

## ARB MINUTES

FEBRUARY 28, 2011

The ARB held a regular meeting on Monday, February 28, 2011 at North Royalton City Hall, 13834 Ridge Road. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Joe Kapitan at 6:00 p.m. Roll called.

Members Present: Joseph Kapitan, Frank Castrovillari, Linda Watkins, Laura Tworzydlo

Donna M. Babinec, Secretary.

Members Absent: None.

Others Present: Donna Vozar

1. **Approval of Minutes of February 14, 2011 Regular Meeting.**

Chairman Kapitan moved to approve the minutes of the February 14, 2011 meeting. Mr. Castrovillari second. Roll called and motion carried 3/0.

2. **Old Business:**

A. **North Royalton Animal Hospital/Beagan Adam Hechko-** 9027 Ridge Road, Local Business Zoned - Site Plan for Building Addition. Tabled February 14, 2011.

Mrs. Babinec called for applicant. Dr. Adam Hechko and Paul Beagan present. Chairman Kapitan moved to remove the application from the table. Mrs. Watkins second. Roll called. Motion carried 3/0. He then moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Castrovillari second. Discussion: Mr. Beagan asked if the Board was familiar with where the animal hospital is now. Chairman Kapitan said yes, across from Carrie Cerino's. Mr. Beagan said yes, and that Dr. Hechko will be purchasing the property to the north side on Ridge Road and expanding the current facility considerably to the north. They will be keeping the set back to the property line residential directly to the south. There will be parking in front and in back for employees. They are doing some landscape screening at the edge of the parking lot where it abuts residential with some mounds and evergreens along the parking lot. They will put up a six foot wood fence directly adjacent to residential property. The driveway will be moved farther north on Ridge Road. Mrs. Vozar stated that she is looking at notes from the Building

Commissioner relative to this application. It is incorrectly stated as YMCA for old business rather than the animal hospital so there are no comments from him. She asked the applicant to advise if it was approved by Planning. Dr. Hechko said it was approved by Planning and BZA. Chairman Kapitan asked what was granted at BZA. Mr. Beagan said the existing building is currently beyond the 40 foot side yard set back. Since that's where the building is and can't be moved, they were granted a variance to allow for an expansion to an existing building within the side yard set back. Chairman Kapitan said so it was only the set back - nothing to do with use. Mr. Beagan said no not with use but recently there has been a zoning change to specifically allow an animal hospital in this district. That was done prior to the meeting with Zoning. There was also a variance for the required number of parking spaces because there wasn't any specific requirement for an animal hospital. The closest would be a medical facility but since the patients are not arriving in their own vehicles, they allowed for a reduction in parking for this type of facility. Mrs. Vozar said, yes the ordinance was amended to permit the animal hospital as a permitted use, however, kennel facilities are not permitted except as a required hospital stay for the animal but not as a boarding facility. She thinks one of the issues at Planning, since there is nothing from the Building Commissioner, was the existing building and it's proximity to the property line and the fact that there will be some kennels in that area. Issues were discussed to make the structure more sound proof and to add a buffer. Mr. Beagan stated that was a legal non-conforming use. Mrs. Vozar said yes, but it cannot be expanded. Mr. Beagan pointed out where there are currently outdoor runs in the back for the animals to go to the bathroom and that Dr. Hechko is sensitive to the neighbors and decided to move that away from the neighbors to the other side of the building so the building shields any noise from animals that might be out along with the fence and landscaping. Mrs. Tworzydlo asked if there is a white house on the property that is being torn down. Mr. Beagan showed on the plans where there is a brick house. Dr. Hechko stated they are expanding to the north. There is also a house to the south but not on their parcel. They have the property where the house is and the lot next door. Mr. Beagan showed how there are three lots that are being consolidated. The top two lots are listed as one parcel now but they were previously two separate lots. Dr. Hechko stated they were consolidated under the previous ordinance. There is only one house on the property - the brick one. Chairman Kapitan asked what they are thinking of for landscape screening up against the adjacent house. Mr. Beagan said they haven't gone through the final landscape design that will be part of the site design. It's being surveyed right now for the consolidation. Right now, they are planning arborvitae. Mr. Castrovillari said they will need to come back to ARB with the final landscape design. Mr. Beagan said that would be a good idea. Mrs. Tworzydlo said only the south side of the property is being landscaped. Mr. Beagan replied yes. Mrs. Tworzydlo said

