

# STRONGSVILLE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

## MINUTES OF MEETING February 12, 2008

The Architectural Review Board of the City of Strongsville met for Caucus in the Mayors Conference Room at the 16099 Foltz Parkway, on ***Tuesday, February 13, 2008 at 8:30 a.m.***

**Present: Architectural Review Board Members:** Bill Boron, ARB Chairman, Tim Huffman, Frank Bohac, Ken Mikula, City Engineer, Keith Foulkes, Assistant Building Commissioner, Bob Hill, City Planner.

The following was discussed:

**Global Country of World Peace:** The Building Department questioned the materials that were going to be used for the exterior of the building.

**Angel House:** Mrs. Milbrandt's report stated that she felt that the building was too close to the existing stream. Mr. Foulkes stated that the lighting report was rejected. He also stated that it would be preferable to have the siding match the existing building. Other than that the Board was in agreement that the plans were okay.

**Walgreen's:** Mr. Huffman stated that the north elevation still needed more detail. He also stated that the addition of the pilasters and gable looked better. He felt that the additional gable added was not necessary. Mrs. Milbrandt requested the addition of 2 pear trees to the landscaping plan

**Walgreen's – Signage-** Mr. Foulkes stated the signage meets code. Mr. Huffman stated that he felt that the "Drive-Thru Pharmacy" signage was too large.

**Eberhard:** The Board agreed that the signage looked good.

**Earth Angels Home Health Care:** The Board was in agreement that the original application was still not acceptable and that there were no revisions submitted.

**The Ravines:** The Board was in agreement that the Master Sign Program was in approvable form.

**AT & T:** Mr. Foulkes stated that signage met the code with the exception of the orange window sign that was not allowed unless it was a temporary sign.



**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 3**

Mr. Fitch – Actually I am just here to take notes. Mr. Murach was supposed to be here today but it out of the country because of a death. He asked me to come and take notes. I am not prepared to tell you more about the project then you already know.

Mr. Bohac – Shouldn't we just Table this because we would have to see materials and things?

Mr. Fitch – I am generally familiar with this project but as for the specific but I don't have the details.

Mr. Boron – Well we will go around the board and get comments so that you can take them back.

Mr. Boron – Keith

Mr. Foulkes – The application material for the wall surface is identified as white cementitious coating like Kien Coating. I don't know what that is, is that an EIFS or what type of material is that?

Mr. Fitch – I think it is a marble dust base but I would have to find out.

Mr. Foulkes – We would need some literature on that and some back up.

Mr. Fitch – Is that for the exterior walls?

Mr. Foulkes – Right that is what is identified as the wall surface. It would be nice to have samples of everything that you have so that we could see the color scheme. The other couple of things that I have are the roof is shown as a gable. I don't know where the HVAC units are going to be located, if they are going to be located on the roof but they need to be screened appropriately. I don't see a plan view of that structure to see where those are going to be located. If they are going to be located on the ground we don't know. Screening of the dumpsters, I saw the location of the dumpsters in the back corner, I don't know if there is any landscaping going around that.

Mr. Huffman – They do have a detail of the dumpster, the wall is 8'.

Mr. Foulkes – I just didn't know if there was any additional landscaping for that.

Mr. Boron – I think what you show on your detail is fine; it is an 8' high masonry wall. That is what the code requires. What Building was referring to is where you're AC Units are and how they are going to get screened. Sometimes they put them on the roof.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 4**

Mr. Fitch – If those are on the ground are they required to be screened.

Mr. Boron – No they don't but they should be identified.

Mr. Huffman – If they are out front we might want to suggest that they be screened.

Mr. Boron – It's mainly what the material of the building is. I know that if it is EIFS material I know that there has to be a water table up so far like a stone or a brick or something. You can't have the EIFS to the ground.

Mr. Fitch – So what is the requirement for that and how high does that have to be?

Mr. Foulkes –Typically I would say at least 24". I don't know what your architecture would allow for. You have those arched columns coming down and how that would fit in. I think you could propose something. I would say a minimum of 24".

