

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page

NEW APPLICATIONS:

BW3/ Kerry Illes, Agent

Recommendation of the Site, Building Elevations, Building Materials/Colors and Landscaping of a 2,045 SF Addition for a Banquet Room for property located at 8465 Pearl Road, PPN 395-08-013 zoned R-RS.

Mr. Huffman– There is no representative so we will Table them until the next meeting on July 25, 2006.

MARIA GARDENS/ Dave Stopper, Agent

Recommendation of the Site Elevations, Parking Lot Lighting, and Landscaping, of the addition of 22 parking spaces including 4 which are van accessible on the east elevation of the Maria Gardens building, located at 20465 Royalton Road, PPN 393-16-001 zoned R100

Mr. Huffman –Item Number Two, Maria Gardens. Please state your name and address for the record.

John Reyes, with Star Incorporated, 216 Montana Avenue, Lorain, Ohio. What we are doing here is we would like to add 22 additional parking spaces to the side of the new Maria Garden's plant sales building that they just did along this side. What we would like to do. . . Like I said, it is about 22 parking spaces additional to what they have now. Asphalt matching the re-pavement that we did out front. That is pretty much it, its more additional parking is what we are looking at here.

Mr. Huffman– Ok, so really its just that side parking area. The front parking lot area has already been approved.

Mr. Reyes – Yes. That is all done. That was approved initially with the new building that we did last year.

Mr. Huffman– Ok, I will move to the City, Fred, any comments?

Mr. DeHoff – No, none at all.

Mr. Huffman– Frank.

Mr. Bohac – No comments.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 3

Mr. Huffman– Tony.

Mr. Biondillo – The only issue, they had agreed to repair the fence on the east and west property line, neither one of those have been done to date. We just want it on record that they are in agreement that when this parking lot gets wrapped up that those fences will be taken care of.

Mr. Reyes – Yes they will straighten up the fences and then what they planned on doing is staining the fences to match the existing, the siding of the new building.

Mr. Biondillo – Ok.

Mr. Huffman– Ken.

Mr. Mikula – No additional report.

Mr. Huffman – Jennifer.

Mrs. Milbrandt – No additional comments.

Mr. Huffman– Bob

Mr. Hill – No comment.

Mr. Huffman– I have nothing either. It looks good, I'm glad you guys are doing it. The building looks good too. If there are no other questions or comments, I would entertain a motion for Maria Gardens.

Mr. Bohac – I motion to accept the Recommendation of the Site Elevations, Parking Lot Lighting, and Landscaping, of the addition of 22 parking spaces including 4 which are van accessible on the east elevation of the Maria Gardens building, located at 20465 Royalton Road, PPN 393-16-001 zoned R100.

Mr. Hill – Second.

Roll Call:

All Ayes

APPROVED

SANTO/GILLESPIE ITALIAN CARRY-OUT/ Scott Gillespie, Principal

Recommendation of the Site, Building Materials/Colors, Parking Lot Lighting and Landscaping, for the utilization of a 440 SF of space as a carry-out restaurant, property located at 10252 West 130th Street, PPN 398-12-019 zoned Local Business.

Mr. Huffman –Item Number Three, Santo/Gillespie Italian Carry-Out. Please state your name and address for the record.

Scott Gillespie, 4555 Summit Circle, Brecksville, Ohio 44141.

Mr. Huffman – Could you explain what you are proposing today.

Mr. Gillespie – Carol, you did receive, I am assuming from Matt Neff, the lighting and landscape plan. Ok, good. As I was out of town, I had Matt drop those off. If you have that available. What you have in front of you, the color photo's. These are the actual building. I took this building that was, I'll just pass this around so you can get a little history. This is what the building looked like last year. That was when it was formerly, we all remember it as a Furniture Nook and then the fellow owned it and he had some sort of short lived food store in there. This was, then I cleaned this building up, added the little entry feature to make it a sales office for my cluster development that is to the rear, its called Bexley Place. So what we did, we replaced the windows, the doors and what you see here in this building and what I've had is I actually had my son just photo shop a few elements on this to show the improvements that we are going to make beyond what it is now. Now he did not show the new parking lot and the lighting which is on your plan. We are going to do. What he showed was a signage with in talking with Fred DeHoff as far as the frontage of the building and the side of the building and what we are allowed, the square footage, I believe that it is all correct. So the front of the building and this a joint venture that I am doing with Mike Santo who owns the Italian Village to make this his, I call it the Italian Village II which is, it's a carry-out restaurant only. Its on the corner of Albion and 130th Street. Obviously we know where this is at. At the moment, we have agreed that the name should be Santos Italian Cuchino, which is obviously Italian for kitchen. This is not going to have any eat in dining but we are going to focus on obviously carryout and delivery as well. So we are trying to expand the operation a little bit to make it a little bit more user friendly. So the parking lot is going to be completely redone. We have met with his kitchen designer as far as the requirements for the vented hoods on the top of the building, which are these mushroom type units and so what I tried to do there is create a scalloped fence detail in white though so it matches the building façade rather than the fence detail which you see here also in your package, it is towards the end. This is the cedar fence that I actually had custom designed by Kalnich Fence. This is a cedar fence that we put all

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 5

the way around the outside of the Bexley Place. This is also going to be the dumpster, again consistency from not only the screening that is needed but, so what I wanted to try to do is mimic the scalloped detail that we did and hide the front and sides and rear because they set very very close, these units will actually sit up towards the front of the building right here. I don't know if you all can follow me on that. So rather than have something that wasn't fitting with the area and the fence that I did. I said well lets do a scalloped fence detail like we did around the project. So what you see added here in the photo shot is the detail on the top of the building, the signage which is in compliance with the code, as I understand it. The back of the building is going to be grassed and if you see your plan, is going to be cleaned out there, there's some old wall A/C's and that sort of thing there stuck on it. So all that façade is going to be, and I tried to show that here where we have some of the stuff that was added on again, photo shop, all I want is a clean façade across the back and in this area then, they make these coolers. These outside coolers that are going to go on a pad that are designed to fit up tight up against the building and that is going to be in the back area of this building. I've said all the parking lot will be redone, I've tried to keep a large grassy area around all the way around it. It's a building that today looks 100%, a lot better than it did a year ago and I think when its all done with the new lighting and also you have the lighting plan you have the down lighting, commercial type lighting that's noted on there. The new parking lot, I think it will be a tremendous improvement as we have already done with the corner of Bexley Place. I will say that the sign out in the front is going to be the same stone base as we use in the consistency in Bexley Place. If you have seen that, it's a natural stone. Its not a cultured stone. That is going to be a very low, again whatever the code says in terms of height, I believe we have it covered. I know that our sizing was correct so, that is my proposal and I would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Huffman – I was just curious, did the, the new look of the building does look good, 200% better than what was there before. Did that ever go before the City?

Mr. Gillespie – Actually, Tony and I got together. This was done as a temporary office. I said, this is what I am going to do. I am going to repaint the building and luckily we found a shingle that matched perfectly to the existing mansard shingle, we went through the Building Department, did the necessary improvements, 0 clearance entries all the sort of things that a commercial sales center would need to do. At the time, I told him when I'm ready to do the transition to this restaurant use, I'll be back before this Board. As far as the cosmetics of this. No, we never went to the Board as it was understood to be a temporary sales office and then when I make it the full use I was here. That is sort of the history of how we got here.

