

ARB MINUTES

July 13, 2009

The ARB held a regular meeting on Monday, July 13, 2009 at North Royalton City Hall, 13834 Ridge Road. The meeting was called to order by Joe Kapitan at 6:00 p.m. Roll called.

Members Present: Joe Kapitan, Linda Watkins and Laura Tworzydlo
Julie Broestl (Acting Secretary)
Members Absent: Frank Castrovillari - Move to excuse approved 3/0.
Others Present: Donna Vozar, Tom Jordan and Larry Antoskewicz

1. Approval of Minutes of June 22, 2009 Regular Meeting

Joe Kapitan moved to abstain from the vote on the meeting minutes as he was not present at the June 22, 2009 meeting. Ms. Watkins second. Roll called. Approved 2/0. Mr. Kapitan moved to approve the minutes of the June 22, 2009 meeting, Mrs Watkins second. No discussion. Roll called. Motion carried 2/0.

2. Old Business:

A. **Taco Bell.** Mr. Kapitan moved to consolidate the old business and new business of Taco Bell. Ms. Watkins second. Roll called. Motion carried 3/0. Mr. Jordan asked to address the Board on this matter. He stated that Taco Bell had been through a number of boards and ARB did review, on a preliminary basis, the architecture and signage on a prior occasion. They have received approval from BZA on all but one variance request - the one for the monument sign which is not included in here. There is a continued issue which is noted in the report of Rito Alvarez concerning the bells on the directional sign going in. It is Taco Bell's intention to move ahead with the bells on the sign but they will have to go back to BZA for reconsideration. He asked the Board to consider that particular sign contingent on BZA's approval so they can complete their application and move forward with building plans to be reviewed by the Building Commissioner and get it under construction. The significant change to the building was an extension of the dining room to lessen the variance request at the request of BZA and the arch, which ARB had reviewed as an option. Mrs. Vozar stated that Mr. Kapitan will need to move to approve the site plan and building design and a separate motion for the signage because, if they go forward on the contingent approval for sign package you would want it to be noted separate from the building design so this can be done all at one time. Present for applicant are Todd Huntington and Kira Kabo from GPD Group representing Pacific Bell. Mr. Kapitan moved to remove the application

from the table. Ms. Watkins second. Roll called motion carried 3/0. Mr. Kapitan then moved to approve the application for the site and building sign. Mrs. Vozar stated for the record that the application is an amended plan which has been approved by BZA. Mr. Huntington stated that this is an amended site plan based on previous meetings with BZA. The dining room addition extended the building frontage to reduce the variance and the arch was added over the exit drive thru. On the east side of the building, the arch extends to a tower or column located on the east side of the building and it is in line with the front of the building. Now the width of the building is increased so, as it relates to the amount of the signage allowed, they removed one of the swinging bells on the east elevation so they now comply with the signage allowed and, therefore, didn't need a variance for signage. The building signage submitted is the same as was submitted. The monument sign was omitted from the application and the directional signs are the same. They are going to BZA for a variance for the logos. The menu board previously had an arch with a Taco Bell logo on top of the menu board and the base of the sign has been reduced by two inches to comply with the seven foot maximum requirement. Ms. Tworzydlo asked about the purpose of the canopy. Mr. Huntington replied that the canopy was put there in an attempt to represent the extension of the building frontage. The 70% width of frontage is required in TCD zoning district. Based on the site layout, they weren't able to obtain the 70% width based on the size of the drives so the extension of the arch with the column on the other side gives the illusion of the extension of the building. Mr. Huntington pointed this out to the Board on the plans. This was done at the request of BZA to increase the width of the building. Mr. Kapitan asked if what was approved at BZA was a combination of the dining room extension and the arch and Mr. Huntington replied that previously the vestibule set back so it didn't line up with the front line of the building. The window square footage was increased as much as possible. Windows cannot be put in the back of the building. Based on the use of the building, they increased the window square footage on the front of the building but still required a variance for less than 50% square frontage on the windows. Ms. Tworzydlo asked to confirm that the canopy was requested by BZA. Mrs. Vozar said that was the original submittal given by the applicant to the City. BZA did not create it. Mr. Jordan stated that BZA did consider it without the arch and turned it down. After the arch was added, they approved it with a reduced variance. Also, the idea of the town center district is to bring the buildings forward, use the building as a sign itself. The options were to turn the building on its side which was not effective operationally. The other was fencing but fencing is not a part of the building. The other option was this canopy. The variance amounts are important as this is the first new construction in the town center district and sets the stage for other buildings constructed there. Granting a huge variance would be setting a standard. The canopy reduces that variance. This was discussed at length with the applicant and they had two BZA meetings two months apart. Ms. Tworzydlo said the Board is addressing the enter and exit signs. Mr. Kapitan stated that they will return to BZA for approval to put a bell on the enter and exit signs. Mrs. Vozar said ARB could grant conditional approval. The reason