nothing on the north side. Mr. Beagan said correct. Mr. Beagan showed the building design to the Board. He said they are keeping in line with the characteristics of other buildings in the district as far as gable roofs and keeping it in character with residential in the south. There will be vinyl siding with some stone on the front, asphalt dimensional shingles and on the gable shake style vinyl siding. He showed the Board samples of all the materials. Mrs. Tworzydlo asked him to point out where the shake style siding is going on the plan. She also asked where on the front the stone would go. Mr. Beagan pointed out behind the front porch railing on both sides - stone veneer. Chairman Kapitan said there is Hardie-board siding above the stone. Mr. Beagan replied yes. Mr. Castrovillari asked what color that would be. Mr. Beagan said it would match the vinyl siding. The trim on the windows, other trim and columns on the porch will be white. Chairman Kapitan asked if it has clear glass. Mr. Beagan replied yes. Mrs. Watkins said they will be siding the existing building. Mr. Beagan replied, yes, right now the existing building is concrete block and they will be doing furring strips and siding over that so it all matches. Chairman Kapitan said, in his opinion, the materials are fairly residential and there's been some attempt to break up the scale with some different portions of the building sticking out breaking up the roof line. He thinks the colors are fine. Mr. Castrovillari said they just have to come back for landscape. Chairman Kapitan said yes and signage. He assumes they will want some signage at the road and maybe something on the building. Mr. Beagan said yes they just indicated where the ground sign would be on the site plan, and they will come back with a signage proposal. Chairman Kapitan said it has to be reviewed by the Building Commissioner as to size or area. Both Mrs. Watkins and Mrs. Tworzydlo remarked that they liked the plans. Chairman Kapitan amended the motion that there will be comebacks for landscaping and signage. Mrs. Watkins second. Roll called. Motion carried 3/0.

2. New Business:

A. **Towne Tavern** - 11300 State Road, Local Business Zoned - Site Plan Approval for 6' Privacy Fence.

Mrs. Babinec called for applicant. Mrs. Laura Scullin present. Chairman Kapitan moved to approve the application as submitted. Discussion: Mrs. Scullin stated that this started out last year as a legal issue. She has spoken with Tom Jordan about a dozen times. They have a six foot chain link fence existing. They had 56 feet of trees lining the fence dividing the properties between both businesses. Last June, the lessee of the property behind them cut all of their trees down. They made a police report and she spoke with Tom. They will be getting legal counsel to take care of the situation with the lessee and there was a suggestion that they put up a fence. They are okay with putting up a fence and

taking care of it. They need a privacy fence as they have a lot of issues going from that business to their business, whether it's bottles, clients climbing over their fence and throwing bottles into their parking lot. It has now become a security fence. They discussed a ten foot fence and it looked ridiculous because it is visible from the street. They then discussed an 8 foot fence which would need a variance or go through Planning Commission. They went through Planning Commission and she sent everything to Julie. Somehow, it came to us for 6 feet even though it was 8 foot at Planning. Mrs. Vozar asked the applicant if Planning Commission approved a 6 foot fence. Mrs. Scullin stated that they never brought up 6 feet. He actually suggested an electric fence because of the security issues. Mrs. Vozar said, based on that, she is recommending that it be tabled until this can be resolved. They may want to return to Planning for reconsideration and then, perhaps to BZA for a variance. Time wise she doesn't know if it can stay on the agenda that long but at least this will give them until the next meeting to figure out where it needs to go. Mrs. Scullin stated that Tom Jordan mentioned a variance and she thought it was all being taken of. Mrs. Vozar asked to see what was submitted to Planning. Mrs. Scullin showed her what was submitted to Planning. Mrs. Vozar said she will get in touch with Julie tomorrow to find out what happened and obviously someone from the building department will be in touch with the applicant. If it was approved for 6 foot by the Planning Commission the applicant will need to go back to them for reconsideration. Chairman Kapitan said that sounds good. Mrs. Scullin said that is fine as she has had numerous conversations with everybody. Mrs. Tworzydlo asked if she had an idea what type of fence they want. Mrs. Scullin said board on board stained brown. If the Board doesn't like brown, it can be another color. She doesn't want the bottles and people climbing over. She said this is probably their best and best looking option because to replant all those trees is very expensive. They can't make the lessee responsible through the City. They will deal with that issue separately. Chairman Kapitan then moved to table the application for clarification as to what happened at Planning. Mr. Castrovillari second. Motion carried 3/0. Mrs. Scullin said they are not building right now because of the snow so they aren't rushed, they just want it done right.

