

# **'STRONGSVILLE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

## **MINUTES OF MEETING**

**October 21, 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, October 21, 2008 at 8:30 a.m.***

**Present: Architectural Review Board Members:** Bill Boron, ARB Chairman, Tim Huffman, Frank Bohac, Ken Mikula, City Engineer, Tony Biondillo, Building Commissioner Jennifer Milbrandt, City Forester, Bob Hill, City Planner.

The following was discussed:

**SUPER EIGHT MOTEL:** The Board was in agreement that the Pole Sign was okay if the applicant would remove the reader board. Mr. Biondillo stated that the Wall Sign and Directional Signage were out of code and would require a variance.

**SCRANTON ASSOCIATES:** Mr. Biondillo stated that it was in approvable form. The Board was in agreement that this is a nice looking sign.

**CSC GROUP:** The Board was in agreement that this is a nice looking sign. Mrs. Milbrandt and the Board agreed that there should be landscaping installed around the base of the sign.

**STRONGSVILLE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH:** The Board was in agreement that the signage looked good. Mr. Huffman suggested that the applicant be considerate of the neighboring residents with any ground lighting to the signage.

Roll Call:

Members Present: Mr. Boron, Chairman  
Mr. Huffman  
Mr. Bohac  
Mr. Biondillo, Bldg. Comm.  
Mr. Mikula, City Engineer  
Mrs. Milbrandt, City Forrester  
Mr. Hill, City Planner

Also Present: Carol Oprea, Recording Secy.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**October 21, 2008**  
**Page 2**

**Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Boron – You have had a chance to review the minutes of October 7, 2008. If there are no additions or corrections they will stand as submitted.

**NEW APPLICATIONS:**

**SUPER EIGHT MOTEL/ Bill Kelleher, Agent**

- a) Recommendation of a reface of the existing 16' x 6' internally illuminated Pole Sign having a 3 line Reader Board, sign face having black copy, trim and returns, yellow background and red graphics; and
- b) Recommendation of a 6'-6 ¼" x 4'-3 13/16" internally illuminated Box Wall Sign having black copy, trim and returns, yellow background and red graphics; and
- c) Recommendation of a reface of the existing 2' x 4' internally illuminated Directional Sign having black copy, trim and returns, yellow background and red graphics, stating "enter" for property located at 15385 Royalton Road, PPN 399-20-013 zoned Motorist Service.

Mr. Boron –Item Number One, Super Eight Motel. Please state your name and address for the record.

Mr. Kelleher – Bill Kelleher, Century Sign, 7401 Exchange Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44125.

Mr. Boron – There are a few issues. I am going to go straight to Building.

Mr. Biondillo – From Building, from an ordinance standpoint the Pole Sign I believe will meet the square footage requirements if you take the corners out. We are not allowed to have a changeable reader board which is proposed for underneath it. The Wall Sign, they are allowed 282 SF and they are proposing 228 SF but the height is capped at a maximum of 5' and the Ground Directional Sign, you are allowed 3 SF with a maximum height of 3' tall and there is existing 8 SF. Those would be the variances that would be required.

Mr. Boron – So the Directional Sign is a reface, correct?

Mr. Biondillo – Correct it is a reface.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**October 21, 2008**  
**Page 3**

Mr. Boron – So if you would still like to have the reader board you would have to go to BZA.

Mr. Huffman – Normally those are only in Public Facility zoning.

Mr. Boron – We would have to deny that and we would have to deny the Wall Sign because of the size issue. You are allowed 5' and this is 6'-6" high sign. Tony what did you say about the directional sign?

Mr. Biondillo – The ground Directional Sign, the maximum is 3 SF, there is an existing 8 SF.

Mr. Boron – So if you would like to proceed with the same submittal, we would have to deny you and you would have to go to BZA for the variance for these issues. The other option, we could approve you, you would have to change these and that would have to meet code basically.

Mr. Kelleher – I don't think that the reader board is a problem but based on the fact that is an existing sign and based on the fact that is the same size that the existing sign is there now, I think we would like to try a variance for those two.

Mr. Boron – Okay so we would have to deny you on the Directional and Wall sign and you are saying that you will take the reader board off?

Mr. Kelleher – Yes, no problem with that.

Mr. Boron – Okay.

Mr. Kelleher – There is an existing price sign there now, changeable price sign.

Mr. Hill – I guess they got a variance for that.

Mr. Kelleher – They did get a variance, so that could stay?