Mr. Huffman – Ok, alright lets go to Fred, well lets talk about the building first and then we will come back to the signs.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 6

Mr. DeHoff – Yes, the building looks good. He did it under a maintenance program. He just spruced it up. It didn't go before the board. He didn't change the footprint or nothing. He just did some outside maintenance on it. Put some shutters on it and stub windows and a door. The building is good. Do you want to get into the signs?

Mr. Huffman – Not yet. We will come back. Lets do a round with the building so that we can stay focused on that. Frank.

Mr. Bohac – The only question I have.

Mr. Huffman – And site, building and site.

Mr. Bohac – What I'm looking at is, the top here where you have the fence across the front and then you are going to have all this stuff on top. Shouldn't it also have, only because for the people that are behind it, I don't know how that is going to view for the people that are buying your clusters, if there should be one across the back also.

Mr. Gillespie – Good question. Here is my take on that. Right now I'm showing, if you look at this view, I'm showing that same fence detail coming, its 10 feet across and 10 feet back. Where these things sit on the front, if you get to the back of the building in all our development sits down quite a bit lower, we have a high, so I'm just giving visual. We have a high fence up on the hill, my houses sit down here and if you stand back there, I do believe it will be impossible to see it from the rear so my position is, if its not and Fred you come out, you say you know this thing is obvious you can see it, then I would add that same screening across the back. I thought for access and snow and all the things that start to happen, rather than, I would prefer to not completely enclose it. But if it has be to so be it.

Mr. Bohac – I don't mean completely, I don't mean sides but just front and back.

Mr. Gillespie – Yes, well front and sides and the back, yes I think we will be ok.

Mr. Bohac – No other questions.

Mr. Huffman – So this is currently on two sides. You've got that.

Mr. Gillespie – Three sides, front and both sides coming back.

Mr. Huffman – Ok.

Mr. Gillespie – Because on the side from the other thing, you may possibly see it but from the rear because it sits so far up on the building. . .

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 7

Mr. Huffman – Before I go on, the comment that I would have is that from the street, for the residents who pass by and see the building that is good. For the people that live in your development, it might be a problem to them but, its your people and I'm not sure what the City stands on. Ok. Tony.

Mr. Biondillo – The only thing Scott, one thing that may force that thing on where your mechanical equipment ends up within 10 foot of the edge of that roof, you are going to be required to put a guard rail against there. I know you are real limited in the amount of room that you have on that so you may end up putting that screen detail up there from a code standpoint.

Mr. Gillespie – Ok, across the . . . will this fence serve as the guardrail?

Mr. Biondillo – Right. As long at it meets the requirements, its got to be a minimum of 48" high but if you are within 10 foot of the edge of that roof with any of the equipment . .

Mr. Gillespie – We probably will be.

Mr. Biondillo – Right, you may consider incorporating that.

Mr. Gillespie – One of the things that we will do when we get out there with you is, because of snow and all the stuff that has a tendency to blow up, the mansard fortunately in the back, it rises up, drops and then comes back down so I wanted to actually keep that space a little bit clearer so blowing snow and that sort of thing, and I think you will agree when you see it, you are still not going to see it from the street because we are going to hold it up 6 to 8 inches with a clearer space and then that fence will be from the base to the top will be the 48 inches that you are looking for.

Mr. Biondillo – Alright, that's all I have.

Mr. Huffman– Ken.

Mr. Mikula – No report, I think that building looks nice. We did receive this site plan, detailed drawings last week and we are reviewing those in our office. Hope to get them done for Thursday's Planning Commission Meeting.

Mr. Huffman – Jennifer.

Mrs. Milbrandt – The only comment I have, the plant material has to be 2 1/2" caliper in terms of the tree. That is our minimum and the height on the confers I believe has to be 8 foot.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 8

Mr. Hill – Well 6 to 8 foot.

Mr. Gillespie – No problem, can we, 2 ½ inch. Also we are saving, there is some of those groupings there now are already out there, we tried to add to it.

Mrs. Milbrandt – This area in the front is mounded.

Mr. Gillespie – Very low mounded. Just to create some . . .

Mrs. Milbrandt – What we try to do is obstruct the view of the front of the cars.

Mr. Gillespie – Yes, I'm not talking about anything like that. I am talking about something like a 2 to 3 foot mound.

Mr. Huffman – To add to Jennifer's I think that if you could get that to 3 feet along this 130th, it would be helpful. You may have some dirt that you could just move over.

Mr. Gillespie – Oh, dirt is not the issue. I'm building 30 homes behind there. We have plenty of dirt.

Mr. Huffman – We have been trying to do that throughout the City to just kind of mitigate the level of the parked cars. As you drive by, you see the concrete and that is what looks bad. Once you get that out of the way, even seeing the cars is ok, its that big sea of pavement.

Mr. Gillespie – I agree.

Mr. Huffman- I realize, also, along 130th you are redoing that whole area to put the sidewalk in, there is very little grass or landscaping. So that would be a real good opportunity to do that. I realize along Albion, its mostly grass now, so you may not want to have to put dirt on top of grass and you've got some existing trees here you are probably trying to keep and across Albion is all wooded, so its not as if there is something there that's maybe some day there will be. Ok, Bob.

Mr. Hill – Nice job.

Mr. Huffman – My comments, I assume, well it looks like your demolishing that shed that is in the back.

Mr. Gillespie – Yes.

Mr. Huffman – There is a like a shed type roof on the backside of the building.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 9

Mr. Gillespie – Being demoed, its just block lean-to, a storage bin.

Mr. Huffman – Is there concrete slab under that.

Mr. Gillespie – I think that there is but it is coming out and we are pouring an all new slab for the coolers to sit on.

Mr. Huffman – So this is an all new pad, coolers and your, oh, the coolers are, what do the coolers look like?

Mr. Gillespie – You know, Its an external, they are white like a metal, I really can't describe it any better. They are rectangular, they snug up against the thing. They have a sloping roof on it. They seal up, the door actually seals up to the inside so it's a, I guess the word I'm going to use is nondescript. It doesn't have any kind of special, it's
...

Mr. Hill – From the factory.

Mr. Gillespie – From the factory, right. They come pre-made, they are just . . .

Mr. Huffman – The color if they are white, similar to the building they won't jump out at you.

Mr. Gillespie –No, they are not going to be some color that doesn't fit in with the scheme.

Mr. Huffman – They are aluminum. If they are white, that would be ideal.

Mr. Biondillo – what if we were to just screen it? With a fence on there.

Mr. Gillespie – That is what I was going to say, if they were an aluminum or they were something that wasn't that wasn't good, I have plenty of extra fence pieces. We actually made more than we needed so I've got a number, so if we need to actually put another piece of fence across that, I'd be happy, Tony we would get out there and look at it.

Mr. Biondillo – If you look at the site plan, you are not going to see it if you screen across the cooler, you've got fence across the back side of this, you are not going to see it anyhow.

