

STRONGSVILLE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES OF MEETING

March 20, 2007

The Architectural Review Board of the City of Strongsville met for Caucus in the Mayors Conference Room at the 16099 Foltz Parkway, on **Tuesday, , 2007 at 8:30 a.m.**

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

The following was discussed:

Taleris Federal Credit Union: Mr. Huffman was concerned that the tower looked out of proportion with the building. Mr. Mikula was concerned about the wall that was being proposed up front, he was concerned about the Police point of view regarding bank. Mr. Boron suggested fencing instead of the wall. Mr. Huffman stated that he felt that the tower was a little too tall for that building. He was interested in what was going into the glass area in the tower. Mr. Huffman asked Mr. Biondillo what the maximum height for the tower would be with the building codes. Mr. Biondillo stated 35 feet maximum. Mr. Hill stated 60 feet in that zoning district. Mr. Boron stated that he felt that the brick wall could be changed out to a metal ornamental fence.

AT & T – 14200 Albion Road: The board had no problems with this application.

AT & T – Olympus Way: Mr. Huffman stated that it sits way back off the road. He stated that this box was surrounded by a wood fence that matches the home right behind it. He felt that AT & T should follow through with that. Mr. Biondillo stated that it was originally in the right-of-way and that AT & T moved it back. Mr. Huffman stated that it should be surrounded by a wood fence similar to the existing one. Mr. Bohac stated that the homeowners paid for the fence not AT & T.

Westfield/Southpark Mall: Mr. Boron stated that this was a sign addition for the Five Guys Burger and Fries. He stated that the only possible issue was the awning signs but Joseph A. Banks has awning signs. Mr. Huffman stated that he felt that the little letters were not a big deal. He felt that they added some character.

Five Guys Burgers & Fries – Site Plan: The board was in agreement that the site plan looked good.

Five Guys Burgers & Fried – Signage: Mr. Biondillo stated that it meets code. Mr. Boron stated that he liked the burger and fries on the canopy.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 3

Mr. Boron –Item Number One, Taleris Federal Credit Union. Please state your name and address for the record.

Rob Kramer with PW Campbell, 109 Zeta Drive, Pittsburgh, PA 15238.

Mr. Boron – Lets start with the site plan first. There is an entrance on Pearl and then on Broxton. One of the questions was the low wall around the parking.

Mr. Kramer - Yes that is going to be masonry, right here. It will be a combination of the . . .

Mr. Boron – It's a split face?

Mr. Kramer – It is a split face.

Mr. Boron – Then with the brick columns.

Mr. Kramer – Then the brick and then it will also have precast caps. We also have along the higher wall across the rear in the residential area, the same material.

Mr. Mikula – How high is the wall that goes around the front?

Mr. Kramer – Thirty six inches high.

Mr. Mikula – If you could run that by the Police Department.

Mr. Kramer – They have already reviewed.

Mr. Mikula – They have reviewed that for visibility and people hiding behind that in a bank situation?

Mr. Kramer – Well we have the ATM machine on the building, which you will see is set back quite a bit further. They have already commented on this when we went for the variance for the parking.

Mr. Hill – That is why you put the wall in.

Mr. Kramer – Yes that was a requirement to shield the headlights.

Mr. Hill – Well you have a variance on the setback and to address that, which is very good.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 4

Mr. Mikula – Well if the Police are ok with it.

Mr. Boron – Ok, we will take the site plan right now and the landscaping plan. I will go around the Board and take some comments on that.

Mr. Boron – Frank.

Mr. Bohac – No comments.

Mr. Boron – Tony.

Mr. Biondillo – From Building, they meet the requirements for the accessible parking, their lighting plan has been approved and I guess the only other issue I have is the same thing with the Mall, the Police Department. We tried to screen the traffic from the headlights and then also help the aesthetics of the building but the Police Department is ok with that wall being solid, I don't have any other comments.

Mr. Boron – Ken.

Mr. Mikula – No additional comments.

Mr. Boron – Tim.