Mr. Fitch – That would be 24" of, how would you describe what would that be?

Mr. Foulkes – From grade.

Mr. Fitch – Of what?

Mr. Foulkes – Of a water table type material, impervious stone or something that is much more durable than the EIFS material.

Mr. Huffman – I think the key is durability. EIFS is an acronym for Exterior Insulation Facade System. It is that stucco look that is very common. They have different qualities of it but you could kick it in if it is down low. You can have higher density materials.

Mr. Boron – Moisture is a problem.

Mr. Huffman – Tony Biondillo our Building Commissioner, there is limitations to where it is able to be used. Mostly for accenting as opposed to a whole building. This material, this Keim Cement, I didn't see it written out, where was it?

Mr. Foulkes – It is right on the application, cementitious coating.

Mr. Huffman – I know that is a pretty strong material that used to be used for soffits and exterior applications. Oh, wait, that is Keim so that is not what I was thinking of. I don't know what that is.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 5**

Mr. Fitch – So you basically really need to know what is this material and what are its qualities as far as durability and moisture related.

Mr. Boron – If you could bring samples of your roofing and what your material is.

Mr. Huffman – Your colors, whatever your colors are that you are going to have on the building. It might be trim that needs to be account for, is it white or does it match this or is this roof material above this copula, what is that material and the color.

Mr. Fitch – They usually use the same material that is on the main roof.

Mr. Foulkes – The lighting report was recommended for approval with the glare shields at we noted in the Planning Commission so that is alright. Other than that, the wall itself that retaining wall on the north side, I think if you do install it, it says installed by others but that wall may need some engineering depending on the size. Ken may have more to say on that. We just have general details that were provided.

Mr. Fitch – So what do you want to do with that? What would be our next step with regard to the wall?

Mr. Mikula – That is being reviewed by the Engineering Department and either your engineer has comments regarding that right now that they are addressing or they gave sufficient information with the other details with the site plan. That is where we are with Engineering. We are working through with reviewing the site plan and working out any issues with their engineer.

Mr. Boron – Frank.

Mr. Bohac – No other comment.

Mr. Boron – Tim.

Mr. Huffman – On the pole fixtures, you may have the colors specified in here, I didn't see it. You need to be prepared to know what that is.

Mr. Fitch – Okay.

Mr. Huffman – I see that they are 26' above ground. It looks like the submittal for your lighting did get approved by the engineer. I assume that the drive will continue to the back part of the property.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 6**

Mr. Fitch – I will have to check on that, I don't know.

Mr. Huffman – That is what it looks like, that it is intended to come back in the future.

Mr. Mikula – That is what it looks like it is intended to do.

Mr. Foulkes – At Planning Commission they did discuss the potential future development of that. I think that they presented some preliminary things to Planning.

Mr. Huffman – Otherwise this parking lot would have probably been designed differently. This is awkward how these little, you come in and out of here. I can see why its been done.

Mr. Foulkes – There was also a discussion about an easement being provided on the north side to provide an access drive along Pearl Road as opposed to several driveway cuts. When the future development of the property to the north so they had to do that.

Mr. Huffman – You obviously have a challenge with your topography but . . . You did a great job with your tree study and that is probably it. I think you would have a hard time, traditionally we have been trying to get berming along Pearl but with your topography it is going to be difficult to do so I think there is not much you can do with that. There is landscaping and maybe I will defer to Bill on the landscaping. As far as screening, it looks like you have screening along Pearl. The neighbors I suspect will want to have some screening between your property and the resident to the south.

Mr. Boron – I have a memo from the Coordinator of Natural Resources for the City and the specifications for the tree preservation ordinance appears to meet code and the landscaping she would like to have, replacing the Blue Spruce and the Concolor Fir with either Canadian Fir or White Spruce.

Mr. Fitch – Could you say that one more time?

Mr. Boron – She said that the White Firs that are specified on the plans she would rather have either Canadian Fir or White Spruce. It will survive better. She would also like to have these moved to the west a little more because she is worried about road salt.

Mr. Fitch – Okay.