Mr. Huffman – Further to the south side along Albion you might see it as you are pulling in.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 10

Mr. Gillespie – Maybe two extra pieces or something maybe needed.

Mr. Huffman – You can probably do that with landscaping, it looks like you are showing a couple of trees of some sort.

Mr. Gillespie – Yes, that is what that was all about.

Mr. Huffman – That I would recommend. Good idea. Your dumpster enclosure is 8 feet high?

Mr. Gillespie – Yes it is.

Mr. Huffman – You are using that same . . .

Mr. Gillespie – Same fence.

Mr. Huffman – That cedar fence?

Mr. Gillespie – Yes.

Mr. Huffman – Ok, good. Equipment is hidden. The moundings, I would like to see, especially on West 130th, that is what I would like to see. No more than 3 feet. Two feet is probably not enough, I would get it up to 3 feet.

Mr. Gillespie – We will take it as high as we can without having erosion issues in this space that we have to use it in.

Mr. Huffman – Like CVS pharmacy would have been nice to get that up a little bit higher but . . . Ok, lets move on to signs.

SANTO/GILLESPIE ITALIAN CUCHINA/Scott Gillespie, Principal

a) Recommendation of a 4' x 7' (28 SF) externally illuminated wooden Wall Sign with crème background and black, maroon, violet and green copy to be located on the side of the building;

b) Recommendation 6' x 9' (54 SF) externally illuminated wooden Wall Sign with crème background and black, maroon, violet and green copy to be located on the front elevation;

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 11

c) Recommendation of a 6' x 10' (60 SF) externally illuminated wooden Ground Sign with 18" stone base, having crème background and black, maroon, violet and green copy for property located at 10252 West 130th Street, PPN 398-12-019 zoned Local Business.

Mr. DeHoff – Ok lets start with the side sign, the one that is facing Albion Road. He is allowed 40% of the frontage which is 28 SF for the side street sign. He is proposing 28 SF, the sign height is 4 feet high which is permissible so that sign is ok. The one facing Albion Road there is no problem with. Lets go to the front sign on West 130th. He is allowed 70 ½ feet and he is proposing to use up 54 feet, the only problem is he has the sign height at 6 feet and the max for City code is 5 feet. So if you can reduce that down to 5 feet.

Mr. Gillespie – We are talking the one along West 130th there?

Mr. DeHoff – Yes, the West 130th one.

Mr. Gillespie – Down to 5 feet?

Mr. DeHoff – Five feet, that is the maximum height you can go.

Mr. Gillespie – The height of the maximum. Are you allowed to grant, I think it would look better centered on that wall.

Mr. DeHoff – You could make it wider if you want but the height. . .

Mr. Gillespie – The height is 6 feet off the ground floor.

Mr. DeHoff – Oh, no I'm not talking off the ground floor, I'm talking about . . .

Mr. Gillespie – The height of the sign?

Mr. DeHoff – Yes, on the building.

Mr. Gillespie – What do I have there, then I have the, what did I have on that? What did I write down? 6 x 9, it won't be any bigger then 6 feet I promise you.

Mr. DeHoff – Six foot high, that sign could only be 5 feet.

Mr. Gillespie – Oh, 5 feet. I'm sorry, I'm not, I'm with you now.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 12

Mr. DeHoff – The sign itself, I don't care how far you get it off the ground.

Mr. Gillespie – So the 70 SF front sign that I am allowed, which right now I'm at 6 x 9, right?

Mr. DeHoff – You are at 54 SF right now. You are within the square footage but the sign itself, the height of the sign can only be 5 feet.

Mr. Gillespie – I'm going to try again. Its fine but the proportion of the oval, you don't want this long thin oval.

Mr. DeHoff – Yes, however you want to do it.

Mr. Gillespie – Is this Board allowed to do that? Or not allowed to make that . . .

Mr. Huffman – You would have to get a variance.

Mr. Dehoff – We are talking a couple . . .

Mr. Mikula – If you wanted a 6 foot high, you would have to get a variance, if you say its going to be 5 foot then we can approve it.

Mr. Gillespie – I will tell you right now it will be 5 foot.

Mr. Biondillo – Scott if you look at in proportion to that door, that door is only, that door is 6' 8" high, you have to be right at around 5 feet as it is, if you look at your front elevation. Its got to be real close to that. Look at it in relation to the window, that window has to be about 5 foot tall.

Mr. Gillespie – Ok. It'll be 5 feet.

Mr. DeHoff – Then last but not least is the corner ground sign. Once again its within the triangle, it has to be within that triangle. I think we talked about that 35 foot.

Mr. Gillespie – That 35 foot clearance.

Mr. Huffman – You have to be outside the triangle.

Mr. Gillespie – I showed that on the one plan, yes, here it is.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 13

Mr. DeHoff – That one again you have it at 6 foot maximum height and it can only go 5 feet.

Mr. Gillespie – Ok, so 5 foot maximum height.

Mr. Hill – You have a base under that sign too, don't you.

Mr. Gillespie – Yes, I have, what I had planned on that sign was a base of about 18 inches of stone.

Mr. Hill – That base is pretty heavy.

Mr. Gillespie – Cut the base down and the maximum height of the sign is then 5 feet off the elevation of the land. Ok, 5 feet maximum, elevation height of sign.

Mr. Huffman – The plan says 5 feet by 10 feet sign and what does the application say? 6' x 10'.

Mr. DeHoff – If you cut it down to 5' x 10' you are within code.

Mr. Gillespie – 5 foot max elevation of sign. Well do.

Mr. DeHoff – Normally we would like to see the address on the edge of the sign but I notice that you have it on the front of your building here. So if that is 4 inch letters on the front of the building that is in lieu of putting it on the sign.

Mr. Biondillo – You are allowed up to a 1 foot base excluding that 5 foot height limitation correct?

Mr. DeHoff – No, they got it in the code.

Mr. Hill – He can meet that easily here.

Mr. Gillespie – I can make that work.

Mr. Huffman – To add to that comment that the building so close to the intersection, all of this, you can't miss the signs on this building. No matter what size they are.

Mr. Gillespie – I'm not sweating it at all. Yes, that building, when everything is all done with it, all the signs, I mean I was happy to know that I could get the number of signs

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 14

that I could get. That is why I did not even try to push the square footage, its cause I don't think its necessary.

Mr. Huffman – To take that further Fred, you show one on the back of the building, I believe.

Mr. DeHoff – No that's the side.

Mr. Gillespie – No, that is the side towards Albion.

Mr. Hill – No, you show one on the north side too don't you?

Mr. Gillespie – No, just, there are three signs, this is towards Albion, that is the south side, this is towards 130th, that is the facing towards the east.

Mr. Hill – I thought I saw another one by that sidewalk.

Mr. Bohac – That is the street sign.

Mr. Gillespie – That, you know what, my son did this, he should have, it probably been pushed a little bit more forward because the front of the building is right here. In other words, that's . . .

Mr. Hill - that is the sidewalk.

Mr. Gillespie – No sir, that's, there is a sign here, there is a sign here, there is no sign here.