Mr. Hill – No.

Mr. Kelleher – That is part of the variance.

Mr. Hill – What did you say was the square footage of the existing?

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**October 21, 2008**  
**Page 4**

Mr. Kelleher – It is 12' x 16', it is way bigger than the sign we are proposing, even with the reader board. Our understanding was that the variance that was granted for the price changer portion would stay with the property since it is still a motel.

Mr. Boron – That would have to be confirmed.

Mr. Hill – Don't you think that the proportions of the existing sign are much better than this?

Mr. Kelleher – I do.

Mr. Hill – What if you got this sign as far as the area and did not have the \$49.99?

Mr. Kelleher – A 12' x 16' sign? The problem with Super Eight is the shape that you see there is their logo and as ugly as it is, that is what they try to do.

Mr. Boron – I think if there is any change then it reverts back to code. I don't think that we can just say, "leave that", if you want that you would have to go for a variance.

Mr. Hill – You would have to address that again. You are right, there is a change.

Mr. Boron – The whole thing has changed. In any case we will have to deny you and you will have to go to BZA for these signs.

Mr. Kelleher – All three, even though the other one meets code, you will still deny it?

Mr. Boron – Well the reader board is not allowed.

Mr. Biondillo – This one meets code if he eliminates the reader board.

Mr. Boron – If you eliminate the reader board then that is okay, it is good to go. We can approve this one without the reader board and these two would have to go to the BZA.

Mr. Kelleher – Okay, that is what I would like to do for now because this guy has nothing there now. It is possible that would get him by for now. Then we could go to the BZA for those two.

Mr. Boron – Okay, we will take the reader board off. Are there any issues or questions or comments from the Board?

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**October 21, 2008**  
**Page 5**

Mr. Huffman – I do, on the Pole sign, I am okay without the reader board. The Wall Sign, I don't mind the size of it but it is a code issue and I don't think that we can over rule the code on the maximum height. The Directional Sign, again it's a code issue so we can't really over rule the zoning code but I don't think you even need this sign period. There is only one way in to this place anyway so I don't think you need to tell people to enter, it's the only driveway that is there. You have a big Pole Sign and you have another sign here on the building. As far as I am concerned you could get rid of it completely.

Mr. Boron – Any other questions or comments?

Mrs. Milbrandt – I concur with Bob in terms of the proportion of it. I would like to see them just reface the ones existing there.

Mr. Hill – There is another driveway close to this for Ice Land, isn't there?

Mr. Bohac – It is the same driveway. It is one in the same.

Mr. Boron – Okay, hearing what I am hearing. You want to get this one approved and then you will go back to BZA for the wall and the directional signs. If there are no other questions or comments, I would entertain a motion for Super Eight Motel.

Mrs. Milbrandt – I motion to accept the recommendation of a reface of the existing 16' x 6' internally illuminated Pole Sign having black copy, trim and returns, yellow background and red graphics.

Mr. Boron – It is actually a 6' x 9' – 5/8" sign. Also it is a new sign not a reface.

Mr. Bohac – Second.

Roll Call:	Mr. Boron	Aye	
	Mr. Bohac	Aye	
	Mr. Biondillo	Aye	
	Mr. Mikula	Aye	
	Mr. Huffman	Aye	
	Mrs. Milbrandt	Nay	
	Mr. Hill	Aye	APPROVED

Mr. Boron – Okay, it is passed without the reader board. I need another motion for the other two signs.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**October 21, 2008**  
**Page 6**

Mrs. Milbrandt – I would like to make a motion to accept the recommendation of a 6'-6 1/4" x 4'-3 13/16" internally illuminated Box Wall Sign having black copy, trim and returns, yellow background and red graphics;

Mr. Bohac – Second.

Roll Call: All Nays DENIED

Mr. Hill – Shouldn't we have individual letters on the wall sign rather than a cabinet?

Mr. Huffman – I don't think it is required. We can ask for it.

Mr. Hill – I thought that is what we were doing on most of these wall signs, individual letters.

Mr. Boron – On tenant spaces for retail. I need a motion for "c".

Mrs. Milbrandt – I would like to make a motion to accept the recommendation of a reface of the existing 2' x 4' internally illuminated Directional Sign having black copy, trim and returns, yellow background and red graphics, stating "enter" for property located at 15385 Royalton Road, PPN 399-20-013 zoned Motorist Service.

Mr. Bohac – Second.