Mr. Huffman – I think on the back wall, zoning wise, is it required to have it turn the corner back here so this residence is shielded also?

Mr. Kramer – Well, actually this is commercial on this side so the abutting property would not necessarily have to be.

Mr. Biondillo – From a code standpoint it is only where it is adjacent to the residential zoning. I think it is a good idea if they could wrap that a little bit and help protect especially with the traffic blowing through there.

Mr. Huffman – It is one way traffic around there so in the evening you would have headlights there. Of course this gravel driveway there to the house must not be on their property, must be on the commercial property.

Mr. Kramer – This is the extent of the property right there.

Mr. Hill – Well could you return the wall?

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 5

Mr. Boron – Adding another section of wall down?

Mr. Kramer – How far do you want to go there?

Mr. Boron – Just where that section is.

Mr. Kramer – One, another section. Ok.

Mr. Huffman – I take it there are no dumpsters, right?

Mr. Kramer – No.

Mr. Huffman – The one that is beyond the landscaping plan, let me ask, is this strictly a handicapped ramp that is right here? Is that what that is?

Mr. Kramer – Yes.

Mr. Huffman- You have the, it is level with the surface and then they go up a ramp and onto a sidewalk right?

Mr. Kramer – Yes.

Mr. Huffman – Ok. The other thing, I am not sure how this is going to play out but you've got a tree here and you've got the light pole behind it. So my question would be, is that lighting going to be effected by that on the pavement?

Mr. Kramer – Well those are 25 foot high light poles. I suppose in time, depending on how quickly the tree grows, it could affect it. Are you suggesting that we eliminate the tree?

Mr. Huffman – No, I'm not sure and . . .

Mr. Boron – It's almost like this thing should be reversed.

Mr. Huffman – Yes that might be a better solution.

Mrs. Milbrandt – Yes that would be a good idea, just switch them.

Mr. Boron – It just seems that the tree would be blocking it after awhile. Shielding that light.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 6

Mr. Huffman – What color are your light poles? I saw in the book it was either black, white or bronze.

Mr. Kramer – I believe it was bronze, it should be checked in there.

Mr. Huffman – I saw arrows pointing to all three colors.

Mr. Kramer – Normally we use bronze.

Mr. Huffman – I see the note, advise.

Mr. Kramer – I guess what the suggestion was, what would you folks want to see?

Mr. Huffman – That building is bronze.

Mr. Kramer – Bronze is typically what we use.

Mr. Huffman – Ok. I think another item would be, I would like to see some more landscaping on the corner around the side. You've got that grass area and then you have the wall. I think that would be a nice place to get some landscaping.

Mr. Boron – Is there any landscaping proposed for the sign?

Mr. Kramer – We are not proposing, our application excludes the sign. Typically the credit union, whom ever they are going to use to do the sign design and all would be making application. We haven't included that. We have allotted an area for the sign. Ordinarily they may use a monument type sign as opposed to a large pole sign. I think that is why we left that area open and didn't landscape it for that reason.

Mr. Huffman – Yes, you will need the ground sign. I think this corner could use some attention, rather than grass and a wall, I think that is a place you really need to dress up.

Mr. Boron – At least some shrubs in front of the wall or something.

Mr. Huffman – That is where you want to apply. I think you really want to put a lot there. That will put attention to your sign, the wall I don't think is going to be real appealing. Normally we try to get some mounding but with that wall, I don't think you will need it, that will block the headlights.

Mr. Kramer – The wall was going to be in lieu of the plantings.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 7

Mr. Hill – I think in that pocket at the corner, you could do some plantings up against the wall. The rest of it I think is the way it should be.

Mr. Boron – Jennifer.

Mrs. Milbrandt – I had couple of things. On the south side of the property, I realize that there is a little area there that shows the neighboring trees and Tony I don't know if you are looking at the landscaping plan or not, are you familiar with that property there?

Mr. Biondillo – Somewhat.

Mr. Huffman – The gas station?

Mrs. Milbrandt – Yes. I was just curious as to what you felt about if they should put any shrubbery or anything to hide it a little bit but I don't know in terms of safety reasons if that would be something that you want to do or not.