Mr. Hill –What is this?

Mr. Gillespie – That is this picture of this side of the building right here.

Mr. Hill –What is this?

Mr. Gillespie – That is a walk that he added on originally, we knew that the, we didn't know that the walk was going to be cur linear like that . . .

Mr. Hill – That is why I thought that it was here.

Mr. Gillespie – I understand now.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 15

Mr. Huffman – That was why I thought it was on the back also.

Mr. Gillespie – You know, you don't see these things until somebody else looks at them. I guess I didn't recognize that.

Mr. DeHoff – No further comment.

Mr. Huffman- Frank.

Mr. Bohac – No other comments.

Mr. Huffman – Tony.

Mr. Biondillo – No other comments.

Mr. Huffman – Ken.

Mr. Mikula – No further comments.

Mr. Huffman – Jennifer.

Mrs. Milbrandt – No additional comments.

Mr. Huffman – Bob.

Mr. Hill – No comments.

Mr. Huffman – There is an existing wall air conditioning unit on that south side, is that coming out?

Mr. Gillespie – It will be coming out.

Mr. Huffman – Ok, one other comment, no the signs look good and I like the consistency of the oval and that, very nice. I forgot to ask about the light poles in the parking lot. Do you know what color those are going to be?

Mr. Gillespie – I believe they are sort of that bronze color. Its sort of brownly bronzy kind of colors what its going to be.

Mr. Huffman – What about the height?

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 16

Mr. Gillespie – I think they are 20 feet. From the top, the fellow told me they would have to be to get that illumination.

Mr. Huffman – That is fine, I just didn't see the height, is there a Zakrajsek report? We have no report from the . . .

Mr. Hill – That is up the to Planning Commission, he has to go the Planning Commission so you should have that report by Thursday.

Mrs. Oprea – I told you have to submit with Zakrajsek but you went with your own lighting guy.

Mr. Gillespie - What is the Zakrajsek?

Mr. Hill – He is the City's Electrical Engineer that review these.

Mr. Gillespie – I'm sorry, I misunderstood, I thought Zakrajsek was some designer or something.

Mr. Hill – He is over in Brecksville. If you just drop it off.

Mr. Gillespie – So I can drop this off to Zakrajsek? Is that what I need to do? Ok.

Mr. Hill – Tell him you need it by Thursday.

Mr. Gillespie – Alright, I will do that. I'm sorry, I misunderstood.

Mr. Huffman – Alright, there are three light poles.

Mr. Hill – Where are the light poles?

Mr. Gillespie – Where are the light poles? There is one right here, there is one right there and there is one right over here. There are three. Can you see those on that plan?

Mr. Huffman – Yes, are there any wall packs on the building?

Mr. Gillespie – Wall packs on the building, no, we have under the eaves now we have recessed cans shooting down onto the sidewalk.

Mr. Huffman – Alright, thank you. Can I have a motion?

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 17

Mrs. Milbrandt – I motion to accept the Recommendation of the Site, Building Materials/Colors, Parking Lot Lighting and Landscaping, for the utilization of a 1,628 SF of space as a carry-out restaurant, property located at 10252 West 130th Street, PPN 398-12-019 zoned Local Business. Subject to the trees being 2 ½ caliper, lighting also being approved by the City’s Lighting Engineer and the mounding along West 130th Street.

Mr. Bohac – Second.

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

Mr. Huffman– If there are no other questions or comments, I would entertain a motion for Santo Gillespie Italian Cuchina Signage.

Mrs. Milbrandt – I motion to accept the Recommendation of a 4’ x 7’ (28 SF) externally illuminated wooden Wall Sign with crème background and black, maroon, violet and green copy to be located on the side of the building; and Recommendation 5’ high proportioned sign externally illuminated wooden Wall Sign with crème background and black, maroon, violet and green copy to be located on the front elevation; and Recommendation of a externally illuminated wooden Ground Sign with a maximum height of 5 foot, having crème background and black, maroon, violet and green copy for property located at 10252 West 130th Street, PPN 398-12-019 zoned Local Business.

Mr. Hill – Second

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

INTERNATIONAL KARATE CENTER/ Jeff Ellis, Principal

Recommendation of the Site, Building Elevations, Building Materials/Colors, Building and Parking Lot Lighting, and Landscaping, of a new 5,293 SF Retail Building to be used as a Karate Center, to be located on Pearl Road, PPN 393-37-052 zoned General Business.

Mr. Huffman – Before we get started why don’t both of you just give your names and addresses for the record.

Jeff Ellis, 13500 Pearl Road.

Andy Riel, 19120 Old Detroit Road, Rocky River, Ohio.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 18

Mr. Huffman – Ok, go ahead and explain, I know there have been revisions so walk us through the changes.

Mr. RiieI – I guess the latest development is that the retention has been relocated to the rear of the property. Storm sewer will be running along the north property line to the retention at the west end of the property and then it will drain across the residential property into a natural creek. I guess Engineering has approved or is looking at it right now. Reviewing it right now for that layout. Because of that we are going to have a landscape mound in the front with landscaping on it. That is about it for the latest go round.

Mr. Huffman – Ok, Fred, any issues?

Mr. DeHoff – No report.

Mr. Huffman – Frank.

Mr. Bohac – No comment.

Mr. Huffman – Tony.

Mr. Biondillo – If the revisions you made to the detention basin, if that impacts that lighting plan that was submitted, you'll have to resubmit. I didn't see that it would.

Mr. RiieI – No, it doesn't change the lighting at all.

Mr. Huffman – Ken.

Mr. Mikula – No report. It looks good. We are reviewing the detailed Engineering plans for Thursday's meeting.

Mr. Huffman – Jennifer.

Mrs. Milbrandt – My only comment was with the landscaping located around the back side. You have spec'd arborvitae. I would recommend . . .

Mr. RiieI – I didn't landscape, I have an extra copy.

Mrs. Milbrandt – I would recommend an alternate species. Maybe a spruce, we are just worried about it being deer food. The arborvitae that are spec'd there.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 19

Mr. Hill – There are probably a lot of deer back there. I don't know that the arborvitae will be ok.

Mr. Riigel – They will like it?

Mr. Bohac – That and white pine.

Mrs. Milbrandt – So I would go with maybe an alternate species, maybe a spruce.

Mr. Riigel – A spruce or a . . .

Mr. Bohac – Norway spruce or Blackhill spruce.

Mrs. Milbrandt – Blackhill spruce maybe.

Mr. Ellis – Do those trees grow shorter or will they grow tall?

Mrs. Milbrandt – They will grow tall and they will be very bushy.

Mr. Hill – Austrian Pines are pretty touchy.

Mr. Riigel – Is Austrian Pine alright.

Mr. Bohac – They are pretty touchy though, to first start them. Once they are established they are a good tree.

Mr. Hill – You could intersperse them.

Mr. Ellis – Andy, where would those go?

Mrs. Milbrandt – Right on the back detention area.

Mr. Riigel – In the back. Eight evergreens back there to screen.

Mr. Ellis – So that would serve as a good buffer.

Mr. Riigel – So Spruce tree or Austrian Pine?

