Buff. That would sort of flip flop the front facade as to texture. They would use Northern Rose smooth face 8" block scored to look like windows. The Carosiellis are contemplating redoing the front of the building to match in about a year and they will return to ARB with those plans. The gutters would be white and metal cap coping would be metal close in color to the Northern Rose. Mr. Kundla asked Mr. Matejka if the property has always been contiguous as it is in the drawing. Mr. Matejka asked his clients and Mr. Carosielli stated that he thought it was built in 1968 or 1969 and they bought it in 1993. It is all one parcel. Mr. Kundla asked if they had been granted any variances on the property. Mr. Matejka said that last June they asked for a variance for the set back. They were granted a variance but they haven't yet returned to Planning Commission. This happened prior to his being contacted by the property owners. He said there are two types of one story buildings - flat roof and gable. The variance was for a two story flat roof. They were given the variance with a two story flat roof and they will probably have to return to BZA to address that since this is a one story. They go to Planning Commission tomorrow. Mr. Kundla made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Kapitan second. Further discussion was had. Mr. Matejka said that he had spoken to Brenda. Their main concern was that the one wall showed glass block windows which are against Code that close to a property line. Mr. Sandora said they also had storm water issues. Mr. Matejka said they have received a comment from the engineer and they have resolved that issue. There will be three down spouts, they are putting in drain tile all the way around the perimeter and back filling with stone and waterproofing. Mr. Kundla asked about neighbors. Mr. Matejka showed him on the diagram where there is a residence neighboring the property. They have a fireplace at the back of their property. He also showed where there is a utility pole and said that they will be bringing their service in there. There is a five to six foot grass area. Mr. Kundla asked if he had any photographs and he did not. Mr. Kapitan asked about the owners' intention as to the facade upgrade on the front of the building. Mr. Matejka said they haven't gotten very far in discussions. The awnings are dated and the store fronts are all old. They have

replaced all the doors and want to replace the windows and gutters. For landscaping there really isn't any except possibly at the treelawn. It is pretty much paved everywhere else. They plan to keep the grass up to the building. Mr. Kundla asked Mr. Matejka if the variance was for the amount of building on the site. He replied that it was only for location/position of the building. Mr. Kundla said that there are asking for 2,170 feet for the addition which looks like twice the space of the existing building. Mr. Matejka said they are probably adding 1,000 to 1,100 additional square footage. Mr. Kapitan stated that they are in a TCD which only allows split block as base and standard block is only for interior courtyards or alleys, i.e., places where it is not visible from outside area. He does not have an issue with the red split block base but has a problem with the field. Mr. Kundla said that there is a higher level of finish requirements on structures in TCD1. TCD1 would only allow split on base not all the way up. Mr. Matejka asked if it would have to be brick all the way up as, in that event, it would increase cost to the owners. Mr. Kapitan asked if they had considered quick brick. Mr. Matejka said his concern with quick brick would be the weather in this area but they will check into it. It would increase the cost as well but not as much as brick. Mr. Matejka asked if doing the band in split face would be acceptable in TCD1 or would that need to be changed to quick brick. It would probably be difficult to match color. There was a short discussion with Mr. Matejka showing again which materials were to go where. He said that they could put quick brick where it would be visible by the neighboring residence. Mr. Matejka then spoke to his clients explaining why they need to use different materials. Mrs. Vozar said that they are going to BZA on other issues so they may want to address this. Mr. Matejka stated that Brenda told him that they had received their variance but he doesn't know the exact verbiage. Mrs. Vozar said that she seemed to recall that they had only applied for a separate building for storage. Mr. Matejka showed the Board the original application and the drawings showed that it was always supposed to be an attached building. Mrs. Vozar said she would advise the law director to look at the BZA minutes before the Planning Commission meeting tomorrow night. Mr. Kundla then amended his motion and moved to table the application pending the outcome of Planning Commission. Mr. Kapitan second. Roll called. Motion carried 3/0.

Mr. Jordan asked if the only issue with ARB was the quick brick and are the other materials okay? Mr. Kundla replied that he had no problem with anything else on the application. Mr. Priest asked Mr. Matejka to bring a sample of the quick brick colors when he returns to ARB.

