

STRONGSVILLE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES OF MEETING

March 19, 2019

The Architectural Review Board of the City of Strongsville met for Caucus in the Mayors Conference Room at the 16099 Foltz Parkway, on ***Tuesday, March 19, 2019 at 8:30 a.m.***

Present: Architectural Review Board Members: Dale Serne, ARB Chairman, Ken Mikula, City Engineer, Tony Biondillo, Building Commissioner, George Smerigan, City Planner and Jennifer Milbrandt, City Forester.

The following was discussed:

Royalton Collection-Master Sign Program: The Board was in agreement that there needed to be some revisions to this submission which would be discussed with the applicant and that the Office building needed to be a part of the program.

Royalton Collection – Ground Sign:

Outback Steakhouse:

Roll Call:	Members Present:	Mr. Serne, Chairman Mr. Biondillo Bldg. Comm. Mr. Mikula, City Engineer Mrs. Milbrandt, City Forrester Mr. Smerigan, City Planner
	Also Present:	Carol Brill, Admin. Asst.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Serne– You have had a chance to review the minutes of March 5, 2019. If there are no additions or corrections they will stand as submitted.

NEW APPLICATIONS

ROYALTON COLLECTION/Greg Soltis, Agent

Recommendation of the Master Sign Program for The Royalton Collection as outlined in their Sign Program dated and received by the City on March 1, 2019. Property located at 17800 Royalton Road, PPN 395-12-033, 034 and 035 zoned General Business, Restaurant Recreational and Office Building.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
April 19, 2019
Page 2

Mr. Serne— Item Number One, Royalton Collection Master Sign Program. Please state your name and address for the record.

Mr. Parrish – David Parrish

Ms. Gray – Crystal Gray

Mr. Serne— Please explain to the Board what you plan to do.

Mr. Parrish – We are here for two things, one is the monument sign at the Royalton Collection which we submitted our material samples to you. A couple of exhibits today, you have seen before. The sign's location is at the entrance. We are proposing a two sided monument sign, so you can see it east and west bound on Royalton Road.

Mr. Serne – I think that the important thing about this is that it is part of the Master Sign Program.

Mr. Smerigan – The way things are going to work. We are going to establish with you the Master Sign Program for the entire development. That will be what the rules are for this entire project. Permits for signs will be based on that. Otherwise we are looking at having to do literally dozens and dozens of variances and we are not going to go there. So the Code provides that we can establish a Master Sign Program for the entire center that this Board makes a recommendation and Planning Commission can adopt it and then that becomes the rules for this center. Frankly, we are not going to approve any signs until we approve the Master Sign Program so that we have the basis for which the signs are going to conform. So, we need to spend a little bit of time with you today on the Master Sign Program to get that squared away so that at least we all have a playing field for what signage you can have and how that signage is designed. We are willing to be flexible in setting that up to have it make sense for the center but that is the whole idea, that it makes sense for the center as opposed to just taking the standard signage that we do for some free standing Starbucks or something.

Mr. Parrish – We think it is a great idea and we are happy to try to put that together.

Mr. Biondillo – We think you guys did a great job in putting it together, very comprehensive and well thought out defined program and I think it is going to work well but as George said there are a few things that we need to tweak in this and we need to consider moving forward, get it established and approved and it will make our lives easier moving forward.

Mr. Smerigan – As I interpret what we have here in terms of wall signage, the way I am reading this, and I want to make sure we are all on the same page is that the tenants are

Architectural Review Board Minutes
April 19, 2019
Page 3

going to be permitted one wall sign for whatever frontage they have on a primary parking field. So, using this drawing you would be authorizing frontage along this wall and this wall and this wall and this wall and this wall because they all face parking fields. Is that the way you were interpreting it?

Mr. Parrish – Yes, I would say this wall to a much lesser extent because customers, this is the back and I would think this would be much more powerful.

Mr. Smerigan – If these guys are smart they will designate this employee parking.

Mr. Parrish – So I would say not so much this, not to say that a tenant wouldn't want something there. Since he is the big guy I would suggest that we at least consider it. But I would say that they are going to put their money here.