Mr. Bohac – Yes, if that is what you wish. If that is what you want.

Mrs. Milbrandt – No additional comments.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 20

Mr. Huffman – Bob.

Mr. Hill – No comment. I have a question, did we approve this building?

Mr. Riigel – Yes.

Mr. Bohac – It was just for the landscape plan and the retention to come back.

Mr. Riigel - And for the dumpster.

Mr. Huffman – Ok, you won't have a dumpster on yours.

Mr. Ellis – Correct.

Mr. Huffman – Maybe later.

Mr. Ellis – Correct.

Mr. Huffman – Ok, my comments, I guess, I appreciate your having the mounding up front. This is the landscaping from before that is being proposed, right?

Mr. Riigel – Yes.

Mr. Huffman – I believe that this new drawing does not show any . . .

Mr. Riigel – This is just a site drawing with the dimensions. That is the landscape drawing.

Mr. Huffman – Ok, good. This mounding, how high is it?

Mr. Riigel – Three feet, it will kind of vary and zig zag through there.

Mr. Huffman – That is good, 3 feet works pretty well. That is enough to hide the fronts of the cars but not, but allows the entire building to be very visible. Ok. No other comments, looks good. Motion please.

Mrs. Milbrandt - I move to accept the Recommendation of the Site, Building Elevations, Building Materials/Colors, Building and Parking Lot Lighting, and Landscaping, of a new 5,293 SF Retail Building to be used as a Karate Center, to be located on Pearl Road, PPN 393-37-052 zoned General Business.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 21

Mr. Bohac – Second

Roll called

All Ayes

APPROVED

THE RAVINES/JOHN BEHRA, AGENT

Recommendation of a new 78" x 72" (39SF) Internally illuminated Ground sign with olive green background, lavender copy stating "the Ravines", Saybrook Sage background with purple copy with white and yellow logo stating "bebeautiful", red copy stating "David's Bridal" and white copy stating "After Hours" with black box and white copy stating "formalwear" located at 17970-17986 Pearl road, part of PPN 396-12-001 zoned General Business.

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

John Behra, with Boyer Signs at 21611 Tungsten, Cleveland, Ohio 44117. You have a revised drawing. The drawing should be dated 6/1/06. Should be right in this corner.

Mr. DeHoff – I don't have one, mine says 5-3-06. Oh, 6-1-06 revised, ok. I got that.

Mr. Behra – This particular ground sign, the overall height is 5 feet, that is within code. It just has the third panel. That the variance allows. Otherwise it's the same, it's the same colors, the same design.

Mr. Huffman– Ok, Fred I will go to you first.

Mr. DeHoff – Yes, they did get the BZA approval for that third tenant space. They lowered the sign down to 5 foot they are going to be pretty low with the existing sidewalk so they meet those requirements, I have no problem.

Mr. Huffman – Frank.

Mr. Bohac – Are you satisfied?

Mr. Huffman – You are satisfied.

Mr. Bohac – No comment.

Mr. Biondillo – Just for point of clarity, where is the height established from, the sidewalk elevation?

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 22

Mr. Behra – The sidewalk, yes.

Mr. Biondillo – Ok, alright. No further comments.

Mr. Huffman– Ken.

Mr. Mikula – No comments, I think it looks ok.

Mr. Huffman – My comments, its very nice looking sign and I appreciate your adjusting to comply with the code. I can see also, that it apparently moved further west in order to avoid the slopes.

Mr. Behra – Yes, because we have a flatter spot there.

Mr. Huffman– You have the address on both sides so. Jennifer.

Mrs. Milbrandt – No additional comments.

Mr. Huffman – Bob.

Mr. Hill – It just appears that the address number are pretty big, aren't they?

Mr. Behra – They are 4 inches. The address is 4 inches.

Mr. Hill – These are only 4 inches?

Mr. Behra – Yes, it may look like they are bigger because we kind of, we had to shrink it down. So it takes up more of that area there.

Mr. Hill – Well, proportionately wouldn't look better if they were not quite as big?

Mr. Biondillo – They have to be a minimum of 4 inches by our standards.

Mr. Hill – Ok. That is it.

Mr. Huffman – To come back, let me just verify, the colors, out of curiosity, this greenish color, does that match the fascia of the building? Is that the same color?

Mr. Behra – Yes it is.

Mr. Huffman – Ok, and the brick is the same?

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 23

Mr. Behra – Is a match too.

Mr. Huffman – Good, that is what I assumed when I was out there. That is very nice.

Mr. Behra – If you look on our sign details on the bottom there it says base. It says base to match building. Wilksborough.

Mr. Huffman – Ok, good. Alright. Go ahead Bob.

Mr. Hill – One minute, this is perpendicular to the street?

Mr. Behra – Yes.

Mr. Hill – Why wouldn't you put the address on the edge that is parallel to the street?

Mr. Behra – When you are driving down the street, you are going to have more of a view of the side of the sign then you are of the actual front. You see the actual front, you have to be right in front of it.

Mr. Huffman – Plus with those horizontals running across the front it would be kind of difficult to put the numbers in there.

Mr. Hill –I pass.

Mr. Huffman – Ok, can I have a motion please.

Mr. Bohac – I motion to accept the Recommendation of a new 78" x 72" (39SF) Internally illuminated Ground sign with olive green background, lavender copy stating "the Ravines", Saybrook Sage background with purple copy with white and yellow logo stating "bebeautiful", red copy stating "David's Bridal" and white copy stating "After Hours" with black box and white copy stating "formalwear" located at 17970-17986 Pearl Road, part of PPN 396-12-001 zoned General Business.

Mr. Hill – Second

Roll Call:

All Ayes

APPROVED

LASER & MASSAGE THERAPY/ Kirk Miller, Agent

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 24

Recommendation of a 3' x 9'-9" (29 SF) internally illuminated channel letter Wall Sign having red copy and trim, black returns and yellow graphic on a white raceway for property located at 17840 Pearl Road, PPN 394-25-001 zoned General Business.

Mr. Huffman –Item Number Six, Laser & Massage Therapy. Please state your name and address for the record.

Shelia Mangano, Global Signs & Graphics, Inc., 10147 Royalton Road, Suite M., North Royalton, Ohio 44133.

Mr. Huffman– Please describe the revisions you've made.

Mrs. Mangono – We had to change the, this is what the amendment is all about, Terry Properties has, it is very self explanatory. If you want me to read it I can.

Mr. Huffman – You can summarize it, I suppose.

Mrs. Mangono – I think the third paragraph really says it, "Mr. Terry respectfully request an amendment to the original program to allow a set of 13" high neon channel letters on one line. It was brought to my attention that 2'-0" high letters for **Laser Massage Therapy** would be 25'-0" overall length and would not fit on the 20'-0" storefront." That is why he is asking for the amendment for the 13" high.

Mr. Huffman – So at this point, we are looking at the revising the Master Sign Program for this tenant only.

Mrs. Mangono – Yes, that is my understanding. Then he in essence said that he will for any tenant, future tenants coming up, he will look at that before he decides on the next size for the next sign.