Mr. Huffman – You probably wouldn't want them all in a line though.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 7**

Mr. Boron – Stagger them don't put them all in a line. All you trees need to be 2 1/2" Caliper instead of 2". A question I had, we also need a detail for the decorative fence. I don't know what you are planning for that, it is a metal or is it wood or vinyl.

Mr. Fitch – I don't know but I can find out for you.

Mr. Boron – You do show decorative fence all the way around the building.

Mr. Fitch – Do you need a sample or just a description of it?

Mr. Boron – You could just do a material cut, we don't need an actual sample. Bob.

Mr. Hill – Where is that decorative fence?

Mr. Boron showed Mr. Hill where the fence was located on the plans.

Mr. Hill – I think that they should probably add 5 Spruce on the south side. Even though this is zoned Business, there is a residence here so to give the resident some screening.

Mr. Bohac – Didn't she just change the Spruce on the other one?

Mr. Hill – Whatever the Spruce that she changed it too, I think that would be best. Maybe 5 of them staggered in there.

Mr. Boron – Ok, we are going to Table this until the next meeting on February 26, 2008.

Mr. Huffman – Out of curiosity, do you know what the fence is for?

Mr. Fitch – In the type of architecture of the building which is the Vedic Architecture, the fence has a meaning or function within that architecture. They would say more than symbolic it has a function, it adds to the effectiveness of the, the whole idea of this building is that it in itself it has some good nourishing qualities to it and the fence is part of that. I am not deeply knowledgeable about that philosophy but it has more than just a purely decorative function in their estimation.

Mr. Huffman – Your guess is that it is more like 3 or 4 feet high and not 8 feet high.

Mr. Fitch – Yes, I would say from the ones I've seen that it is not 8' high.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 8**

Mr. Hill – That is important here because as far as that fence, it probably should not be more than 3 or 3 ½ feet because the Police for example, they need to see in there.

Mr. Boron – It may be a picket fence too.

Mr. Fitch – Sometimes they are not solid. In fact I have usually seen that they are not solid.

Mr. Hill – That would be a concern that there be visibility.

Mr. Boron – My guess is that it is a picket fence.

Mr. Fitch – I've seen a metal picket fence.

Mr. Boron – Okay, we are going to Table for the 26<sup>th</sup>. You will be put on the Agenda unless you call Carol and set up a different date.

Mr. Fitch – Okay, thank you very much.

**ANGEL HOUSE/ Carol Dombrose, Principal**

Recommendation of the Site, Building Elevations, Building Materials/Colors, Parking Lot Lighting, Landscaping and Screening for a 1,542 SF free standing building and parking lot addition for property located at 14217 Mill Hollow Lane, PPN 399-05-007 zoned Public Facility.

Mr. Boron –Item Number Two, Angel House. There is no applicant present so this matter will be tabled until February 26, 2008.

**WALGREEN'S/ Dushan Boucek, Agent**

Recommendation of the Site, Building Elevations, Building Materials/Colors, Parking Lot, Lighting, Landscaping and Screening for the proposed 14,820 SF Drug Store; property located on the corner of Boston and West 130<sup>th</sup> Street, PPN 399-33-008 zoned General Business.

Mr. Boron –Item Number Three, Walgreen's. Please state your name and address for the record.

Dushan Bouchak – 25001 Emery Road, Warrensville Hts., Ohio 44128.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 9**

Tim Dean – 22100 Horseshoe Lane, Strongsville, Ohio 44149.

Mr. Boron – Okay, you are back with the revisions.

Mr. Bouchak – At the previous meeting the “photo” signs have been taken off the building. We have addressed the north and west side with additional pilasters. A duplicate feature that mirrors the drive-thru feature on the building. All the other signs all stayed the same. The ground sign stayed the same. The landscaping has been redone to match the area on Boston Road and match the adjacent landscaping and carry it around the corner.

Mr. Boron – Frank.

Mr. Bohac – It looks a lot better, I appreciate your changes.

Mr. Boron – Keith.