**B. Giant Eagle/Sign Erectors, Inc. - 6000 Royalton Road, Towne Center District Zoned - Set of Individual Internally Illuminated LED Letter Signs.**

Mrs. Babinec called for applicant. Brad Hoff present from Sign Erectors, Inc. Chairman Kapitan moved to approve the signage submission for Giant Eagle/Huntington. Mrs. Watkins second. Discussion: Mr. Hoff stated they will be installing individual channel letters. The logo will be 2 foot 4 ½ inches, 1 foot 9 inch letters. Green faces with gray returns. It'll be spaced off ½ inch. It will be 3 bolted like most shopping centers. No further discussion. Motion carried 3/0.

**C. Drees Homes/A Sign Above - 10892 Angelina Drive, R-1A Zoned - Ground Sign for Huntington Park Model Home.**

Mrs. Babinec called for applicant. Jennifer Zabcar present. Chairman Kapitan moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Castrovillari second. Discussion: Chairman Kapitan asked if this is a ground sign for a model home? Ms. Zabcar said yes. Chairman Kapitan stated that the Building Commissioner's comments are that the height and area comply but there is no mention of setback on the application. His comment is that it has to be 25 feet from the street because there is no mention on the application. Ms. Zabcar said okay. Mrs. Tworzydlo asked how long the sign will be up - until they are all sold? Ms. Zabcar said they intend to keep the model there. They have a two year agreement with the developer to have the model home and exclusively market the homes so up to two years or as long as the model is there. She said they have already sold two of the sites without the model being opened so they intend to move quickly. Mrs. Watkins said she doesn't have a problem with it as long as it has a 25 foot setback. Chairman Kapitan asked if the sign will be landscaped. Ms. Zabcar replied yes, it will have landscape beds as indicated on the application. It's in an upscale neighborhood so it will look nice and appealing. Mr. Castrovillari asked how it will look when the sign is removed? Ms. Zabcar stated that they will put a very nicely edged bed there and, typically the homeowner will keep the landscape there. No further discussion. Chairman Kapitan amended the motion with the caveat that there is a 25 foot set back from the road. Roll called. Motion carried 3/0.

**D. Transport Services/Brilliant Electric - 10499 Royalton Road, GI-General Industrial Zoned. Ground Sign.**

Mrs. Babinec called for applicant. Major Harrison from Brilliant Electric present. Also present was Adam Therrion from Transport Services. Chairman Kapitan moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Castrovillari second. Discussion: Mr. Harrison stated that they are proposing a double sided, illuminated ground sign with some unique features. It is 76 total square feet. The cabinet that has the business name, etc. is opaque and aluminum face with routed out copy which means that the logo as well as Transport Services is routed out and backed up by Lexan. The logo and word "services" has an applied dual film which means that during the day when the cabinet is not illuminated it appears, in this case, gray and "services" appears black. When it is illuminated it appears white so that it is very visible. "Transport Services" is an applied translucent burgundy vinyl and will be burgundy at all times. The split block will match, as close as possible, the building facade. In the middle of the sign are two 16 millimeter full color electronic message centers. Right below there, where the address is, you will find it is a perforated metal which serves two functions, to identify the address and