Mr. Huffman– Ok, well we can certainly discuss it and vote on that to change the Master Sign Program. I don't see an issue with that. One thought, I was just wondering if, well let me ask this Fred before we do that. Does the width as submitted here fit within the sign program?

Mr. DeHoff – Yes.

Mr. Huffman – Does, if that, is that a sun? What is the logo?

Mrs. Mangono – Yes its there, its supposed to be a sun I guess. A star burst.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 25

Mr. Huffman – If that logo were 24” high and your lettering were what you are proposing, 13”, would that, is that something you would consider? Not that I am suggesting that you do that.

Mrs. Mangono- No, I really couldn’t answer that. We would have to go back to Mr. Terry again.

Mr. Huffman – That is the way you would be able to comply with the code as is and not have a revision to the sign program.

Mr. DeHoff – You would still need a revision because it says the letters, it says the letter have to be 24 inches not the logo.

Mr. Huffman – Letters have to be, alright, strike that from the record. Ok, alright, well lets, I will go around the table real quick as far as any discussion and then I will look for a motion to revise the sign program. Fred.

Mr. DeHoff – No, its good, this is what I asked them to do and they did it.

Mr. Huffman – Frank.

Mr. Bohac – If that is ok with the City then its ok with me.

Mr. Huffman– Tony

Mr. Biondillo – No comment.

Mr. Huffman– Ken.

Mr. Mikula – No comment.

Mr. Huffman – Jennifer.

Mrs. Milbrandt – No comment.

Mr. Huffman– Bob

Mr. Hill – No comment.

Mr. Huffman – I have none either so. Maybe Carol wants me to though, I will think of something. I would entertain a motion for a revision to the Master Sign Program.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 27

Mr. Lengal – Six feet with the 36 inch addition to keep it within the footage of the front of the building.

Mr. Huffman – So you are adding on to this sign. You are leaving the existing one up?

Mr. Lengal – Yes.

Mr. Huffman – Then you are just adding another . . .

Mr. Lengal – Putting a white sheet all the way across.

Mr. Huffman – So you are adding more box. Is that a reface or is that a new sign.

Mr. DeHoff – It's a reface with a update, you would call it.

Mr. Huffman – Ok.

Mr. Hill – Tim would you pass that down, we don't seem to have that here.

Mr. Huffman – We had that from the last meeting. Ok, I just wanted to get that clear. Fred.

Mr. Dehoff – He is allowed 40 SF, he is going to wind up using 24 SF and it did cut down all that copy they wanted to put in here. They have it dressed up, Sky Roofing and the skylight specialist is what he is allowed per the code. Other than that, I have no more comments.

Mr. Huffman – Frank.

Mr. Bohac – No comment.

Mr. Huffman– Tony

Mr. Biondillo – No comment.

Mr. Huffman– Ken.

Mr. Mikula – I have no comments on it.

Mr. Huffman – Jennifer.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 28

Mrs. Milbrandt – No comment.

Mr. Huffman– Bob

Mr. Hill – No comment.

Mr. Huffman– Could you pass it back, to see if I had any. So it is going to be off center. The existing one is centered over these two doors and you are adding on to the sign. If you were replacing the whole sign, I would center it over the doors like the existing one is.

Mr. Lengal – That is what we suggested and its money.

Mr. Huffman - And I appreciate the revision because this has too much on it. This looks much nicer. Alright, I would entertain a motion for Sky Roofing.

Mrs. Milbrandt – I motion to accept the Recommendation of a 3' x 8'-10" (24 SF) internally illuminated box Wall Sign with blue copy stating "Sky Roofing" and red copy stating "Skylight Specialist" on a white background with black trim for property located at 11037 Prospect Road, PPN 392-17-001 zoned General Business.

Mr. Bohac – Second

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

MAD CACTUS/ Dan Krukemeyer, Principal

Recommendation of a 4' x 8' externally illuminated Ground Sign having red double mounted raised letters with black trim and raised dimension cactus art work on beige stained cedar boards for property located at 9175 Pearl Road, PPN 395-16-004 zoned Motorist Service.

Mr. Huffman –Item Number Eight, Mad Cactus. Please state your name and address for the record.

Russell Sysack with the Mad Cactus, we are the people building it, he is the one putting it up. You guys wanted me to draw a site plan where its going. I met with Fred, the Assistant Building Commissioner, we plotted it out together and he says we are ok.

Mr. Huffman– So the revised drawing is, has been submitted. Fred any comments?

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 29

Mr. Dehoff – No we went out and did it. Its not like a right triangle, it turned out to be an isosceles triangle, its on a right angle. He falls right within it. He is good. Height wise, he's 4 – 4.5 feet, he is allowed 5. He is 8 feet wide and he is allowed 10 so he is well within the limits of it. Other than that I have no further comments.

Mr. Huffman– Frank.

Mr. Bohac – If Fred is satisfied, I'm satisfied.

Mr. Huffman– Tony

Mr. Biondillo – No further comments.

Mr. Huffman– Ken.

Mr. Mikula – No additional comments.

Mr. Huffman – Jennifer.

Mrs. Milbrandt – No comment.

Mr. Huffman– Bob

Mr. Hill – The address numbers are on here.

Mr. Sysack – Oh yes, that, we have to put that on the sign.

Mr. Huffman – That wound up on the side, on the ends right?

Mr. Sysack – Yes that is where its going to be. On the end.

Mr. Huffman – Ok, and I have on further comments. I would entertain a motion for Mad Cactus.

Mr. – I motion to accept the Recommendation of a 4' x 8' externally illuminated Ground Sign having red double mounted raised letters with black trim and raised dimension cactus art work on beige stained cedar boards for property located at 9175 Pearl Road, PPN 395-16-004 zoned Motorist Service.

Mr. Hill – Second

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 30

Roll Call:

All Ayes

APPROVED

PAT CATAN'S CUSTOM FRAMING/ Lou Belknap, Agent

- a) Recommendation of a 16" x 14'-8" (19.54 SF) internally illuminated channel letter Wall Sign having red copy, and trim stating "Custom Framing";
- b) Recommendation of a 16" x 11'-8" (12.99 SF) internally illuminated channel letter Wall Sign having red, blue, yellow and green copy with matching trim for property located at 14225 Pearl Road, PPN 396-17-114 zoned General Business.

Mr. Huffman –Item Number Nine, Pat Catan's Custom Framing. Please state your name and address for the record.

Lou Belknap, with MC Signs, 8959 Tyler Blvd., Mentor, Ohio 44060. I'm here for Pat Catans Custom Frames at 14225 Pearl Road. We actually have two different layouts that we are looking at. One side of the store is going to have, they are taking over another section of that property.

Mr. Huffman– Is it all one store though?

Mr. Belknap – Its one store yes.

Mr. Huffman – Its an expansion.

Mr. Belknap – Its on the drawing I gave you. As far as the building. Basically they are taking over another 7,000 feet. This is the main store and heading towards Pearl Road, they are taking over this space where CVS was at which was 7,000 SF and it will be one store. They are doing different items in that store so that's why Mr. Catan wants to put custom framings on one side of the store fascia and art supplies laid out over the other side of the boxed in area of the store. They will be flush mounted letters, neon letters similar to what he has up there now on the Pat Catans, says floral and bridal stuff over there. That one just says floral.