Mr. Foulkes – Overall it looks good. There was some discussion about the signage and allowable on the secondary side. If possibly you could review your signage on the secondary side, possibly look at those negative spaces. Bring this down to the allowable. On the primary you have 171 SF and on the secondary you had 78 SF. If your actual on Boston Road, you are showing 86.34 SF. I know you are including your exit directional signs as well.

Mr. Boucek – What is allowed on the secondary?

Mr. Foulkes – You have on here 1.5 X 130 feet x 40 would be 78.

Mr. Boucek – That is for total signage.

Mr. Foulkes – Right or you go by the frontage which is 40% of the total on the main which would come down to 68.4.

Mr. Boucek – I would rather distribute the signage that works with the architecture more over two sides then doing on the 78 SF on the secondary side and area then have signage that is oversized.

Mr. Foulkes – I think what needs to be shown is something that would be accurate without having to go for a variance. In other words your numbers reflect actual net of your signage. You may be close to meeting code.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 10**

Mr. Boucek – Do I even need to show the exit directional sign as part of the calculations?

Mr. Foulkes – I would say no, its not a building sign.

Mr. Boucek – If we don't even count that . . .

Mr. Huffman – The directional signs should only be 3 SF and should only say enter or exit per the code.

Mr. Boucek – A 3 SF sign is not going to be affective and it needs to be at least the size that is shown so that they see it.

Mr. Huffman – Directional signs are intended to be small signs, mounted in the ground and say "enter", "exit" and I think a lot of places said "drive-thru" or various other things that direct people but they are not intended to be on the building. This is an exception to what the code says.

Mr. Boucek – Is there any leeway there?

Mr. Huffman – That is a variance issue.

Mr. Foulkes – I don't know how we can vary from what is required without you going to that Board. If you calculate your signage, you have two signs that is not a total of 6 SF that is 6 SF per sign?

Mr. Boucek – It says drive-thru pharmacy on the one side and exit on the other side.

Mr. Huffman – I am talking about the wall pharmacy sign should only be 3 SF. I am not talking about those exit signs. Those are probably 3 SF right?

Mr. Foulkes – I think it is appropriate that sign is that size because I know that there was discussion at Planning Commission about cross traffic and people going up that way.

Mr. Huffman – Is that measuring the whole rectangle or just the "exit"?

Mr. Boucek – The rectangle.

Mr. Boron – You could use just the "exit" for the actual calculation.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 11**

Mr. Huffman – Those aren't even what I am talking about. I am referring to the "Drive-thru Pharmacy" sign on the front of the building. That is a directional sign and by code that should be 3 SF and I don't think it is even allowed on the building without a variance.

Mr. Boucek – The conversation regarding the signage, we wanted that as not a directional sign and as a regular sign as part of the overall signage package.

Mr. Huffman – An identification sign? You are allowed one per building, two if you have a corner lot.

Mr. Hill – You already have a "pharmacy".

Mr. Huffman – "Walgreen's" is your identification sign. "Pharmacy" is an extra sign.

Mr. Hill – Then you have directional signs.

Mr. Dean – So this is a directional sign, you refer to?

Mr. Hill – You don't need it, we know that you want it.

Mr. Boron – We have to abide by the code. If you go through BZA for signage you can still go through your permitting process. Signage won't hold you up for Planning at all. This would be a whole separate issue to BZA. BZA will look at this.

Mr. Dean – This is their prototype look.

Mr. Boucek – Is there any way that you can call this sign not a directional just an identification sign and part of the signage package?

Mr. Hill – Its not an identification sign.

Mr. Boron – Even so you can't have it, we have to refer back to code.

Mr. Dean – If the arrow is removed would it still be considered directional?

Mr. Huffman – What would it be called if it is not? What kind of a sign is it?

Mr. Boron – The issue is still the amount of signage.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 12**

Mr. Hill – Why don't we consider it without? We can consider it without and then they can go to the BZA.

Mr. Boron – Yes we could do that. We could approve the building and approve the site and landscaping and they could go to BZA for their signage.

Mr. Hill – Or we could approve the signage without that.