Mr. Biondillo – I know that they have a sign, the gas station has a sign right there.

Mrs. Milbrandt – I mean more of the drive thru area sort of back there, on the one side you have the trash area and they have the tires back there and . . .

Mr. Biondillo – Right, you could do it there, we would not object to that if that is what you are asking.

Mrs. Milbrandt – From your client's perspective, there is typically storage area back in this area.

Mr. Bohac – Its not a pretty view from back here.

Mrs. Milbrandt – It might be something that you would like to consider. To have some additional screening in this area.

Mr. Kramer – Just between the tree that we have and the front area here?

Mrs. Milbrandt – Yes and that drive thru area.

Mr. Kramer – We are going to return that wall.

Mr. Boron – It probably just has to go back to the canopy.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 8

Mrs. Milbrandt – I was just going to say to the canopy because when you are driving, its not a very . . .

Mr. Kramer – It is the south elevation?

Mrs. Milbrandt – Yes.

Mr. Boron – We have 5 feet there.

Mr. Kramer – I don't know if you want to plant any trees along there. You probably want shrubs.

Mrs. Milbrandt – I don't know what you could do.

Mr. Bohac – How about some arborvitae?

Mrs. Milbrandt – Yes, that might be something to look at. The only other thing, we had talked about the fence but was that something that was decided in a different committee? To have something that was obstructing headlights?

Mr. Hill – Yes.

Mrs. Milbrandt – No additional comments.

Mr. Boron – Bob.

Mr. Hill – Looks fine.

Mr. Boron – Any of these additional landscaping items, are you ready for final Planning?

Mr. Kramer – We were going to submit after today for the Planning Commission.

Mr. Boron – All this additional landscaping items, can you get those revised and get them to Jennifer prior to your Planning Commission meeting?

Mr. Kramer – Sure, we can submit the plans here.

Mr. Boron – That way those get reviewed and I will be at Planning also to make sure that they are all there.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 9

Mr. Kramer – What we were going to do unless there were any major issues here today is go ahead and file for the next Planning Commission and so the plans that you see today, that will go into the Planning Commission won't reflect the changes that you requested. As long as we submit, you need the 10 copies or how many would you need?

Mrs. Oprea – Sixteen copies.

Mr. Mikula – That is for Planning Commission.

Mr. Kramer – I know but of these revisions? Do you still want 16 sets?

Mr. Boron – Yes they still need the 16 sets.

Mr. Kramer – Ok.

Mr. Boron – Ok, lets move on to the building.

Mr. Kramer – We talked about the materials that we are going to use on the different walls. The split faced block would be on the back but then we have this accent brick which will be this break line through here as well as the soldiers and the sills around the windows. We are using, we did not have a sample of it here, this will be just like a precast icon that will be a similar color to the split face, it will be in the tower area. The metal roof will be on the tower and this is the shingle that we are using, fiberglass shingle on the rest of the building. The EFIS which will primarily be in the tower here, as well as that fascia around the building will be this color here. This is the trim which will be for all the aluminum gutters and downspouts. This material here will be for the doors and windows, it's a champagne. This of course is the main brick with the standard mortar.

Mr. Boron – Frank.

Mr. Bohac – The tower, is that just a fake tower or is there office space up in there?

Mr. Kramer – No its not occupied, its just open up, its just the structure, its not accessible.

Mr. Hill – Is there any lighting in the tower?

Mr. Kramer – I believe we probably will have some lighting up in here. The fixtures will be either off the ceiling, something coming down.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 10

Mr. Hill – Illuminated?

Mr. Kramer – Yes it will be illuminated, yes.

Mr. Bohac – It looks good. No other questions.

Mr. Boron – Tony.

Mr. Biondillo – From Building, it looks good. It will be the Queen Mary of the buildings on that end of town.

Mr. Boron – Ken.

Mr. Mikula – I don't think that there is anything that I can add to that comment.

Mr. Boron – Tim.