Mr. Smerigan – Based on this there is no signage on this wall.

Mr. Parrish – No.

Mr. Smerigan – I am assuming that you could claim signage here because you have a parking field here. By your draft there is no signage here.

Mr. Parrish – Correct.

Mr. Smerigan – On the east side of this building 4.

Mr. Parrish – I see where you are going, we need to write in here where signage is not permitted. We have been sort of looking at it on a positive side and not on the other side too.

Mr. Smerigan – I just want us all to be under the same understanding.

Mr. Parrish – It is because we are not the tenant, we don't know what the tenant is going to want.

Mr. Smerigan – And I understand that. As long as it is clear for them when they come in then we shouldn't have an issue. I just want to get clear that we are all in agreement about where in fact signage can be mounted, wall signage.

Mr. Biondillo – It is prohibited on Building 4 is essential because that is right up against the residential.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
April 19, 2019
Page 4

Mr. Smerigan – So the east wall of Building 4, which you have as prohibited and I am okay with. I think we need to clarify what is on the west wall of Buildings 2 and 3.

Mr. Biondillo – I didn't see anything that would be allowed on Buildings 2 and 3 to the west because they are not facing Royalton.

Mr. Smerigan – I think that you probably should clarify that.

Mr. Parrish – So you would like me to put in the Master Sign Program.

Mr. Smerigan – I think it would make it clear so that we are not arguing with somebody later. Okay?

Mr. Parrish – Okay.

Mr. Smerigan – You don't address the east wall of the, it's Outback, and I am okay because there is a commercial operation right next to it. You have the east wall but that is because the residents are right there, that is why that is prohibited.

Mr. Parrish – I can't imagine why they would want to put a sign on that side.

Mr. Smerigan – Because you have all the traffic coming from the freeway in this direction.

Mr. Biondillo – And its visible and as we get further into this, they are not going to be allowed a separate ground sign for that, so they may want that.

Mr. Parrish – That makes sense.

Mr. Smerigan – One of the things that you don't address in here, you came today for a permit for the ground sign but monuments signs aren't identified at all in here and we need to identify the monument sign because that is the basis, we would have to issue the permit. Our position is, for this entire development there will be only one monument sign out at Royalton.

Mr. Parrish – I guess the reason why we didn't do that is that we thought we were coming in to get that approved before we did this.

Mr. Smerigan – Before that can get approved it has to be in this. So, the monument sign needs to be identified in the Master Sign Program and you can write it around what you are proposing, we all agree on that if we get to that point, again we also want it clear that there will only be the one sign on Royalton. Now, I don't have a problem if the office

Architectural Review Board Minutes
April 19, 2019
Page 5

building wants a ground sign back here but I don't see anything else on Royalton. If they want to be out front then they have to be on that same side. The office building is part of this whole development by our Code.

Mr. Parrish – I have never talked to them.

Mr. Smerigan – I understand but what you are proposing in terms of wall signage could impact them too. We need to get that addressed.

Mr. Biondillo – I think we need to address it within the Master Sign Program and Foundation will have to follow along with that Master Sign Program. Make it clear that there is only two monument signs allowed, one at the Royalton Road and the one back here somewhere.

Mr. Smerigan – As opposed to on their building, I am okay with that but it would only be back here on the site.

Mr. Biondillo – George I think we need to identify that those are the only two ground monument signs in the development so that none of these others want to have one.

Mr. Smerigan – What you don't address and what we would be willing to consider is some on-site directional signage. I don't know if you need it but if you do that is something we should write in here.

Mr. Serne – Make it a part of the Master Sign Program.

Mr. Smerigan – Make it part of the Master Sign Program.

Mr. Parrish – In a larger development I would think directionals would be appropriate, I didn't think this was necessary.

Mr. Smerigan – I think it is hard to get lost here.

Mr. Biondillo – Well do we want to prohibit that within the Program because right now you identify that it is permitted.

Mr. Smerigan – Just say no other free standing signs other than those two monuments signs, there are no other free standing signs. Then that solves that problem.