Roll Call: All Nays DENIED

Mr. Boron – Okay the other two signs have to go to BZA if you wish and the pole sign is approved without the reader board.

Mr. Kelleher – Thank you.

**SCRANTON ASSOCIATES/ Kirk Miller, Agent**

Recommendation of a 6' x 7'-9" externally illuminated Ground Sign having black background, blue and gold lettering and blue white and red logo for property located at 17647 Foltz Parkway, PPN 394-04-007 zoned General Industrial.

Mr. Boron –Item Number Two, Scranton Associates. Please state your name and address for the record.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**October 21, 2008**  
**Page 7**

Mr. Miller – Kirk Miller, Global Signs and Graphics, 10147 Royalton Road. It is a non-illuminated post and panel type sign that will be out in front of their property. There is a temporary one there, that one will come down. They would like to know if they could move that over to the shipping/receiving around the corner and put on the bottom, shipping and receiving. I didn't know what the code was as far as the size.

Mr. Boron – Tony.

Mr. Biondillo – No, you are only allowed one ground sign.

Mr. Miller – What would they do then as far as a directional for shipping and receiving?

Mr. Biondillo – Three square feet in area.

Mr. Miller – Okay.

Mr. Biondillo – Maximum height is 3' high and maximum square footage is 3 SF. There are some right along there that have received variances for the directional signs.

Mr. Miller – They just want to be able to show it. Would that need to come back to the Board then as well?

Mr. Boron – It could be approved by Building. If it is to code and it just says shipping or something.

Mr. Miller – I can do that.

Mr. Boron – Tony, anything on the signage?

Mr. Biondillo – Approvable form.

Mr. Boron – Frank.

Mr. Bohac – It is fine.

Mr. Boron – Ken.

Mr. Mikula – It looks nice.

Mr. Boron – Tim.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**October 21, 2008**  
**Page 8**

Mr. Huffman – It is double sided, I assume.

Mr. Miller – Correct.

Mr. Huffman – Good.

Mr. Boron – Jennifer.

Mrs. Milbrandt – Is this going to be externally illuminated?

Mr. Miller – There is no provision for power out there right now so my impression is that I don't think they are going to. They may but I don't think that they will.

Mr. Boron – Bob.

Mr. Hill – What did we decide about the height?

Mr. Boron – It is okay because that one foot base, we are going to call it one foot.

Mr. Boron – If there are no other questions or comments, I would entertain a motion for Scranton Associates.

Mr. Bohac – I motion to accept the recommendation of a 6' x 7'-9" non-illuminated Ground Sign having black background, blue and gold lettering and blue white and red logo for property located at 17647 Foltz Parkway, PPN 394-04-007 zoned General Industrial.

Mr. Huffman – Second.

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

**CSC GROUP/ Rob Milburn, Agent**

Recommendation of a 6' x 8' internally illuminated Ground Sign having green background, white copy and logo mounted on a 20" masonry base for property located at 17999 Foltz Parkway, PPN 394-08-003 zoned General Industrial.

Mr. Boron –Item Number Three, CSC Group. Please state your name and address for the record.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**October 21, 2008**  
**Page 9**

Mr. Milburn – Rob Milburn, with Boyer Signs, 21611 Tungsten Road, Euclid, Ohio. What we are proposing is a ground sign for the CSC Group Corporate Headquarters. What it is, an aluminum cabinet, routed out, the letters will be basically the only thing seen, white plastic coming through. The base will be brick and it will match the building. I do have a landscaping plan that we are still working on it but basically if the landscaping is required I will put around some junipers and things like that. If landscaping is required then we will go ahead with the junipers.

Mr. Bohac – You should have something around there.

Mr. Boron – As long as they stay low.

Mr. Milburn – Right, like I said we will put in junipers and daylilies or something like that.

Mr. Boron – Tony.

Mr. Biondillo – I guess technically it is in conflict with the code but I don't have an issue with it. You are allowed a sign height of 5' with a supporting intricate base of 1'. Your overall height is still 6' but your base is 20". I don't have an issue.

Mr. Boron – Especially if you are going to put plants here, it probably would be better to get it up anyway.

Mr. Boron – Frank.

Mr. Bohac – It is fine.

Mr. Boron – Ken.

Mr. Mikula – I think it is a really nice looking sign.

Mr. Boron – Tim.

Mr. Huffman – No objections, looks good.

Mr. Boron – Jennifer.

Mrs. Milbrandt – Looks good.