Mr. Huffman – If it is a wall sign, one identification wall sign may be permitted. You have Walgreen's and Walgreen's which are allowed because it is a corner lot. Pharmacy is not allowed per this code but somewhere there was something that was revised and allowed Marc's to put pharmacy on their building.

Mr. Dean – CVS has the word "CVS Pharmacy".

Mr. Boucek – "Drive-thru Pharmacy", the wording is different from "Pharmacy"?

Mr. Hill – You have drive-thru on your directional signs, right?

Mr. Huffman – You even call it a directional sign on here but still, my personal problem is, I would rather not see that sign there. If you want it you can have it but I think you have to go get a variance for it. If the BZA says its okay then fine.

Mr. Hill – If you want your sign package approved today, the Board's position is that we are in a position to do that if that sign is eliminated. You can always go to BZA and if you get it then you can put it up.

Mr. Dean – Even if it is reduced it still doesn't meet the code.

Mr. Hill – No.

Mr. Huffman – You can have a ground mounted sign as you enter the sight directing them. Which you see at the other stores.

Mr. Hill – From an aesthetic standpoint it detracts from the building.

Mr. Boron – The Board is looking to remove that but you can always go to BZA and ask for it.

Mr. Boron – Ken.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 13**

Mr. Mikula – No comment.

Mr. Boron – Tim.

Mr. Huffman – I appreciate with the berming what you have done, the landscaping looks great, it was what we were hoping for. You have added the pilasters on the back of the building which takes it to the next level which is acceptable to me. There is that extra gable that you added. I really don't know that is necessary. How far from the building does that extend?

Mr. Boucek – I would make it 8" to a 1' to break up the dimension.

Mr. Huffman – It serves a decorative purpose. I don't know, without columns on it, it looks awkward. I would rather probably not have it than have it. You have pilasters. It will save you some money.

Mr. Boucek – I can delete it.

Mr. Boron – Jennifer is not here right now. She had a couple of plant names that have to be changed. The spirea, instead of little princess she said that the existing ones are called neon flash. I am going to mark that here. She wants to see 2 pear trees in this island which mimic the pears on the other side of the drive. Two pear trees.

Mr. Dean – What side? Oh, I see, by Outdoor Power World.

Mr. Boron – That will help screen out some of these dumpsters too. So two Cleveland Select Pears and those will need to be 2 ½". The crabapple, she wants to have Harvest Gold. That 1 ½" needs to be 2 ½". Those were her comments and I concur with her. Everything else looks good, the mounding looks good. The building looks good.

Mr. Hill – I think that with those modifications it is very nice.

Mr. Boron – If there are no other questions or comments, I would entertain a motion for Walgreen's for the building and signage without the "Pharmacy" on the building. If you want to go to BZA for that in two weeks.

Mr. Dean – We can still go to Planning and get approved?

Mr. Boron – Only your elevations will go back to Planning not the signage.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 14**

Mr. Huffman – I motion to accept the Recommendation of the Site, Building Elevations, Building Materials/Colors, Parking Lot, Lighting, Landscaping supplemented by the City Arborist report, Screening and also to have the decorative gable removed on the west elevation for the proposed 14,820 SF Drug Store; property located on the corner of Boston and West 130<sup>th</sup> Street, PPN 399-33-008 zoned General Business as well as the recommendation of Recommendation of a 4' x 8' internally illuminated Pylon Sign having white copy and graphics, cardinal red background, bronze trim and returns; and Recommendation of a 34" x 26'-8 ½" (61.14 SF) internally illuminated channel letter Wall Sign having red copy on a masonry background, bronze trim and returns for the east and south elevation; Recommendation of a 1'-6" x 12'-9" internally illuminated channel letter Wall Sign having red copy, masonry background, bronze trim and returns, stating "Pharmacy" for both the east and south elevations.

Mr. Bohac – Second.

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

Mr. Huffman – I motion to accept the Recommendation of a 2'-8" x 17'-8" internally illuminated channel letter Wall Sign having red copy, brick background, bronze trim and returns, stating "Drive Thru Pharmacy" for the east elevation property located at Boston and West 130<sup>th</sup> Street, PPN 399-33-008 zoned General Business.