Mr. Biondillo – George before we, after we get off the directional, I think we should identify, since addressed the monument sign for Foundation, we should address the wall signage

Architectural Review Board Minutes
April 19, 2019
Page 6

for Foundation as well. You limit your wall signs to a letter height which we again need to amend, to 6' for an anchor tenant and 48" for smaller. Six foot may not be scaled appropriately for this building, if they wanted to put wall signage up along their upper façade, since they set back so far. So you may want to look at scaling something and have a separate wall provision for that tenant.

Mr. Smerigan – They need to get a separate wall sign.

Mr. Parrish – The lead tenant will want to put their name on a wall, you want us to regulate that in this document.

Mr. Biondillo – It is all part of this development.

Mr. Smerigan – Everything needs to get regulated into one document. You'll probably need to get together with the folks at Foundation Software and figure out what they want. They may not want anything. Whatever they are going to get is going to be in this same document.

Mr. Biondillo – Our thought was, being a major anchor tenant, they are going to want exposure on Royalton Road but if they have a larger wall identification and a monument, once you get within the development that may satisfy them wanting to push for an additional monument sign out at Royalton.

Mr. Parrish – In lieu of.

Mr. Biondillo – They are going to be at least 20 feet over the top of the roof tops of these other buildings out front so exposure and identity shouldn't be an issue. Especially if they have their name and a logo on their façade.

Mr. Parrish – Would it be permitted to have two monuments on Royalton in lieu of just one?

Mr. Biondillo – That is what we are saying.

Mr. Smerigan – That is what we don't want.

Mr. Parrish – They are going to ask me or somebody is going to ask me at some point.

Mr. Smerigan – Particularly if we are going to go, I have no problem going to a larger sign because this is a major development but if we are going to do that I see a single sign. This is a very congested traffic area.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
April 19, 2019
Page 7

Mr. Biondillo – Based on what was submitted my assumption was that the developer wanted a separate identity for their Royalton Collection, excluding Foundation Software, otherwise you can incorporate it in there but I know that Home Goods is the major anchor.

Mr. Parrish – It will get lost. Once you put too much signage it just gets lost.

Mr. Smerigan – I didn't personally have any issues with what you did in terms of the blade signage or the standards that you had for the wall signage other than the fact that you talk about letter height and I think you really need to talk about sign height rather than just letter height.

Mr. Biondillo – Section 3.1.

Mr. Smerigan – If somebody has a logo or something we are not regulating it at all.

Mr. Biondillo – Your wall signs within the framework of the sign program, you limit the overall square footage of all signage, to include wall signs, canopy signs, blade signs etc. to 2 square feet of the store front width. Then you further break it down into your maximum allowable height of the individual signs but like George said, we should limit it to the wall height and the letter height fall within that framework and then I think it will be proportional to the building facades.

Mr. Parrish – Our biggest concern was to make sure of a level of quality. So many signs went up looking cheap and that is not what we wanted. Quality was number one.

Mr. Smerigan – We are very happy with what you did.

Mr. Biondillo – One more thing, under prohibited signs, I think you should also identify those sandwich board temporary sidewalk signs as being prohibited. I think that you provide them enough signage in their glass area, their name plates, their canopies.

Mr. Parrish – You mean instead of something sitting outside the door like a chalkboard that says today is swiss.

Mr. Smerigan – Once you start it you are going to have everybody trying to compete and it is just going to get cluttered. I think we are better off, we are being generous enough about the signage that they can identify themselves well without having the temporary stuff out front.

Mr. Biondillo – Either that or identify a permanent type of sign in the entrance area that you may be able to put your menu in there or something but not a cheap sign, it's going

Architectural Review Board Minutes
April 19, 2019
Page 8

to be a nice development, you don't want to cheapen it. Some people put an actual fixed cabinet on the wall where there is glass and you open it up and put today's specials or a menu in there, that looks classy as opposed to any type of temporary sign.

Mr. Parrish – Got it.

Mr. Smerigan – I didn't have issues with the sizes of your signs or square footage of signs you are authorizing. I wanted to get straight about what we were doing in terms of locations, what walls were permitted, what were not and wanted to get straight about the free standing monument sign. You need to talk to Foundation because their signage is going to get tied into this.