Mr. Huffman – And crafts.

Mr. Belknap – Right. So everything is going to be similar to what he already has existing on that side and also existing as the other tenants that's like Radio Shack and I think the bank and stuff down there all have the same type of letters. The neon channel letter plastic faces, everything is flush mounted to the building, no raceways. So that is

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 31

what he is asking us to do for him. You have Radio Shack, Quick Copy, Super Tan and Ohio Savings. They all have similar type letters.

Mr. Huffman– Ok, so it sounds like these two signs are identifying additional services and products that are within this store similar to crafts and floral and they are not identifying a store. Pat Catans is the building identification sign. Fred.

Mr. DeHoff – This has got to be unique thing as far as the code goes. Does the store have a separate address? Will it hold the old CVS address?

Mr. Belknap – I'm sorry.

Mr. DeHoff – Is this going to have a separate address or will it hold the old CVS address?

Mr. Belknap – I would think for tax purposes it does yes.

Mr. DeHoff – They only way you can do this legally for code, it would have to say Pat Catans, Art Supplies or Pat Catan's Custom Framing. It would be like a separate store because it has a separate entrance, a separate address.

Mr. Huffman – It will have, maintain that entrance?

Mr. Belknap – Yes.

Mr. DeHoff – You can't have Custom Framing and Art Supplies both, you would have to say Pat Catan's Art Supplies or Pat Catan's Custom Framing. I think that would be in line with the code. The only other way out would be to go to the Board of Zoning Appeals and get these put down as two additional signs. That would be my suggestion.

Mr. Huffman – You can listen to our comments about them if that helps make your decision.

Mr. Belknap – Well that is something I would have to take back to Mike Catan and let him know but I don't think it would be a problem for him to do that. Its just another item that we would have to do. As far as I know, the building is split up this way so I don't see why he would not use this, keep that as an address. Because his plan is not showing a walk through taking part of the wall out or something so they are going to have an access from one side to the other.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 32

Mr. DeHoff – Yes, all those stores are connected by a walkthrough as long as they get a separate . . .

Mrs. Milbrandt – Yes he does.

Mr., Belknap – Does he? This particular plan he gave me does not show that on here.

Mrs. Milbrandt – The last time I was in there it looks like there was an opening.

Mr. Belknap – So they are going to have access from inside the store to the other store. Ok. Unfortunately I don't have that. No to answer your question I didn't. I know they have photographs of the existing that is there and I don't have that on me.

Mr. Huffman – Lets go through, we will go around and provide our additional comments and then . . .

Mr. Bohac – I have a question, whether is was relevant or, I have been around Strongsville for a long time but, was this always when they built this a one store situation?

Mr. Hill – That I don't know.

Mr. Bohac – In other words if this at one time was two separate entities.

Mr. Hill – There is only one entrance.

Mr. Bohac – I understand that but what I am saying is years ago.

Mr. Huffman – As I recall, that was a grocery store before Pat Catans and Pat Catans added on to it, to the front, and provided that whole new entrance and this of course was CVS Pharmacy, these two bays I believe.

Mr. Bohac – I know that it was a Pick N Pay at one time. It knew that.

Mr. Huffman – So its still one store, two bays.

Mr. Bohac – Ok.

Mr. Huffman– In fact I think Catans did a nice job with the whole center building that metal roof, its very nice.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 33

Mr. Bohac – No other comments.

Mr. Huffman – Tony.

Mr. Biondillo – No additional comments.

Mr. Huffman– Ken.

Mr. Mikula – I really think it looks fine, its just a matter or complying to the code. That is my only comment.

Mr. Huffman – Jennifer.

Mrs. Milbrandt – No additional comments.

Mr. Huffman– Bob

Mr. Hill – I have a couple of questions. We don't have anything that shows the signage on the main building, correct?

Mr. Huffman – Not with us but I can certainly describe it to you. Pat Catans is 4 feet high, its red letters, its got bronze, red trim and bronze returns. The Floral and Crafts are up on the side there which in my recollection never came before ARB but . . .

Mr. Belknap – Actually they are in my camera, its in the car.

Mr. Hill –That's alright. The other question, are you painting the background of this art supplies a different color then is on there?

Mr. Belknap – No. I think the reason it looks blue is because they had to white it out because on the image, the photo's they had the Red CVS.

Mr. Hill – Oh, Ok.

Mr. Belknap – So the photo image, it didn't come out right.

Mr. Huffman – Blanked it out getting rid of CVS then the color didn't quite match.

Mr. Belknap – Right.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 34

Mr. Huffman – Then the other signs in this shopping center vary, there is a Radio Shack next door that is white and red, bronze returns and then you go down and we have the bank, blue and white letters . . .

Mr. Belknap – Blue and white right, Super Tan.

Mr. Huffman – Super Tan is red with red trim and bronze returns. CQ Printing is white and blue, CQ is in white and Printing is in blue.

Mr. Belknap – Yes, there is an array of color that is out there. The biggest issue that we have is the code compliance as far as the name.

Mr. DeHoff – Yes, everything looks good. Code compliance.

Mr. Hill – I think if you add Pat Catan on here its going to get way to busy.

Mr. Belknap- I think that is probably why he did not want to do that over there. Because its going to crop it all up again.

Mr. Huffman – Overall my comments are, they look good positioned in those bays. It looks like its separate stores and if those were going to be names of stores that's beautiful and the colors in Art Supplies is fine with me. It is just the code is the issue whether or not we would approve something that does not comply with code.

Mr. Belknap – Yes, see I, even if he had a choice, if he said well lets just keep it under the main Catan's address, I'm not so sure that the City would allow him to change because its already allocated address to each store front. So I don't know if he has the option to say well, I'm taking that address off of this, you know what I am saying. The Post Office has already got all this information, I don't know if they can just say we are not using this address anymore. If they take it as one store, I don't know if that going to really make any difference.

Mr. Huffman – I'll just suggest this and there is a number or opinions here but, I'm just one. I would suggest that you table it and you talk with the Catans and talk with the Building Department in terms of what the code is and how you can best comply with it. If you can't comply or don't want to comply with it then you go for the variance. In the mean time I'll look through it to so I can get a better understanding of how this fits.

Mr. Belknap – Other than that we have no issue as far as the type of letters, the colors. Just maybe food for thought. Throw it out to you this way. I don't know how Mike would feel about it at all but if they were to put the name like Pat Catans or Pat Catans in a pin letter under the under canopy on the wall.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 35

Mr. Huffman – That is still a sign though Fred isn't it?

Mr. DeHoff – Yes.

Mr. Huffman – If it were in the window . . .

Mr. Belknap – That's what I mean, put the name Pat Catans down here so its not cropping this together or something of that nature, they would have the store name on the wall and not illuminate it, maybe just do something.

Mr. Huffman – I think you need to work with the Building Department as far as the code is concerned.

Mr. Hill – When you work with them I would look at this, this is part of the Pat Catan building, correct? You have the main building and you have this wing. They are, the code allows whatever service is being offered by this building correct? So I think if you look at it that way it probably could.