Mr. Bohac – Second,

Roll Call: All Nays DENIED

**EBERHARD/ Colabianchi Construction, Agent**

Recommendation of a 5' x 10' masonry ground sign having black copy and masonry background to match existing building, property located at 21944 Drake Road, PPN 394-04-005 zoned General Industrial.

Mr. Boron –Item Number Five, Eberhard. There is no representative here so this item will be tabled until February 26, 2008.

**EARTH ANGELS HOME HEALTH CARE/ Mark Wos, Agent**

Recommendation of a 15" x 18'-9" (23.43 SF) non-illuminated Box Sign having blue copy on a white background with black trim for property located at 14400 Pearl Road, zoned General Business.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 15**

Mr. Boron –Item Number Six, Earth Angels Home Health Care. Please state your name and address for the record.

Mark Wos, 14400 Pearl Road, Suite #2, Strongsville, Ohio 44136. This was considered a roof last time we looked at that. I went back to the City and tried to get an actual drawing of the building but ended up making my own. In the mean time, I took some pictures looking at the plaza and on the other side of the building these signs are on the exact type of structure, shingles and everything. What is the difference between that being a roof and this not.

Mr. Boron – The difference here is, this does not have a sign band where you could actually put a sign. If this sign band was not here you would see signs on the roof.

Mr. Wos – Alright, what I did then, this is where I want to put the sign now.

Mr. Boron – That is your building, correct?

Mr. Wos –Yes.

Mr. Bohac – I went and took a look. There are other signs on that side.

Mr. Huffman – Could you tell me where the sign is going to go?

Mr. Wos – Basically in the middle above the windows.

Mr. Huffman – Not above the door.

Mr. Wos – No.

Mr. Huffman – Where the red is, is the door.

Mr. Wos – Yes here is the entry way.

Mr. Boron – Keith.

Mr. Foulkes – This is the first time I have looked at this. The side of the building allows 50% of the frontage for signage.

Mr. Boron – Do we know how long that building is?

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 16**

Mr. Foulkes – All I have in my packet is a sign, 18.75 feet. What does that show? Fifty Two feet on that?

Mr. Wos – I measured it yesterday. It is 34 feet to the door.

Mr. Foulkes – To the door but we don't know what the total is on this side.

Mr. Boron – This building, he is not in this particular building. He is in the building that is down here.

Mr. Foulkes – It is not attached to it?

Mr. Boron – I think that it is attached here isn't it?

Mr. Wos – Actually looking at it, it is not attached it is a separate building but it has a fascia there that makes it look like it is attached.

Mr. Boron – The history is that he wanted to put one on this front on Pearl and we don't allow it.

Mr. Foulkes – I remember when he came in some time ago.

Mr. Boron – This really does not even come into play here in terms of frontage.

Mr. Foulkes – This sign is the same size? This 18.75 feet?

Mr. Wos – Yes it is 18.75' x 15" wide.

Mr. Boron – Based on 34' or what does he have in the frontage?

Mr. Foulkes – That is what he is showing, 34.6.

Mr. Boron – He is allowed 40% of that?

Mr. Foulkes – Right.

Mr. Mikula – What does that work out to?

Mr. Huffman – 23.44 SF is the sign he has here.

Mr. Boron – 3.44 SF so it is 40% of 34. So he is under the allowable.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 17**

Mr. Vos – That is good?

Mr. Boron – Yes, based on that your allowable square footage, you are allowed to have the sign that you made on the building. I am going to go around the Board and see if anybody has any objections to putting the sign on the fascia. What else is in here, do you know?

Mr. Vos – There is nothing.

Mr. Boron – Just your space?

Mr. Vos – Just our space, the rest of the building is vacant.

Mr. Boron – Any comments?

Mr. Foulkes – No, if he is within the requirements of the zoning code, the only thing is, looking at the sign, did you ever consider stacking that “Earth Angels” on top of the “Home Health Care” and making it a shorter wider sign instead of that linear format?

Mr. Vos – No.

Mr. Bohac – Just so you know, the sign is made already.