Mr. Parrish – Have they come forward for permits?

Mr. Biondillo – Just on the interior renovations. They have started that. Under the mural section, I know we have, there are almost individually treated and its scale should be appropriate for the building etc. and that these have to receive, all of the signage has to receive landlord approval. Do we want to address any size limitations on a mural because that gets skewed? You have Dunkin Donuts with their coffee cup with steam coming out of it or Outback with their Australian map.

Mr. Parrish – The intent of this was pretty much dead wall on centers. You have a big blank brick wall and it is ugly and just sits there. And you do something that is interesting to look at, like a mural. We've done this successfully on some of our other projects where we engage the community artists to have a competition to come in. You are talking about size, we were thinking that you could do a mural on a whole blank side wall if the tenant would be amenable to that. We just put that in there as an option. Don't know how you guys felt about that. That is the intent, it is important to understand the intent.

Mr. Biondillo – I didn't know if you did it to address Outback's mural of their as part of this. I guess we assumed that is why it was in there as well, it would address individual tenants that want their identity or logo in mural form. Technically it won't be, it is, you are allowed to have murals but then you are still going to have to come back here for the approval.

Mr. Smerigan – In fact, in your approval process in 4.1, you've got those 3 bullet points that talk about the landlord having to approve. At the end where it talks about, it refers back to the Code, that won't be the way it works. What will happen is they'll come to this Board for approval, you it would come to the ARB for approval based upon compliance with the Master Sign Program and once we approve it the Building Department will issue permits. This set of regulations they'll have to comply with but each sign will come to us for a review to determine compliance with the approved Master Sign Program.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
April 19, 2019
Page 9

Mr. Parrish – Obviously a mural would absolutely be in that. If they came with a volcano erupting, we don't think that is the right kind of thing.

Mr. Smerigan – So what will happen is, people will have to comply with this, that is how we are going to review things. If something doesn't meet these requirements you would need to amend the Master Sign Program for the entire development in order to get it, there is no way to get a variance. What happens is this becomes the rule for the center.

Mr. Parrish – How amenable would you be to that if that ever came to pass?

Mr. Smerigan – I can say this, if we set it, I don't see us in the next 12 months wanting to do changes to it. We are taking the time now to get it right.

Mr. Parrish – Everybody is going to be coming in and the center is going to be filled up.

Mr. Smerigan – We have a similar thing with Mall where we did a Master Sign Program there and over time, because things change, we have made some amendments to that. But we don't take those lightly because you are changing the standard. You've obviously put a lot of thought into this and I just want to make it clear that this will be essentially the guiding document for the site for some period of time.

Mr. Biondillo – I don't really see a need for a whole lot of changes because we are pretty liberal we're giving them the freedom of color and logo and font. We haven't addressed any of those things within this, basically numbers and area and size and location. You are right, it's a pretty liberal sign program. That is what we found over the years, once you start limiting that people don't want that because it's not their identity that is not the face or their franchise.

Mr. Smerigan – I have been involved with things where they try to set the colors and all that stuff and it doesn't work. We are going to be more flexible than that but then once we set the standards, I think it would take something significant to move away from. Just so you understand.

Mr. Biondillo – I forgot, on the monument sign along Royalton Road that has to be a minimum of 10 feet from the right-of-way and 25 feet from the property boundary. You have a property boundary along the entry area here.

Mr. Parrish – It is important to know which bench mark are we talking about cause there are a lot of bench marks here.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
April 19, 2019
Page 10

Mr. Biondillo – This inner property boundary. It would be 10 feet from the right-of-way off Royalton Road and then 25 feet from this boundary on the west side of the entry area.

Mr. Smerigan – Unless we set a different standard in there. We can set a different standard for that. That is what the current code says.

Mr. Parrish – When you are driving along and you are looking for whatever you are looking for, normally the curb cut for that entity is where that sign is. If you make that sign too far away, to me that gets confusing.

Mr. Biondillo – Per scale that entry is what, 100 feet wide.

Mr. Mikula – The reason is for sight distance.

Mr. Serne – You are not blocking the cars pulling in and out.

