

BUILDING & BUILDING CODES COMMITTEE
MINUTES
September 19, 2005

The Building & Building Codes Committee meeting was held on September 19, 2005, at North Royalton City Hall, 13834 Ridge Road. The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

Present: Chair Vincent Gentile, Robin Zaccardelli, Lisa Uffman-Kirsch; Council President Robert Stefanik, Denise Bobulsky, Tom Koch, Building Inspector Joe Hartman, Tony Sandora.

Moved by Mrs. Uffman-Kirsch, seconded by Ms. Zaccardelli to approve the minutes of July 18, 2005.
3 yeas/0 nays. Motion carried.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Low impact development (LID)

Discussed with item 2 below.

2. Proposed changes to Zoning Codes Village concept for R1A per RRZ

The previously distributed information was discussed as well as how the committee wanted to handle working toward a final product.

Discussion occurred regarding the following: proceeding with parts of the code or the entire code; to allow PUD as a separate option, to remove PUD entirely, to allow a blend or to allow a drastically revised PUD option that could incorporate what the PUD is supposed to be, i.e. mixing residential with other types of uses; keep the option of the PUD and fix what is wrong; incorporate the conservation development aspect of Rural Residential Village into the PUD.

The original intent before the PUD came up was to have the village conservation concept be available as an option in R1-A. Shops in the small PUD developments may not survive and the newly designated town center will need to draw from the whole community to support that; allowing pockets of clusters or village style concept in a development within R1-A was also discussed; allowing the developers to determine what would best suit the development of the land according to permitted use density set by the city. Types of uses allowed in a PUD could be defined so they would fit into the area of concern in order to control trucks in the neighbors.

The committee decided to look at what another community with a town center has in their code regarding the PUD and cluster development. The committee wants to look at the codes of Hudson.

It was recommended to add the topic of PUD Chapter 1280 revisions as an item of discussion to the next agenda.

3. Chapter 1282 Off-Street Parking and Loading

It was discussed that it is still desired to hear from the Building Department whether or not the comments of Carol Thaler in the memo of November 17, 2003, have been reviewed regarding our off street parking as well as the set of changes proposed by Mr. Arrendale. Legislation was pulled from Ghanna, Hudson and Dublin, and some parts were found to be desirable. It was said that there seems to be a large volume of information and how might it best be pulled together.

Mr. Gentile said that the legislation from Portland, Oregon might provide better answers to our needs with regard to issues of flooding and could be the one we would use for our model instead of looking at all the others.

It was mentioned that many parking standards might apply as opposed to just one standard depending on the area being developed.

The committee should determine what is desired and then present it to the Building Department for their input. It was recommended that this be done in a workshop setting. Some things desired to be incorporated were discussed such as: minimum parking angles, interior landscaping, surface materials and drainage, and snow removal.

The areas to be covered will be listed in an agenda for a workshop so that members may be prepared to discuss the topics for each workshop session.

4. **Licensing Requirements**

Mr. O'Donnell previously supplied an opinion. This will be discussed at the next meeting. Input is desired from the Building Commissioner.

5. **Proposed amendments to Chapter 1440 Department of Buildings**

No action.

6. **Clean Ohio Fund/Cuyahoga County Green Space Plan for North Royalton**

Mr. Gentile said that he read an article in the *Sun News* that Mrs. Uffman-Kirsch and Mrs. Bobulsky are working on this. Mrs. Uffman-Kirsch said that the NR Greenway Committee has been meeting since March and the Cuyahoga County Green Space Plan is one of the document sources being used in mapping the actual proposed parks and trails. This committee is a citizens group and not an official group of the city initiated by Mrs. Uffman-Kirsch with an article in the *Royalton Recorder* and the *Sun Star* asking for volunteers. It is not a city sanctioned committee.

Committee members asked questions regarding the progress of the citizens group and the involvement of Mrs. Uffman-Kirsch and Mrs. Bobulsky with the group. It was asked if there is any information ready for presentation and it was said that the group has no information to present at this time.

It was said that we should be working closer with the county and their experts who have devised a plan and map. The county is having someone starting next year to work closely with our city so they can get some of the ideas that appear in their maps moving forward.

The citizens committee was initiated after the park land legislation was defeated by Council that was trying to create a funding mechanism for park land acquisition and preservation. At the point it was defeated by the majority of Council it was said that a plan should be created and will be considered.

It was said that our city has not responded for the first three rounds of the program. This is probably the fourth and final round. It was thought that the residents committee should be working closely with Council so we can be on the same page when applying for the fourth round.

Mrs. Uffman-Kirsch reported that the citizens committee is taking what is known specifically, for example our wetland areas, and residents they know that are interested in having their property saved in perpetuity after they pass away. They are putting all of our existing parks on there. They are putting our FEMA mitigation on it. They are mapping all that now. What they were going to do next was to be able to bring in and see where the county green space plan overlaps and pull on the resources within the committee along with the Parma West Creek Preservation group, who has already done the trails and to have them help with the interconnectivity of the parks. The citizens committee is using the big zoning maps and they are just coloring them right now. They are trying to find a program that works with AutoCAD to be able to put it in a digital file.

It was asked that the citizens committee pool all the resources into this committee in order that something can be accomplished.

Mr. Stefanik asked for Mrs. Uffman-Kirsch to bring the citizens committee to the next Building & Building Codes Committee meeting.

Mrs. Uffman-Kirsch said they made a presentation to the Recreation Board and it was on their agenda. They are going to the Recreation Board next because that is where park land went through.

The intent was that the citizens committee would come to the Recreation Board with the proposed map and the plan and discuss it with them. The reason they were on the agenda last month was to let them know about the existence of the committee and what they have been doing and how they plan on going through this. Then the plan was to get the opinions, feedback and recommendation of the Recreation Board and bring it to Council. The plan of the citizens committee is to go through the Recreation Board

because it is a recreational package. Then it is going to come to Council and Council will all work on it together.