Mr. Foulkes – Oh.

Mr. Vos – Yes we kind of jumped the gun. I just figured that since these signs are so ugly on this building that I would have . . .

Mr. Foulkes – Are you lighting that in any way?

Mr. Vos – No.

Mr. Foulkes – That is all I have.

Mr. Boron – Frank.

Mr. Bohac – The only comment is, is it just a banner type sign or is there actually a substance behind there?

Mr. Vos – Well I have a ¾” plywood backing to it. I have trim all the way around it.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 18**

Mr. Bohac – Alright, no other comments.

Mr. Boron – Ken.

Mr. Mikula – I have no objection to putting it on that wall.

Mr. Boron – Tim.

Mr. Huffman – I think the linear look is probably better because this is a long facade. I can appreciate what you are doing, assuming that you are trying to center it over this window area which is pretty distinct on that building. I can see that making sense. I was kind of expecting you to center it over the entrance but I think this works too. You parking I assume is in the back?

Mr. Wos – Yes, we have the side and back.

Mr. Huffman – So that kind of draws you to park back here and walk around so I think it would be appropriate where you have it. I would say that you need to center it between here and here, over the top.

Mr. Wos – Yes, both those windows are equal distance so they are the same size, 6’.

Mr. Huffman – Are you going to maintain the red that is there today or are you going to change that?

Mr. Wos – No, that stays there.

Mr. Huffman – I think you have located it in a good place.

Mr. Boron – Bob.

Mr. Hill – Do we have a color rendition of the sign?

Mr. Boron – Yes, it is blue.

Mr. Huffman – Is the blue a logo color or something associated with the business?

Mr. Wos – Yes pretty much on all of our stationary.

Mr. Huffman – Okay.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 19**

Mr. Boron - I agree, if we center it on this I have no objection to it. I would entertain a motion for Earth Angels Home Health Care.

Mr. Huffman – I motion to accept the Recommendation of a 15” x 18’-9” (23.43 SF) non-illuminated Box Sign having blue copy on a white background with black trim centered over the existing group of windows for property located at 14400 Pearl Road, zoned General Business.

Mr. Bohac – Second.

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

**THE RAVINES/ Jim Briola, Agent**

Recommendation of a Revised Master Sign Program for The Ravines Shopping Plaza, permitting the color #3M #3630-8071, light blue and color #3M #3630-8015 for **AT & T only**, *as long as long as AT & T is a tenant operating in this location and as called out in their Revised Sign Program dated and received by the City on January 24, 2008.* Property located at 17970 Royalton Road, PPN 396-12-001 and 005 zoned General Business.

Mr. Boron –Item Number Seven, The Ravines. Please state your name and address for the record.

Jim Briola, North Coast Sign and Lighting, 310 N. Broadway Street, Medina, Ohio 44256.

Mr. Boron – There is a letter stating that they would like to amend the Master Sign Program to allow AT & T to have their federal trade mark global logo colors as light blue and dark blue for AT & T only. Once AT & T would leave then it would revert back. Is there any questions? If not I would entertain a motion.

Mr. Huffman – I motion to accept the Recommendation of a Revised Master Sign Program for The Ravines Shopping Plaza, permitting the color #3M #3630-8071, light blue and color #3M #3630-8015, dark blue for **AT & T only**, *as long as long as AT & T is a tenant operating in this location and as called out in their Revised Sign Program dated and received by the City on January 24, 2008.* Property located at 17970 Royalton Road, PPN 396-12-001 and 005 zoned General Business.

Mr. Bohac – Second.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 20**

Roll Call:

All Ayes

APPROVED

**AT & T/ Jim Briola, Agent**

a) Recommendation of a 2'- 8 3/16" x 8' – 1 11/16" internally illuminated channel letter Wall Sign having white copy, blue and white logo, bronze trim and returns; and

b) Recommendation of a 5'-9 7/8" x 10" routed aluminum tenant ID panel having black copy, blue and white logo on a soft green background for the ground sign, located at 17970 Royalton Road, PPN 396-12-001 and 005 zoned General Business.