Mr. Biondillo – Typically if it were a corner lot you have a 35 foot triangular area that nothing can be located within. Something should identify it within your Master Sign Program to tie it to the site plan somehow.

Mr. Smerigan – To identify your location. That way we are not defaulting back to some other standard. Clearly you are going to need to make some modifications to this and get it back in to us.

Mr. Parrish – Absolutely

Mr. Serne – It will be a good living document that will suffice for all. Anything else George?

Mr. Smerigan – I don't think so, I think we covered all the points that we had that we had discussed. I assume what we will do is just leave this on the table until you get us revision and we will go from there.

Mr. Parrish – We will have this revised for the next meeting. Give us a couple of weeks to incorporate this. How do you want this to be revised? We have this date on here so should we put a new date on here?

Mr. Serne – A whole new document.

Mr. Smerigan – That way we don't get it all confused.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
April 19, 2019
Page 11

Mr. Biondillo – I think you should amend these to the changes that we suggested, like your wall sign height rather be identified as a sign height instead of letter height, with your monument sign. I would like to get more into your monument sign too.

Mr. Smerigan – Now that we have settled this I think we can talk about your monument sign. We just want you to understand that until we get this adopted, again we are making a recommendation to Planning Commission and they have to adopt it but once Planning adopts that then everything will be through this Board and we just have to review that signs based on these standards. These will essentially become your Code.

ROYALTON COLLECTION/ Crystal Gray, Agent

Recommendation of a 6' x 24' internally illuminated ground sign having wood look veneer and brushed stainless steel, 9 tenant panels and "Royalton" in Aquarium and "Collection" in white for property located at 17800 Royalton Road, PPN 395-12-033 zoned General Business.

Mr. Serne– Item Number Two, Royalton Collection. Ms. Gray and Mr. Parrish remain at the microphone.

Mr. Serne– Please explain to the Board what you plan to do.

Mr. Parrish – We wanted to name the center so the sign had basically two parts. The name of the center, there is a primary tenant and then the owner would like the ability to have each of the tenants to have their sign which creates this collage where each of those would have their ID sort of like Westgate. Westgate's monument just has these smaller elements and they may not all be filled, they will be filled as they get leased and the tenant wants it then you put it on there. The anchor and the junior anchor we know, we call it the primary position and we changed the color so that this would be a wood grain metal which we see here, this would be a metal panel, metal panel, very simple cabinet that could be fabricated by a sign company. The height of it would be, the max height would be 6 feet and the length would be about 34 feet. This projection would be about 2 feet above here. It would be a two sided element. I didn't do a width because we are going to look to the sign company, it would be approximately 2 feet wide, just enough to get equipment to have it operate inside there. The colors are a mixture of these two.

Mr. Smerigan – I don't have any issues with the materials, I don't have any issues with the sign either. This is a big enough development that it makes a statement.

Mr. Biondillo – Is that illuminated with landscape lighting or any of the signs?

Architectural Review Board Minutes
April 19, 2019
Page 12

Mr. Parrish – It will be internally illuminated. That is why I said that the width would vary on the cabinet.

Mr. Biondillo – They have to identify their orientation on the site plan.

Mr. Parrish – Yes, they could have a little better site plan.

Mr. Mikula – How it fits in with that landscaping because I don't know how you see the other side of the sign. The way it is shown here.

Mrs. Milbrandt – Yes, with the trees and the shrubs.

Mr. Smerigan – It is going to be difficult to do this perpendicular to the street because it is so deep.

Mrs. Brill – You said that was 34 feet, because on your application it says it is 24 feet.

Mr. Parrish – I am sorry did I say 34, its 24 feet.

Mr. Smerigan – I just don't know if that is going to be, I don't have a problem with the sign being two sided and being perpendicular to the road but I think your 24 feet deep and you are already set back from the right of way. Remember with the right-of-way you are set back even further from the travel lane. The back edge of that thing is getting pretty far back. Assuming that that is the leading edge, because that is the name of the development, the Home Goods is going to be pretty far back off the road.

Mr. Parrish – There are a lot of other ways that people have done it, triangular signs, curved, arched.