to serve to ventilate the electronic message center. Chairman Kapitan asked if this business is located near Tri-County. Mr. Therrion replied that it is next door. Mr. Harrison stated that the current sign is a ground sign that is 70 square feet supported on concrete blocks which is a two-part cabinet which has an outdated manual changeable copy board and the other cabinet indicating Transport Services. They are making a very significant investment in their sign as well as their business. Mr. Castrovillari pointed to a portion of the sign on the application and asked what it can do. Mr. Harrison said it has the capability of doing anything. Mr. Castrovillari asked if the background will be changeable. Mr. Harrison replied yes. Mr. Castrovillari stated then basically it is a TV that does whatever you want it to do. Mr. Harrison said that Mr. Therrion can speak to how it will be used. They won't be utilizing it to broadcast. Mr. Castrovillari said, in his opinion it will be very busy and extremely distracting. He has a real problem with it. He went on to point out that the upper portion is fine and he likes the split face but what is going on in the middle is a problem. Mr. Harrison said the picture on the application just shows the capability of the sign. They can have a black background and add "full service semi" and anything they are currently promoting. Mr. Castrovillari said there is the potential of anything goes that is the problem. It doesn't matter what is said today, when the sign goes up there is the potential of it being extremely distracting and busy. Mr. Harrison stated that he is sure that Mr. Therrion would conform to ODOT regulations and that it is also utilized so that the message changes in a certain period and it does not flash or scroll. Obviously, being on a two lane road they don't want to distract drivers. Mr. Therrion said the set back is actually further back. Mr. Harrison said it is set back 36 feet from the roadway. Chairman Kapitan said that LED is allowed in the City and he cannot quote the rule, Mrs. Vozar can if necessary, but, as Mr. Harrison just stated, there cannot be flashing, scrolling, letters flying in and out, especially on 82. The message can change but it is a complete sudden change and then it is still. He asked Mr. Castrovillari if his problem is toward the background. Mr. Castrovillari said the banding of the LED sign is one thing but this has the potential of being a 3 by almost 7 foot whatever it wants to be. Not to bring up other signs, but there is a sign for a photographer in the City who said what they would not do but, once the sign was up, there is flashing, there's advertising and other things which they said would not be done and that is just a band. Mr. Harrison said he believes that the intent on this sign is no different than the Church of the Redeemer and how their sign is utilized. Mr. Therrion said that is where they got the idea. Chairman Kapitan said he believes that anytime he has gone past, it has a black background, he doesn't remember seeing a photo. Mr. Therrion said there is a photo and it could be different than this one, but their real goal for the sign is, since they expanding their product line, they want to advertise more to the public so that they can add on and hire more people. Their intent is not to blind anyone or anything