why they are requesting a variance is because they had originally requested a monument sign but they are prohibited in TCD. BZA did not want to approve monument signs in TCD. This will give some recognition from the roadway. They did not request a variance for the amount of signage but it could be argued that this is just a variance for the amount of signage they are requesting. Mr. Kapitan asked, before they get into signage, are there any comments on the building or site. Mrs. Watkins and Ms. Tworzydlo both thought it looked good. Mr. Kapitan stated that he would like to see the arch come down a little bit but he knows this is a concern for tall vehicles. He is also concerned that vehicles that would be heading west on Rt. 82 are getting a false front view of the arch. He pointed out on the plans that it is flat and has no depth similar to a false front on a movie set. Ms. Kabo said they won't be able to see because of the landscaping. There will be landscaping on the side. The first tree starts a little behind it. She showed the Board the landscaping she is referring to. She also said that the adjacent building blocks the view. Ms. Tworzydlo asked how tall the trees are. They could find no information as to size on the application. Ms. Tworzydlo asked if the burning bushes lose their leaves in the winter. Mr. Kapitan said he has one in his front yard and the leaves turn red and drop. Mr. Kapitan said that it does appear there is some landscape screening. He suggests that they not do anything different on the front but to extend the depth a few feet farther back to the south so it doesn't look like a false front. It shouldn't change any other aspects of the design or affect the BZA approval. Mr. Huntington said the column is approximately a 3 by 3 column, a standard size, and is more for construct ability. There will be a cantilevered beam resting on the column. If the concern is the view from the road behind that arch, in lieu of adding a false wall, other things can be done with landscaping such as putting in more dense landscaping in that location instead of adding cost. Perhaps adding some evergreens, six foot starting height, a line of three. The building next to it will then provide more screening. Mr. Kapitan said it isn't as much for screening as adding to the depth of the building so it doesn't look like a false front. He went on the say that, it doesn't need to be as tall as the top but turn something around the corner and take it a few feet back and stop. Mr. Huntington asked if a board on board fence accomplishes what he is looking for. Mr. Kapitan said no - it wouldn't look like the building. Ms. Kabo asked if landscaping as discussed could do that since the building is 90% designed - the structural is done. They would have to redesign the structure as it is completely attached to the building and all loads and weights go on the building. She understands that they want to bring depth but BZA said they don't want people to see depth they want them to see width. Mr. Kapitan said he understands the reason it is there is because of the look from the front. He doesn't know if BZA even considered what he is talking about. It's really a non-functioning wall. He asked about the construction of the column. Mr. Huntington said it is CMU with the same Coronado stone and EFS material above that. Mr. Kapitan asking if it's CMU surrounding a steel column or just a beam bearing on CMU. Mr. Huntington said he didn't know if there is a steel column pile. It will be a block concrete foundation which the CMUs rest on. He didn't know if the structural

design would require a steel 8 by 8 column. Essentially, what he is asking for would require an additional retaining wall, an extension, similar to the building with an additional column so there is added cost. Mr. Kapitan said extending the wall say 6 feet would obviously need a footer to support the wall but he doesn't understand how extending that wall would affect the structural design of the building. Even if there is a steel column it could just be CMU and wouldn't have any impact on any steel design. He does recognize it would be added cost. Ms. Kabo asked Mr. Kapitan how high of a wall he was talking about. Mr. Kapitan said the canopy column is about 15 feet. Mr. Huntington said the height is about 19 feet. Mr. Kapitan said, after it turned the corner, it could step down a few feet - maybe 15 feet. Mr. Huntington stated, depending upon the height, it varies on what that structure becomes. A fifteen foot structure that's six feet back there are wind loads and certain things that need to be designed. If it's a six or four foot structure, it's more of a low lying wall and you don't have the wind load but you're increasing the foundation, materials. It depends how far back you go. Mr. Kapitan said four feet, in addition to the three feet it already is, you have something turned back seven feet. He asked for any other comments. Mrs. Watkins said someone coming through the drive through would get the effect of a tunnel. She would rather see this done with landscaping. She doesn't think people will see it that much because of the adjacent building. Looking at it as a rider it would be quick. She thinks that landscaping would be a better idea. She thinks it would not be a benefit going through the drive through. She thinks it may have a trapping feeling. Ms. Kabo said they can consult with a professional about the landscaping to make it as full as possible using evergreens. Mrs. Watkins asked if the arch is high enough for delivery trucks. Mr. Huntington said delivery trucks will exit out of a different driveway. There will be clearance bars. He showed the Board how the trucks will have to maneuver around. Mrs. Watkins said they will only be able to exit east. Mrs. Watkins said she has had some drivers try to enter her business in motor homes and hit the building but it appears the clearance bars will prevent that. Ms. Tworzydlo asked how far the column is from the street. Mr. Huntington said it will sit back 35 feet. They had to be ten feet off the future right of way. It will be 25 feet when the road is widened. Mr. Kapitan asked for anything further on building or site. Ms. Tworzydlo said she would like to see the dwarf burning bushes changed to some non deciduous plantings. She tried to recall what bushes were used on the Manorcare site. Mr. Kapitan said it is for someone else to make that call. She wants the entire drive-through where the burning bushes are to be changed. Mr. Huntington said replacing the plantings to something more year round wouldn't be a problem. They could put a six foot starting height, mature trees there or something to provide more of a screen so you wouldn't even be able to see the drive through window. On top of the plantings in front of the building as well as the adjacent building the view from that area is essentially minimal. Mrs. Tworzydlo pointed to an area on the plan asking if there is room. Ms. Kabo said if you wrapped the wall around, there wouldn't be room for landscaping. If you didn't wrap around, there would be room to start landscaping right at the column. Ms. Kabo said you wouldn't want to block the column