Mr. Smerigan – I don't have a problem with, like I say, I think that the design is clean, I think it is simple and nice.

Mr. Biondillo – I think you need to look at what was approved for a landscape plan for the development and see how it fits with that.

Mr. Smerigan – There are a lot of trees out there.

Mr. Parrish – We will come back and merge the two together that way it will not be a question.

Mr. Serne– Tony normally we request an address, would that be appropriate here?

Architectural Review Board Minutes
April 19, 2019
Page 13

Mr. Smerigan – I don't know how you do that, there are so many addresses.

Mr. Biondillo – The only thing you do is the range of addresses because if you do have a range of addresses that were assigned and I know that safety forces typically want something to identify the range of addresses.

Mr. Parrish – That really gets confusing, you have all kinds of numbers. We could do a panel that popped up or something like that.

Mr. Serne – It just makes it more confusing.

Mr. Smerigan – No matter how you do it there are just too many addresses.

Mr. Biondillo – Which is something that probably that should be identified in the Master Sign Program with window signage or something.

Mr. Serne – What does the mall do?

Mr. Biondillo – That is all 500 Southpark center.

Mr. Smerigan – It is all one address.

Mr. Biondillo – It has addressable alarm system so you know where you are going.

Ms. Brill – Would it be appropriate to do a range underneath the Collection but high enough to still be visible?

Mr. Parrish – Is it for the Fire Department? I get it but it is going to confuse more than it will not confuse.

Ms. Brill – If you did like a lowest number and a dash and then the highest number.

Mr. Biondillo – Yes, that is what I meant by a range. I didn't mean all the individual numbers.

Mr. Smerigan – You could pick the lowest number and the highest number, so and so dash so and so.

Mr. Parrish – If that is a factor we will work that in.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
April 19, 2019
Page 14

Mr. Smerigan – I don't know how big a factor it is, historically we've included the address on signs.

Mr. Parrish – What did you do at the Greens? How was the Greens handled?

Mr. Smerigan – I don't remember.

Ms. Brill – I remember seeing something somewhere that had the lowest and the highest with a dash.

Mr. Smerigan – That might be the way to handle it even if it is small and subtle and you really don't see it, you've complied. I wouldn't be opposed to leaving it off to be honest but I am only one vote.

Mr. Biondillo – I think it is an issue with the Fire Department.

Mrs. Milbrandt - At the Greens, don't they have them above the doors?

Mr. Biondillo – Yes that is what I said, that should be incorporated in the Master Sign Program that each tenant has to identify their address.

Mr. Smerigan – I don't know if it needs to be on that free standing sign.

Mr. Parrish – If people are looking for Subway or they are looking for Outback they are looking for the Outback sign not 17294.

Mr. Mikula – I don't know how it comes in on the CAD for the Fire Department. It might not come in as the name.

Mr. Smerigan- I don't know that the numbers on the sign out front are really going to make a big difference. If we are doing something that actually helps them then I am in favor of it. I don't know if we are. Like you say, either they are looking for the name of they have stuck it in their GPS and their phone caddy is telling them, turn right in 50 feet.

Mr. Biondillo – I agree.

Ms. Brill – Could you place that sign parallel to Rt. 82 instead of down the drive?

Mr. Smerigan – Then it gets difficult to see.

Ms. Brill – I don't know, the Greens, Costco, it stands out there pretty good.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
April 19, 2019
Page 15

Mr. Smerigan – I only brought it up because I am sitting here looking at it and thinking the backend of that sign will be pretty far from the street. By the time you get the distance between the edge of pavement and the edge of the right-of-way and then 10 feet back from the edge of the right-of-way and you are another 20 feet back from that, those words on the back end of that sign are pretty far for people even though the sign is large. I am certainly not going to vote no because of that.

Mr. Serne – We are going to table everything.

Mr. Parrish – So you may like us to consider a different orientation.

Mr. Smerigan – I just threw it out there as an observation based on the design you have.

Mr. Parrish – We will draw it to scale and blow it up.

Mr. Smerigan – If you think it will work then that is fine. I just hate to see them go in and put it in and then say, this isn't getting it done.