Mr. Boron – Bob.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**October 21, 2008**  
**Page 10**

Mr. Hill – Nice looking sign.

Mr. Boron – If there are no other questions or comments, I would entertain a motion for CSC Group.

Mrs. Milbrandt – I motion to accept the recommendation of a 6' x 8' internally illuminated Ground Sign having green background, white copy and logo mounted on a 20" masonry base for property located at 17999 Foltz Parkway, PPN 394-08-003 zoned General Industrial.

Mr. Bohac – Second.

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

**STRONGSVILLE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH/ Jim Pierce, Agent**

- a) Recommendation of a 4'-6" x 6'-7" non-illuminated, double faced Ground Sign mounted between masonry pillars having black background, white copy and changeable copy panel to be located in the entrance island off Webster Road; and
- b) Recommendation of a 5' x 8' internally illuminated, double faced Ground Sign mounted between masonry pillars and having a white background, black copy and red graphics and reader board to be located in an existing island off the Royalton Road drive, property located at 13500 Royalton Road, PPN 398-29-002 zoned Public Facility.

Mr. Boron –Item Number Four, Strongsville United Methodist Church. Please state your name and address for the record.

Mr. Pierce – Jim Pierce, 14558 Regency Drive, Strongsville, Ohio 44149. In general we hope to put up 2 signs, one on Royalton Road and that will be internally illuminated, similar to what is up there in the center of town. It will be placed on the island between the entrance and the exit portion of that entrance. The other sign would go on Webster Road and it will simply be a wooden sign. It will not have any internal lighting. Both will have the brick and the brick framing and that framing would be the same as the brick on the building.

Mr. Boron – That is an existing sign that you are putting back up?

Mr. Pierce – It is and it has to be done over. It has had a few years of wear and tear so it will be repainted.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**October 21, 2008**  
**Page 11**

Mr. Boron – Tony.

Mr. Biondillo – You said that this other one is an existing sign?

Mr. Pierce – The one that goes on Webster is an existing sign. It was taken from our previous location.

Mr. Biondillo – From Building, they meet the size requirements. You are allowed to have one ground sign at 50 SF and then the secondary sign at 30 SF. You are allowed to have a bulletin board type of sign which is indicated on Route 82, with changeable copy. The other sign is supposed to just be an identification ground sign with the address and everything else.

Mr. Huffman – Do you plan on putting changeable copy on that one?

Mr. Pierce – No. Would it matter if we did change our minds on that? It is the usual with the church thing. Announcing a turkey dinner or so. At this point the discussion has been a permanent sign. We on the other hand have all the letters and it isn't really redoing of that sign.

Mr. Bohac – Is this the sign that you are putting on Rt. 82?

Mr. Pierce – No, this is the sign that will go on Rt. 82.

Mr. Bohac – It is not going to have changeable copy.

Mr. Pierce – It does because . . .

Mr. Bohac – Oh, you are going to have the reader board.

Mr. Huffman – That is the one that wants to be the reader board. It is allowed to be 6' high. The second sign is supposed to be 30 SF which it just is. It is not supposed to be a reader board.

Mr. Boron – I would like to go around the Board and ask for the opinions on the secondary reader sign.

Mr. Bohac – I don't have a problem with it.

Mr. Boron – Ken, do you have any issues with having another reader board sign on Webster Road?

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

Mr. Mikula – I don't have any issues with that because those are the letters that you just put a little message up there.

Mr. Boron – It is pretty far back too.

Mr. Bohac – That is not going to be lit right?

Mr. Pierce – No, you are right.

Mr. Bohac – You do have neighbors.

Mr. Pierce – Yes, that was part of the reason for being a little bit farther back. It would be desirable to put it right on the road but part of that was that it was in the neighborhood and so to meet their rules but my understanding it that we can't put it out there where it is going to interfere with their sight lines.

Mr. Huffman – You are saying that there will not be any lighting?

Mr. Pierce – I'm sorry, yes just the little illumination lights. Right now there are those low level driveway lights, it would be something akin to that.

Mr. Bohac – Low voltage.

Mr. Pierce – Yes.

Mr. Huffman – I would guess, I don't know if it would be akin to that.

Mr. Pierce – Those stand about that high and I am just referring to the fact that we have the power out there, the electric lines out there, you could have a light that would shine but it is not going to be any overhead type light.

Mr. Huffman – My concern with that is, I am concerned with the blue house that is right next to the south of that drive and the lights going beyond the sign into their windows. So if you are going to have lighting, I think it has to be very dim.