because that is why they went to BZA to get the extra width. Driving by, you would see the bushes and the column. Ms. Tworzydlo said that you could put three of them to make it more of a wall. Mr. Huntington said you could stagger them to make them more dense - center staggered. Ms. Tworzydlo asked if you could put four there. Mr. Kapitan said it doesn't look like there is room. Ms. Tworzydlo said you could take the other bushes out. Mr. Kapitan said something evergreen. Ms. Tworzydlo said she is talking about a tree, can you plant an eight foot tree? Ms. Kabo said the Board can specify the tallest available tree they can plant. Mr. Jordan said you could say a minimum six foot non-deciduous tree. Ms. Tworzydlo said you could forget the pear tree and put in four or five. Mr. Huntington said it would depend on the tree as to how much space is needed to plant. They can let the landscape professional know what is desired. Mr. Kapitan moved to amend the motion to approve the building and site submission to: add 3 or 4 minimum six foot high non-deciduous trees immediately south of the entrance column and to also replace the burning bushes down the east side of the site with another non-deciduous species. Ms. Tworzydlo said she would rather see 4 or 5. Mr. Kapitan said 4 or 5 and the landscape architect will need to make the determination. Ms. Kabo said due to the fact there is another building so close, it may be a waste of money to go too deep. She went on to say that she thinks the Board will be happy when they see the finished project because of how Pacific Bell landscapes their sites. Mrs. Vozar stated, for the purpose of the motion, the Board will have to put specifics in the motion and then state a number recommendation and put subject to landscape architect's recommendation provided it meets the minimum standards set forth herein. Mr. Kapitan stated 4 or 5 minimum 6 foot non-deciduous trees immediately south of the column subject to the input of a landscape architect as well as replacement of the burning bushes down the side with a non-deciduous species. Ms. Tworzydlo second. Roll called. Mrs. Watkins, aye, Ms. Tworzydlo aye, Mr. Kapitan, nay. Motion carried 2/1. Mr. Kapitan then turned to the signage application. Mr. Kapitan asked for comments. Mrs. Watkins said they came in compliance with the drive through with the building commissioner. Mr. Kapitan said they dropped one of the swinging bells to be in compliance with the area. They are returning to BZA for directional signs. He went on to say, being the first new construction for the TCDs, it seems to be against the nature of what they are trying to do. He believes the purpose of the signage is to direct the motorist and the bell doesn't help with that, it's only there for marketing. Ms. Tworzydlo said none of the other existing fast food directional signs have anything on their signs. Mr. Huntington stated that sometimes McDonalds has something on their signs. Ms. Tworzydlo said McDonalds is only exit and enter. Ms. Kabo stated that Arby's does. Ms. Tworzydlo stated that is because it's grand fathered in. Ms. Kabo stated that they all have free standing signs, Taco Bell will be the only business in the entire City without a free standing sign. Ms. Tworzydlo said they are at the top of the hill, they'll be seen. Mrs. Watkins said she doesn't have a monument sign. Ms. Kabo said this is the reason they talked to Tom and the City attorney for some representation on the directional sign. Mr. Kapitan said no because there are grand fathered things that they wouldn't approve of now.