Mr. DeHoff – Yes, if you could consider that one sign Pat Catan's Custom Framing and Art Supplies if it was more together it would be considered one sign because you are allowed to put down the name of the thing and the services.

Mr. Hill – That's . . .

Mr. DeHoff – This being spread out like that, I don't know if you can consider it one sign.

Mr. Hill – It's a little unique but it is part of their building.

Mr. DeHoff – Yes, that is absolutely true.

Mr. Hill – These two things are part of their service.

Mr. Huffman – Lets say if you were like Lowes or Wal Mart or Home Depot, I just using a bigger box situation. If they had signs all the way across their building, lets say, we'll use Wal Mart because they don't but Wal Mart and then they had One Hour Photo and Deli and Bakery and Garden Center and all that all the way across their building as long as it still fit within the frontage, is that acceptable?

Mr. DeHoff – That is another unique situation.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 36

Mr. Hill – Well . . .

Mr. Huffman – That is kind of what that is equivalent too, is Custom Framing . . .

Mr. Hill – Tim, CVS they have the identified the building then their services are there.

Mr. Huffman – They do not have that on their building, we did not allow it.

Mr. Hill – I thought we did, some of it.

Mr. Huffman – They just have CVS Pharmacy on two sides and then they've got some things with the drive thru pharmacy area.

Mr. Bohac – I have a questions, if, would he be allowed to leave these signs the way they are if he put on the door, Pat Catans?

Mr. Hill – I don't think that is necessary.

Mr. Bohac – I am just, I mean to get it you know. . .

Mr. Hill - I mean everybody, see he's the one, if you really look at it, its Pat Catans business so if he is going to advertise that way, he would want it on here, I would think. I think everybody knows that it is part of Pat Catans.

Mr. Belknap – I know Mike just didn't want to put a lot of extra signage up there. He just wanted to keep, to add on to what his services are for that facility. I know that was a concern he had. He did not want to put signs all over the front and duplicating what's already there. I know its one of his thoughts with our sales person.

Mr. Huffman – I think what you've heard from . . .

Mr. DeHoff – The code actually says for business uses such sign may also include the principal type of goods sold or services rendered, however, the listing of numerous goods or services, prices, sales items and telephone numbers shall not be permitted.

Mr. Hill – Correct. Well but these are two separate and distinct services. Custom Framing and Art Supplies.

Mr. Bohac – Right. Are you saying its legal?

Mr. DeHoff – If you read this now you've got to . . .

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 37

Mr. Bohac – Interpret it.

Mr. Hill – I think we should use some administrative judgment.

Mr. DeHoff – You are allowed to name it at the place which is Pat Catans and then it says you are allowed to include the principal type of goods sold and the services rendered.

Mr. Hill – Now Fred as far as these business units, they are within the are of limitations of the sign ordinance.

Mr. DeHoff – Yes, definitely.

Mr. Bohac – It doesn't says you can have four services, three services, five services.

Mr. DeHoff – It doesn't give you the numbers, no.

Mr. Hill – No, but here you have two distinct.

Mr. Bohac – So it would pass then.

Mr. Huffman – Then what was the bit about the numerous and how do you define numerous?

Mr. DeHoff – You don't, I mean if you have a little store front, you put 100 items on it. This is a massive area here.

Mr. Bohac – It's a big area.

Mr. DeHoff – Yes.

Mr. Bohac – It's a big area.

Mr. Hill – I think this is good.

Mr. Huffman – I think it looks good but I don't know that I could vote for it without reading through the code a little more carefully. I don't know if you could wait two weeks, you have a temporary sign up there now, which should help.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 38

Mr. Belknap – I know he had his, wanted his stuff up by the 12th. I'm not sure what it was, I know the sales person said he said some kind of dedication or something going on.

Mr. Bohac – They just put new lights on the place too. Pole lights up, replaced the old ones. They were doing that Sunday.

Mr. Hill – Why don't you make a motion.

Mr. Belknap – He had down there that he had wanted to try and hit the July 12th target for the install.

Mr. Bohac – Let me make a motion and see where we are on it.

Mr. DeHoff – According to the code, if you read it, it almost says you are allowed to do it. Because there is no definition of numerous and goods and services are allowed.

Mr. Huffman – Are you going to add in all the signs for the building?

Mr. DeHoff – I would suggest that we use the two signs that are here.

Mr. Huffman – Because if it is one store you've got to use the whole frontage I would imagine so you would include Pat Catans, Floral Crafts, Custom Framing and this within your frontage.

Mr. DeHoff – They are listing four services. Numerous, it doesn't define numerous.

Mr. Huffman – But has there been a calculation for the whole store though?

Mr. DeHoff – He is way, way within the limits.

Mr. Hill – But we are not concerned with, all we are concerned about is right here.

Mr. DeHoff – That is perfect. There is no problem with that.

Mr. Hill – The other did not meet code, it should have.

Mr. DeHoff – He is allowed 75 foot and he is using 14.

Mr. Huffman – Not for that whole store.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 39

Mr. DeHoff – 28 for this. He is allowed 75 for here and he is using 28 so he is way within the limits of his maximum usage.

Mr. Hill – Our function is to determine from an aesthetics standpoint if its acceptable. I think we are comfortable with the signs.

Mr. Huffman – I don't think Floral and Crafts are included in that square footage either. That was never here.

Mr. DeHoff – Yes, but that again is a totally different . . .

Mr. Belknap – That is on a totally different part of the building.

Mr. Huffman – I think it is one store not two or three stores. I just want to us to be within the compliance of the code.

Mr. DeHoff – Well, if you read this where it says numerous it doesn't give you the exact number for numerous. You are allowed to put down services or goods which they are doing.

Mr. Biondillo – It ultimately comes down to our decision. It will give me some time to review it a little closer and go from there.

Mr. Bohac – So I can't make a motion.

Mr. Biondillo – I think you can make a motion, we always have the ability to then recommend that we reject it. It then goes back to either the board or it goes to City Council, but I would like, I'm not opposed to making the motion and then take a closer look at it. I agree, I would like to calculate all that area across the front and see where that fits in and get a little better definition of the flexibility in the word numerous.

Mr. Bohac – I motion to accept the Recommendation of a 16" x 14'-8" (19.54 SF) internally illuminated channel letter Wall Sign having red copy, and trim stating "Custom Framing" and the Recommendation of a 16" x 11'-8" (12.99 SF) internally illuminated channel letter Wall Sign having red, blue, yellow and green copy with matching trim for property located at 14225 Pearl Road, PPN 396-17-114 zoned General Business.

Mr. Hill – Second

Mr. Huffman – Secretary, please call the roll.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 13, 2006
Page 40

Roll Call:

| | |
|----------------|-----|
| Mr. Mikula | Aye |
| Mr. Biondillo | Aye |
| Mrs. Milbrandt | Aye |
| Mr. Huffman | Nay |
| Mr. Bohac | Aye |
| Mr. Hill | Aye |

APPROVED

Hearing no further business. The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:40 a.m.

Timothy E. Huffman
Vice-Chairman