like that. Chairman Kapitan asked Mrs. Vozar what percentage of the sign can be changeable. Mrs. Vozar stated 25% and the Board may want to keep in mind that under 1284.05 Design Standards, the items displayed are limited to 10. This exceeds 10. Chairman Kapitan said, yes, if you go by the message on the application. Mrs. Vozar said that is what is being submitted. Mr. Castrovillari said yes, that's the potential of the sign. Mrs. Tworzydlo agreed. Chairman Kapitan said, looking at Rito's comments, it doesn't look like he even looked at the fact that it exceeds 25%. Mrs. Tworzydlo asked how many lines does this have. Mr. Harrison said you can have six lines of copy. Chairman Kapitan advised the applicant that the Board is referring to a City Ordinance which limits the amount of changeable area of a sign to 25% of the entire sign. Even though the Building Commissioner did not make reference to it in his notes, he's concerned that it appears that the changeable copy is more than 25% just by looking at it. Mr. Therrion asked what is meant by 25%. Mrs. Vozar offered to read the ordinance. No 1284.05 Design Standards, Section (k), Changeable Copy: "Signs displaying electronically changeable copy shall be permitted. 'Electronic changeable copy signs' are defined to include but are not limited to animated LED, scrolling, holographic or projected words, symbols or images. Manual changeable copy signs shall be limited in size to not more than 25% of the area of a permitted pylon or ground sign." Mr. Castrovillari pointed to the changeable portion of the sign and said it is limited to 25% of the entire sign. Mr. Therrion said he understood but wanted to know how the Royal Redeemer sign was permitted as it is definitely not 25%. Mr. Castrovillari said one sign came in 25 years ago. Mr. Therrion said no, the Royal Redeemer sign was put up within the last year. Mr. Castrovillari said he never saw it. Mrs. Watkins stated she doesn't think it has six lines. She recalls it being a lot smaller than this sign and the message is one sentence. Chairman Kapitan stated, if it is a new sign, they have to comply with the same regulation and if they are not complying with it then that is an issue of not being in compliance. Mr. Castrovillari said that is something to look into. Mrs. Watkins said they definitely don't put this much type on it. Mr. Castrovillari said this sign is much smaller than theirs as far as height. He went on to say he doesn't want to talk about someone else's sign. The issue is that the Code says 25% and this is well over 25%. Mr. Harrison said this sign face is 20.39 square feet. The total sign face is 76 square feet so 25% is 19 square feet. They have no problem with taking it down 1.39 square feet. Mr. Castrovillari asked Mrs. Vozar if the 25% is of the entire sign. Mrs. Vozar stated that the Building Commissioner stated that the sign, as submitted, exceeds the allowable amount. He indicated that he spoke with Mr. Harrison. Mr. Harrison agreed that they will reduce it to 7 feet. She then asked him if the figures he quoted were based on the original size or the reduced size. He said the original submission. Mrs. Vozar said okay, then that still must be reduced for the new size. She went on to say that the Board should be aware that there is a limit to the amount of items that can be included on the sign. Since

they already have five items on the first part of the sign, they only have five items in the sign itself. If there is going to be a photo there, those could be construed to be items so if you have a photograph and the words in front of it, theoretically you could argue that the items behind the words should be included. For all these issues, she recommends that this application go back to the Building Commissioner. She doesn't believe, when he looked at the sign, he did not understand it was a changeable copy sign. Chairman Kapitan said he agrees, if he did he would have referred to it in his notes. He then asked Mrs. Vozar to give the applicants the ten items of information. Mr. Harrison stated that, if they take the sign down to 7 feet, everything would be reduced. They have no problem with complying with the changeable copy area being 25% of the total sign face area. The owner is here and has indicated that it is not his intent to have scrolling, flashing, anything hazardous or distracting in any way. They have already agreed to reduce the sign to 7 foot. Mr. Harrison asked the Board not to let the image put in their mind that this is what the sign is. Any electronic message center has that capability. Mr. Castrovillari said that it is the potential of the sign and that is what he's faced with. That's why he doesn't like it. Mrs. Vozar asked the applicant if there is any way to technically alter the sign so it would only be able to list five items. Mr. Harrison yes, he has total discretion. Mrs. Vozar said no she meant can the sign be created so that it cannot exceed the limit so it does not have to be policed. Policing signs takes time and manpower for the City. When a sign is submitted with ten items, it has ten items when it's approved and it's done. This requires more involvement with policing when it has the ability to be changed on a daily basis or minute by minute. So that is why she asked if it could be built to limit the items. Mrs. Tworzydlo asked Mrs. Vozar if, the sign has five permanent items, they only have five more items, right. They might want to consider to taking out "transportation equipment provider" and put it in the scroll. Chairman Kapitan said it would give them more flexibility. Mrs. Tworzydlo said then they don't need the whole six lines, they only need one or two. Mrs. Watkins said, but the potential to use six lines is there. Mrs. Tworzydlo said they can't, they can only use ten items. Mrs. Watkins said it's changeable script - they can put whatever they want in there. Mr. Harrison said, when they reduce the changeable copy amount to 25% the amount of lines of copy is also reduced. Chairman Kapitan asked Mr. Harrison, if they reduced it down to five or four rows, because the number of items is limited, does that give the ability to do less lines, bigger lettering. Mr. Harrison replied yes. Mrs. Watkins asked Mr. Harrison if they have any other signs in the area already existing. Mr. Harrison said Church of the Redeemer. Mrs. Watkins asked if they put that one up. He said no but they bid on it and it was spec'd out to do the same thing. He couldn't recall any in North Royalton. Mrs. Watkins said it doesn't have to be North Royalton, she would just like to see one since she's not familiar with the signs. He said Bryant & Stratton