Mrs. Tworzydlo agreed. Mrs. Watkins said they just want the building to be the signage and the building and landscaping is gorgeous. Everyone will know where they are. Mr. Jordan said this submission has the bell. Mrs. Vozar said, with the way it is submitted, the Board can approve it with removal of the bell. Obviously, they can then go to BZA to appeal ARB's decision or to make application for a variance. Mrs. Watkins said they can then go to BZA to get the sign with the bell on it. So if they get the variance, they don't return to ARB. Mrs. Vozar said they don't have to return to ARB. Either BZA would hear an appeal from ARB's decision or they can hear a variance request. When ARB is reviewing the sign package, the Board should review each of the items and approve each of the items and reference the fact that the decision is to deny the advertising. Or the Board can review the package as submitted with no advertising. She then addressed the applicant that they have an option as to how to proceed tonight. Mr. Huntington said, if they decide to go with the logo, they would have to go to BZA but they have to check with the client. Ms. Kabo said tonight they would like it approved by ARB without the logo. Mrs. Vozar said they are then going to amend their application so no logo appears on the directional signs. Ms. Kabo agreed that it their intent. Mr. Kapitan moved to approve the signage package with removal of the bell as submitted on the menu board and contingent on the removal of the bell logo currently shown on the directional signage. Mrs. Vozar said she wanted to confirm that it was the directional signs that the building commissioner had an objection to the advertising. Mrs. Watkins second. Roll called. Motion carried 3/0.

B. **City Grill.** Mr. Kapitan called for City Grill. Mr. Ted Joyce present from sign company. Mr. Kapitan moved to remove the application from the table. Mrs. Watkins second. Roll called. Motion carried 3/0. Mrs. Watkins asked what changes had been made. Mr. Joyce said he was going to try to have it ready but the client just decided today what to go with so he showed the Board which drop in goes where. Both cabinets are black. The pole stays the same. He then showed the Board the two faces that are changing. They are replacements of the panels only. Mr. Joyce said the client wants the pole to stay the same because it matches the building. Mr. Kapitan said the letters, restaurant, is written as black. Mr. Joyce said those are just vinyl letters which can be stripped off. It's going to match the text and color. You have to have the same type of drop shadow, the red drop shadow with the black text going across. He probably won't keep restaurant and banquet but he hasn't made that decision yet. It can be stripped off but he would want something along the lines of his theme. Mr. Kapitan said the Board may have to drop that out of tonight's approval because he and the client don't know what they want so the Board doesn't know what it is. Mr. Jordan asked Mr. Joyce if he is just proposing to paint the cabinets black. If it's movable lettering, we don't get into moveable lettering. Mr. Kapitan said the applicant is saying he doesn't know what the vinyl fixed letters are going to be. Mr. Joyce said it's green so it's coming off. They are movable letters but the top is fixed vinyl. Mr. Kapitan said he is saying it may change the wording because he may not have a banquet function. Mr. Jordan

suggested approving the cabinet. Mr. Kapitan said he agrees but will save the actual text in the lower panel for another day. Ms. Tworzydlo said it looks redder to her. Mr. Joyce said it's his printer, it was running out of ink. Mr. Kapitan moved to approve the City Grill submission as amended that both sign cabinets on the monument sign and on building be painted black, that the bumped out upper panel on the monument sign be replaced as submitted, the building signage panel be replaced as submitted and the contents of the lower panel on the monument sign, other than the black cabinet being painted, the contents of the panel are not included in this motion. Mrs. Watkins second. Roll called. Motion carried 3/0.

C. **Graley Beauty Shop.** Mr. Kapitan called for applicant. Mr. Kapitan moved to remove the submission from the table. Mrs. Watkins second. Roll called. Motion carried 3/0. Architect, Mr. Noeth, stated that he had presented a picture to the Board at last meeting which he has brought back. He took a winter picture of the building and put the colors they want to use. The logs will be the light color and the trim would be the dark color. The part behind the arches would be tan. The columns and beam will then stick out and the deck would be the dark color. The under side of the eaves and the triangle would be smokey topaz. The hearts will be removed. The logs will be smoky topaz. The brick will stay and will not be painted. The Board liked the look of the building. Mr. Kapitan moved to approve the application as submitted with the color rendering and material and color samples. Mrs. Watkins second. Motion carried 3/0. Mr. Noeth left the samples and color rendering with the Board.

4. **Miscellaneous:** None.

Mr. Kapitan moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:13 p.m. Mrs. Watkins second. Meeting adjourned.

Approved: _____
Chairman - Architectural Review Board

Attest: _____
Secretary - Architectural Review Board

Date: _____