It was said we will not be able to follow that timeline. There will be a work shop as last year and everything will have to be in by March to the Clean Ohio Fund.

The county should be involved right from the beginning. Starting in January the county will have a full time person on board that will do nothing but implement this plan. Carol Thaler will be coming to the Building & Building Codes Committee meeting next month to do is explain the process as to how it will play out and the possible funding opportunities.

Mrs. Uffman-Kirsch said it is too premature for that because they are trying to get all the blocks down and then they are going to try to look at the interconnectivity of them. They are trying to utilize the Green Space Plan also for those blocks. The blocks may change depending on the interconnectivity factor. So it is a work in progress and it is not something that is saying this is where they are right now. They are mapping everything through the Green Space Plan, the steep slopes, the riparian areas, the existing parks, the existing ball fields, the downtown district and then seeing if a pattern emerges to look at interconnectivity over time. They are not on the interconnectivity yet. There is no product yet, it is a work in progress and it may change. The goal was to have it ready for September, but it is not going to work due to the computer problems. She does not know when it will be ready.

7. Plan review fees and administrative costs.

No action.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Proposed Ordinances 05-81, 05-82, 05-83, and 05-84 temporary banners/pennants

Mrs. Uffman-Kirsch reported that Planning Commission recommended defeat. There were two major items that she perceived were confusing on Planning Commission. First it was thought that this legislation was allowing banners that we did not allow before. That is not true, as Section 1284.18 already allows banners. The second thing mentioned by Mr. Arrendale and some Planning Commission members was that the new legislation doubled the allowable area for signage. That is also not true. The existing code for banners and pennants in Local and General Business District doubles the allowable area. It states currently without any amendments that the temporary signage can equal the maximum area of permanent signs permitted. All this legislation tried to do was to add the allowance of temporary ground signs whereas previously they had to be on the inside of windows and doors and on the exterior surfaces of buildings only. It was extending the time that they were able to be up from 30 days to 120 days to allow for seasonal use and adding the word seasonal.

From the Planning Commission meeting and from a conversation subsequently with Mr. Hartman, Mrs. Uffman-Kirsch suggested changing the line that says "The gross sign face area of all banners may not exceed," by adding "20% of the maximum area of permanent signs permitted for each establishment." That would reduce the actual number of temporary signs allowable. She said another comment made by Mr. Hartman was if we are going to allow temporary ground signs he wants to make sure that the sign is attached to anchored stationary poles or stakes. This can be added to "it could be on the inside of windows and doors, exterior surfaces or as a temporary ground sign on the property of the business provided that such ground sign meets placement requirements in accordance with appropriate section and the sign is attached to anchored stationery poles or stakes." Those are the two amendments Mrs. Uffman-Kirsch is proposing.

Mr. Hartman was asked if the Planning Commission would approve this legislation with these amendments. Mr. Hartman felt that they would be willing to entertain it. Additional comment was that they did not want North Royalton to look like a big flea market when people were driving through.

Mr. Sandora said that is exactly the reason Planning Commission recommended defeat. The city has done a lot of work to get rid of a lot of signs that have been an eyesore in the city. They have taken down poles and lowered them to the ground. We would be moving back in time to make it a carnival atmosphere. If a company has a good company and they have signs on the building and signs on their poles out by the

street, why do we need banners on the street flying around? Also if you want to have banners, and for example with Giant Eagle where 200-300 square feet of signage is allowed, it should not even be 5% for a banner in an area like that. They could have a banner 3 feet by 50 feet long and banners could be on every corner. What reason would it be to take away the 30 days and allow it for 120 days? If it is a sale would that be for 120 days? The banners permitted now in our codes should be changed.

Mr. Gentile asked if it was worth sending it back to Planning Commission with the proposed amendments.

Mr. Willey said that it seems that our sign laws for new businesses coming to our city trying to attract new customers or a company struggling trying to have a sale trying to attract customers are anti-business. They are trying to make a living and it is a form of advertising to attract customers. The 120 days is collectively. He feels it gives the businesses an opportunity. He does not think Route 82 will be loaded with all these banners.

Mr. Sandora said he is not against business. He thinks that once the banners begin that many will have them flying on the roadway.

Discussion continued that we look at other cities for the look that we want to have. Cities such as Hudson or Westlake have restrictive signs.

Mrs. Uffman-Kirsch would like to send it on to Planning Commission and give them the opportunity to amend it or vote on it. Mr. Gentile said if it comes back from the Planning Commission with a defeat he does not think that there will be enough votes on Council to override it.

Mrs. Uffman-Kirsch moved to recommend approval of the amendments as read by her earlier, seconded by Ms. Zaccardelli. 1 yea (Uffman-Kirsch)/2 nays(Gentile, Zaccardelli). Motion defeated.

2. Building permits available online

Mr. Gentile said that he had calls from residents regarding accessing simple building permits. They do not get home until after the Building Department closes. Some communities offer simple permits available online that can be filled out and sent in with a check. Permits that might be online could be the no fee permits, such as hot water tank replacement and roof replacement. Mr. Hartman said that the Building Commissioner should make the decision with regard to this.

3. Chapter 1426.04 proposed amendment

The Building Commissioner recommended the amendment be made bringing our code in line with the Ohio Residential Code as opposed to the International Code which is stricter.

Mrs. Uffman-Kirsch moved to approve the amendment, seconded by Ms. Zaccardelli. 3 yeas/0 nays. Motion carried.

Mr. Gentile moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Zaccardelli. 3 yeas/0 nays. Motion carried. 3 yeas/0 nays. Meeting adjourned at 9:18 p.m.