Mr. Boron –Item Number Eight, AT & T. Mr. Briola remains at the microphone.

Mr. Briola – What we are proposing is a channel letter sign with no raceway, just like the other signs on the building and they are going to be illuminated by LED's. Someone has already removed the old sign and patched the building front and painted it.

Mr. Boron – Keith.

Mr. Foulkes – I had a couple of questions, the overall sign on the canopy is okay and you are going to need an approval for the building electrical code for that installation in the future. The orange sign you have displayed in the window, is that applied to the back of the glass or how is that put on there?

Mr. Briola – That is going to be applied to the glass.

Mr. Foulkes – Okay but our zoning code 1272.12(h) refers to that being called a window sign so a window sign is only permitted on a temporary basis. A 30 day window so to speak. You would either have to get a variance for that to be continued as a permanent sign or removed it as part of your application.

Mr. Briola – Does that include all window signs? Would they be allowed a smaller one on a permanent basis?

Mr. Foulkes – The code is pretty clear. It just states that window signs are temporary signs.

Mr. Briola- Okay.

Mr. Foulkes – There is no delineation of a permanent window sign.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 21**

Mr. Boron – Basically for sales and things like that.

Mr. Foulkes – Banners.

Mr. Briola – Okay.

Mr. Boron – I guess if that is a permanent sign we would have to deny you or just not even vote on it at this stage.

Mr. Briola – If we put a sign in the window and it is temporary would we apply for a temporary sign permit?

Mr. Foulkes – Yes separate through the Building Department. In 30 days we would follow up and make sure that it was removed.

Mr. Boron – We don't need a vote for that.

Mr. Foulkes – If you call the Building Department we will give you the details on temporary signage.

Mr. Briola – So it is not permitted as a permanent sign at all?

Mr. Foulkes – Right.

Mr. Boron – Frank.

Mr. Bohac – No other comments.

Mr. Boron – Ken.

Mr. Mikula – I have no comment.

Mr. Boron – Tim.

Mr. Huffman – The wall sign, the theme you have done with the wall sign is the AT & T with the logo would be centered over that column?

Mr. Briola – Yes, centered in the storefront area that they have.

Mr. Huffman – I would recommend that it be centered on that column because that is what David's Bridal has done and that is what the Tux shop has done. Industry Source

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 22**

and Be Beautiful before that were centered on that same column so please center it on the column not on the frontage.

Mr. Briola – Okay. It is centered on the frontage that is where the column is.

Mr. Huffman – I know that was the intent.

Mr. Briola – Okay.

Mr. Huffman – Otherwise the sign looks great and the ground sign look great.

Mr. Briola – We are going to match the color of the other sign so it fits in exactly in the routed directory ground sign.

Mr. Huffman – As far as that window sign, I really don't think that you need that at all. You have a big sign on the fascia, why would you need to say AT & T again in the window? You have one of the nicest looking centers in town and I hate for you to make it look worse by putting in these window signs.

Mr. Briola – Actually the window sign draws you attention away from the sign on the front of the building. They try to get as much as they can.

Mr. Bohac – They have a pylon sign too so people know that they are there.

Mr. Boron – Bob.

Mr. Hill – No comment.

Mr. Boron – If there are no other questions or comments, I would entertain a motion for AT & T.

Mr. Huffman – I motion to accept the Recommendation of a 2'- 8 3/16" x 8' – 1 11/16" internally illuminated channel letter Wall Sign having white copy, blue and white logo, bronze trim and returns; and Recommendation of a 5'-9 7/8" x 10" routed aluminum tenant ID panel having black copy, blue and white logo on a soft green background for the ground sign, located at 17970 Royalton Road, PPN 396-12-001 and 005 zoned General Business.

Mr. Bohac – Second.

Roll Call:

All Ayes

APPROVED

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**February 12, 2008**  
**Page 23**

Mr. Boron - Is there any other business to come before the board?

Hearing no further business. The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:15 a.m.

---

William P. Boron, Chairman

---

Carol M. Oprea, Administrative  
Assistant

---

Approved