Mr. Biondillo – Once you overlay it with your landscape plan you are going to know where it needs to go.

Mr. Parrish – We will blow that up, I think that would be effective for everybody's purpose.

Mr. Smerigan – We are not refusing to approve it, we are raising an issue that is all so that you can at least consider it. As long as you are having to go back and look at things anyway, you might consider it. I like that sign. I like them when they are clean like that. I like the materials that you chose, I like the way it is a fairly clean sign. I'm not a big fan of listing all the tenants like that but I understand that from an economic standpoint. I understand you have to do that. I get it but at least the rest of the lines on the sign are clean.

Ms. Brill – Just so you understand, the Master Sign Program will go on to Planning Commission so on the next agenda hopefully you will get your revisions back, we'll address the Master Sign Program and it will go on to Planning Commission then these other signs will come back at a meeting after that.

Mr. Parrish – So we are going to come back here and then it is going to go to Planning Commission.

Ms. Brill – Yes to adopt the Master Sign Program.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
April 19, 2019
Page 16

Mr. Smerigan – What she is getting at is that monument sign and Outback Signage won't be approved until after Planning Commission acts on the Master Sign Program.

Mr. Parrish – You have to follow steps.

Mr. Smerigan – Nobody is ready for signage yet anyway.

Mr. Parrish – Right, thank you.

OUTBACK STEAKHOUSE/ Stacy Miller, Agent

- a) Recommendation of a 15' x 15' non-illuminated Wall Graphic in black, white and maroon for the south elevation; and
- b) Recommendation of a 7'-5" x 2'-6" internally illuminated Wall Sign having black background, white copy and cardinal red graphics, stating Outback Steakhouse; Curbside Takeaway and Delivery for the west elevation; and
- c) Recommendation of a 6'-4" x 14' internally illuminated Wall Sign having white background and red copy stating Outback Steakhouse for the west elevation; and
- d) Recommendation of a 6'-4" x 14' internally illuminated Wall Sign having white background and red copy stating Outback Steakhouse for the south elevation for property located at 17800 Royalton Road, PPN

Mr. Serne– Item Number Three, Outback Steakhouse. There was no representative present.

Mr. Serne– Tony.

Mr. Biondillo – I think what they are presenting there looks good other than the fact that, I don't know if that is a wall sign or a monument sign but we obviously don't want a separate monument sign for that but I think everything else looks good. I don't know what this sign is identifying because it's not really identified. I don't know if that was a potential ground sign. The wall signage is identified here but that is just . . .

Mr. Serne– Ken.

Mr. Mikula – With this sign being 6' – 4", does it fit the sign program then?

Architectural Review Board Minutes
April 19, 2019
Page 17

Mr. Biondillo – They would have to modify it so no. It would have to be modified to maximum in height.

Mr. Smerigan – Their letters were the right size but we don't want to be so hung up on letters so if you need to adjust those numbers you can do that but I think that would be a better control then just the letter height. Otherwise there is nothing controlling this. It sounds silly but there is always somebody so we need to look at it in terms of overall sign height as opposed to just simply the letter height and then we can go from there.

Mr. Biondillo – Do you need one of these?

Mr. Parrish – That came directly to you guys.

Ms. Brill – They are not presenting for Outback. Outback is not here today.

Mr. Smerigan – The mural at least for me is not a big deal but I think you want to make sure that these dimensions are consistent with what you are saying. They've got a couple of those little pick-up signs and I don't know if those are covered in your regulations.

Mr. Parrish – It is something that is a fact for restaurants.

Mr. Smerigan – No question, everybody has some sort of a pickup lane now. That is how people do that now. That is all I am saying is here is the first one in the door and it's got this issue and you want to clean that up so you want to consider how that works.

Mr. Parrish – Okay.

Mr. Serne - Okay we will table all three items. Is there any other business to come before the board?

Hearing no further business. The Chairman adjourned the meeting.

Dale Serne /s/
Dale Serne, Chairman

Carol M. Brill /s/

Carol M. Brill, Administrative Assistant,
Boards & Commissions

Approved