on Snow Road, however, this sign is no different than the Church of the Redeemer. Chairman Kapitan stated that it is his inclination to table the application since they need the Building Commissioner to tell the Board how big the changeable portion can be. It will also give them a chance to discuss whether or not they want to delete the three words from the permanent signage and give themselves more flexibility within the message center. Mr. Therrion asked what the limit is for the message center. Chairman Kapitan said you're allowed 10 items of information on the total sign. If you take "transportation equipment provider" off permanent lettering, you have three more items available for the message center. Mrs. Watkins asked Mr. Harrison if you can remove the picture on the background and make it black. Mr. Harrison said yes. She asked if it would be permanent. He said no, it's programable. Mrs. Watkins said she thinks the application should be tabled. Chairman Kapitan said he thinks that other signs that may have come before the Board may have had the capability but have always had a black background. Mr. Harrison said 25% of the reduced size would be 16.6 square feet. Chairman Kapitan said that has to be determined by the Building Commissioner. Mr. Harrison said to be clear the Building Commissioner has to tell the Board what the size of the changeable area has to be. Chairman Kapitan said, yes, he has to tell the Board the limits of the changeable area. Mr. Harrison said it's 16.6 square feet. Mr. Castrovillari said they are currently submitting a different sign. Mr. Harrison asked if the Board could make their approval contingent that the changeable copy be 25% of the reduced sign. Mr. Castrovillari said either it is tabled or he says no. He'd rather table it for review by Rito than do anything on contingency. Chairman Kapitan said he understands that they want to move forward but it appears to him that something was missed in Rito's review and they want him to take another look at it. Also, if they decide they want to remove the three permanent words, they may want to submit a revised application. Mr. Therrion he wants to make sure that the sign down the road from them doesn't have more than ten items. Chairman Kapitan said if a sign comes before the Board and is approved for a certain number of items and they go ahead and put more on the sign, it becomes an enforcement issue with other City agencies. The ARB only handles the initial design. Mr. Castrovillari said no one on the Board remembers seeing that sign at all and if you're saying it's only a year old, that becomes another issue. Mrs. Vozar stated that it may have come before the Board and she will check with the Building Commissioner. When signs are submitted and the Building Commissioner indicates that the sign is in compliance, and it appears that way to the Board, there would be no reason for this Board to question that. For example, if the Building Commissioner, in this case, assumed this was not a changeable copy sign, it may have happened before and that's how another sign may have gotten through the system. She reiterated that she will have a conversation tomorrow with the Building Commissioner. The problem the Board has is that they rely on comments from the Building Commissioner and he did not

comment on the changeable copy. Chairman Kapitan said, tabling the application, also give the applicant time to put in a revised application if they want to. He then moved to table the application, Mrs. Watkins second. Roll called. Motion carried 3/0.

4. Miscellaneous:

Chairman Kapitan moved to open nominations for the position of chairperson. He then nominated Frank Castrovillari and asked for a second, Mrs. Tworzydlo second. Roll called. Motion carried 3/0.

Chairman Kapitan also advised the Board that he would not be present at the next meeting as he would be in Chicago.

5. Adjournment.

Chairman Kapitan moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Castrovillari second. Meeting adjourned.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman - Architectural Review Board

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary - Architectural Review Board

Date: \_\_\_\_\_