Mr. Pierce – I will be very honest with you, I don't have a straight answer for you but I can't see it being any other way. We have been very conscientious about the neighbors if you will. The intent when we addressed the issue, just what are we going to do, was to make sure that it isn't in their windows, it isn't in their garage or anything of that sort.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**October 21, 2008**  
**Page 13**

Mr. Huffman – It would look nicer with some lighting but maybe just not have the lighting. If it is a problem with the neighbor, if the neighbor doesn't care then okay.

Mr. Boron – How about the reader board?

Mr. Huffman – I am not going to object to the reader board.

Mr. Boron – Jennifer.

Mrs. Milbrandt – I don't have a problem with the reader board.

Mr. Boron – Bob.

Mr. Hill – I don't have a problem with the reader board. The sign that you are proposing for, it is a very nice looking sign and you have a nice building and it is new, you are going to be building these columns for the one on Webster.

Mr. Pierce – Both of them.

Mr. Hill – Right, wouldn't it be nice to repeat this sign on Webster?

Mr. Pierce – Yes, if we had the money.

Mr. Hill – You said that there was some work that you had to do on this sign.

Mr. Pierce – This sign was taken from our old site so obviously it is worn. The idea is to repaint it and brighten it up if you will.

Mr. Hill – This is Pearl Road site, you couldn't read the pastor's name anyway.

Mr. Pierce – As long as it doesn't cause any problems here. That is why at the moment I am kind of leaving this open as to whether we will actually ever have a reader board there or not.

Mr. Boron – I may be better to just eliminate it.

Mr. Hill – It is very busy. This is a nice looking sign.

Mr. Pierce – I am not going to argue that point, you are right. It is again is still the actual lettering is still under debate. It would be either a total permanent sign or just the small letter type thing.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**October 21, 2008**  
**Page 14**

Mr. Huffman – Is your lettering for Strongsville United Methodist, is that raised or is that painted on there?

Mr. Pierce – It is painted on there.

Mr. Huffman – Okay so basically you could repaint that whole area any way you wanted to.

Mr. Pierce – Yes, that was the idea.

Mr. Huffman – My opinion would be to just repaint it and just make it an identification sign that says “Strongsville United Methodist Church”, if you want to put the pastor’s name that is great and avoid the whole reader board situation.

Mr. Boron – That way you are in code.

Mr. Huffman – You are in code and I think it will serve as an identification sign as the code prescribes.

Mr. Boron – I think we have to fall back to the code on this.

Mr. Pierce – So I have it right then, you are saying we are going to treat this as an ID sign only.

Mr. Boron – Yes, and no changeable copy for the one on Webster.

Mr. Huffman – Like Bob said, it will actually read better because the lettering will be a little larger, more easy to read.

Mr. Boron – No changeable copy on Webster.

Mr. Huffman – Most of your traffic should be on Royalton, although I know you get a lot on Webster too.

Mr. Pierce – It is kind of a bad place anyway for reading.

Mr. Huffman – Yes, you go from house to house and all of a sudden there is a driveway.

Mr. Pierce – There is the break from the hill, you don’t have time to stop and read.

**Architectural Review Board Minutes**  
**October 21, 2008**  
**Page 15**

Mr. Boron – If there are no other questions or comments, I would entertain a motion for Strongsville United Methodist Church with the stipulation that there not be changeable copy on Webster.

Mr. Huffman – I would like to stipulate that they take whatever precautions they can with the lighting.

Mrs. Milbrandt – I motion to accept the recommendation of a 4'-6" x 6'-7" externally illuminated, double faced Ground Sign suggesting that there be consideration to the surrounding residential homes with the lighting, mounted between masonry pillars having black background and white copy to be located in the entrance island off Webster Road.

Mr. Bohac – Second.

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

Mrs. Milbrandt – I motion to accept the recommendation of a 5' x 8' internally illuminated, double faced Ground Sign mounted between masonry pillars and having a white background, black copy and red graphics and reader board to be located in an existing island off the Royalton Road drive, property located at 13500 Royalton Road, PPN 398-29-002 zoned Public Facility.

Mr. Bohac – Second.

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

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

Hearing no further business. The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:37 a.m.

William P. Boron /s/

William P. Boron, Chairman

Carol M. Oprea /s/

Carol M. Oprea, Administrative  
Assistant, Boards & Commissions

\_\_\_\_\_  
Approved