B. **Rego's.** Mr. Kundla called for applicant. Mr. Kirk Miller present. He stated that the application is for signage for Rego's. Mr. Kundla moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Kapitan second. Discussion began with Mr. Miller showing the Board a new drawing of the front signage stating that, after further discussion with his clients, they had agreed to lower the front signage to where it was on the building when Topps was there. The sign itself is unchanged, just lower. Both signs are channel letters. There are two small ground signs that they propose replacement of the face only. Mr. Jordan asked Mr. Miller if the ground signs are already existing. He replied that they were but they have plain white faces now. They were there when Topps was there. Mr. Kundla asked if Regos is going to Planning Commission tomorrow. He replied that he was. Mr. Kundla said they would address the ground signs last. Mr. Kundla asked if all the letters were individually illuminated. Mr. Miller replied that they were. Mr. Kundla said 36" high for "Regos" and 24" high for "Supermarket" fire engine red in color which is in keeping with what is already in that center. Mr. Kundla asked the other Board members how they feel about the building signage. Mr. Kapitan said it was okay. Mr. Priest asked if, since they are showing some landscaping on the drawing of the side of the building on the Sprague Road side, did it mean that there will be landscaping there. Mr. Miller replied that it would look nice but that is a landlord issue. Mr. Kapitan said that last fall an application came before the Board for Timber Ridge. The landlord wanted to reface the main Timber Ridge signs and put Realty One there. This was before anyone knew that Rego's would be in that space. The ARB wanted to know the long term intent for the left over signage. Their application was tabled and they never returned to ARB so the application was eventually denied. Mr. Priest said it was his recollection that the ARB had asked the sign company to talk to the landlord and come back with a master plan for all the ground signage. They never returned. Mr. Miller said that his company does all the Rego's. He talked to Lydia at Petros and had a minor discussion regarding this issue. Mr. Jordan stated that he had met with a representative from Petros and he recalled the submission was made prior to the Rego's refacing so the issue should be dead. He went on to say that Rego's always uses red for their signage. He was advised by Realty One that they were going to get a monument sign as it is part of their lease and they think the City is holding this up. Mr. Kapitan said that the old Timber Ridge signage still has the old "Miami Vice" colors even though the refacing will be different colors so they will probably redo the signage. Pursuant to the current Code, the ground signs are non-conforming as any sign that goes defunct for a period of ninety days is "goodbye." They need to know the unified intent for the entire center. Mr. Miller asked if they

can just deny the application and they'll go to the landlord to get direction as to other signage. Mr. Miller said that Rego's had pushed the landlord to the refacing. He had given them some ideas as to other signage but they had not gone with him yet. Mr. Kundla said he should give them a copy of the ARB minutes from this meeting and perhaps encourage them to attend the meeting in case they have questions for the Board. Mr. Jordan said you may want to let Realty One know what is really holding them up. Mr. Kundla said to impress upon them that the two ground signs as well as the monument signs for the center are at issue. The major issue is a comprehensive signage package. Mr. Kundla then moved to table the sign application. Mr. Miller asked if they can go ahead with the building signs. Mrs. Vozar said they could do that. Mr. Miller said they would like to amend their application to withdraw the ground signs and go forward with the building signs only. Mr. Kundla amended his motion as such. Mr. Kapitan second. Roll called. Motion carried 3/0. Mrs. Vozar asked Mr. Miller to make the change to the application and it will be an exhibit to the application. She also told Mr. Miller that, when he goes before Planning Commission, they will need to amend their application there as well to remove the grounds signs.

4. **Miscellaneous.**

Mr. Jordan addressed the Board and stated that he would like to discuss two issues. He stated that the site plan approvals go before ARB and Planning Commission, what is the history of that? His experience is that site plans just go before ARB, unless it is something that changes a use or expansion of use. Is there a technical reason? Mrs. Vozar read the Code at Section 1224.07 as to ARB's authority to which Mr. Jordan replied "that is for ARB, what about Planning Commission?" Mrs. Vozar said the Code says the same thing for Planning. Mr. Kapitan said he doesn't know the technical answer to the question but the common sense answer is that, usually if it is a very involved site plan with parking, driveways, drainage, etc., Planning Commission looks at the number of parking spaces, site coverage and things the ARB doesn't look at. Mr. Jordan stated that it seems to be a practice issue. If they are shy of parking or over lot coverage, the Building Department should note the number of spaces, etc. in the application and kick it to BZA. It shouldn't be Planning Commission saying that they're shy, it should be an administrative function. Mr. Priest then asked what Planning Commission looks at. Mr. Jordan replied that Planning Commission looks at uses, change of usage, set backs. Technically, this (Carosielli) was an expanding use in a TCD as opposed to a garage storage facility. In that instance, it might be kicked to

Planning. He didn't think that most general site plans should be before Planning Commission. ARB would look at driveways, ingress, egress, landscaping and visibility issues, such as whether it is visible from a right-of-way and, if so, do we have a higher standard. Mr. Kapitan said that ARB doesn't look at civil engineering issues. Mr. Jordan said that would be an administrative function. Mr. Kundla said ARB is doing it because the Code said that an application must be approved by Planning Commission before coming to ARB. Mrs. Vozar said that the Code does require everything to go to Planning Commission - ARB doesn't have authority. Mr. Kundla asked why there are so many applications coming to ARB first. Mrs. Vozar said they shouldn't because ARB is going in blind. The ARB doesn't know what any department heads have said about an application so they get no input. Because of how the process is set up, they are required to be heard quickly. Mr. Sandora said there is usually a problem at this time of year due to elections and meeting dates being changed. Mr. Priest said that we set our own agenda so, when you look at an application, if it hasn't gone before Planning Commission, it shouldn't be on ARB's agenda. Mrs. Vozar said the Code doesn't allow you to wait. If it comes in, it must go on the Agenda and it then forces it to be tabled. The Administration will have to look at this for changes. The ARB can look at an application and approve it contingent on Planning Commission approval but that can also be a problem because the ARB doesn't know what issues might come up at Planning. Mr. Jordan said these issues need to be addressed. Mr. Sandora said, at least at Planning, they have all the notes to review which the ARB does not. Most issues can be resolved at the meeting. Mr. Jordan said that Planning has the engineer and building commission there to resolve issues. He will look into this further.

Mr. Kundla moved to adjourn at 7:10 p.m. Mr. Kapitan second. Roll called. Meeting adjourned.

Approved: _____
Chairman - Architectural Review Board

Attest: _____
Secretary - Architectural Review Board

Date: _____