Mr. Huffman – I appreciate how you have embraced that corner, you have oriented that tower to create a vertical element, addressing the corner. I am a little bit concerned about the proportion of the height of the tower versus how small the rest of the building is. I can easily see if there was a bigger building, the tower would feel comfortable, more like the Greens area and their shopping center. It just seems taller than it needs to be. I understand that you are trying to get the visibility and it really shows up but you don't see the building behind the tower elevation over on the right.

Mr. Kramer – We have done another project for Taleris with a similar tower. This is kind of a prototypical design for them. That is why the tower is the way it is. This is not the first design, we did another one for them about a year and a half ago.

Mr. Huffman – My sense is that it probably needs to be about 2 to 3 feet shorter. I guess I would have to see that proportion. Behind the glass in the tower, that is all open space to below and you will have fixtures up in the ceiling or suspended from the ceiling.

Mr. Kramer – Right.

Mr. Huffman – Those fixtures you want to make sure would not be a glare problem, so you are not seeing the light source from outside. It kind of depends on what kind the fixture is. You would not want to see the lamp itself.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 11

Mr. Kramer – No, I'm thinking normally what we will do in these towers is, in the ceiling up above we will put some down lighting in so that it lights it down.

Mr. Huffman – Oh. It looks like an opportunity to hang something nice in there. A pendant mounted decorative fixture.

Mr. Boron – Is that glass clear?

Mr. Kramer – Yes its clear.

Mr. Huffman – That would be my definite concern. I am glad you've toned down the door color, on the back. I was a little concerned but it is matching the trim which is good. Otherwise I think the building looks fine. I'm just a little worried about the proportion of that tower.

Mr. Kramer – So your feeling would be to lower it about 2 or 3 feet.

Mr. Huffman – Right, and the brick part too, that whole cap would probably want to come down. If you have a photo of your existing building that is elsewhere, that would probably help.

Mr. Kramer – Your feeling would probably be the same when you look at that one. It's a similar style building. It's the one thing that the client wanted is a tower to be a focal point. That is their personal decision, I had a tendency to agree with you however, I am not the one that owns the building so again we have gone through this on another project with them.

Mr. Hill – I don't think there is anything wrong. You get a pretty good perspective on this bottom left hand side. I don't think that is out of scale at all. It may be a little bit when you look at different elevations but certainly here in the front I think it works well. I don't know how it would look if you shortened it. I think that is too squatty.

Mr. Bohac – Yes, that is what I was thinking.

Mr. Kramer – Well, I think you would have to do it proportionately. You would lower this and lower this.

Mr. Huffman – Plus the one on the left, you are seeing more width than you always see. You are seeing two sides there. Up on the upper right you are only seeing one face. I think that the vertical aspect of that will be more obvious. The one in the lower left makes it look squattier because you are seeing more width of that tower.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 12

Mr. Kramer – Well, you have your roof lines coming in too at an angle. It just breaks up that overall vertical appearance.

Mr. Huffman – What really happens is that tower is out, the roof lines are low around the tower as you see over in the upper left. The roofs don't come into it except down low. It accentuates the height more I guess. I'm not sure what I can tell you to do about it. Ideally it would be nice to see another version and we all decide on which one is the better one, including yourself.

Mr. Kramer – Well, again we'd have to redesign around the client unless we have no other option as far as the City is concerned, I guess is what I am asking. I understand what you are saying.

Mr. Hill – We will get to that point.

Mr. Huffman – That is my only other comment.

Mr. Boron – Jennifer.

Mrs. Milbrandt – I think it look very nice. I think it will be a very nice addition to the area.

Mr. Boron – Bob.

Mr. Hill – I think its fine.

Mr. Boron – If there are no other questions or comments, I would entertain a motion for Taleris Federal Credit Union.

Mr. Bohac – I motion to accept the Recommendation of the Site, Building Elevations, Building Materials/Colors, Building and Parking Lot Lighting, Landscaping to be coordinated with Jennifer for additional landscaping for the proposed 2,362 SF Building to be used for a Credit Union; property located on the corner of Broxton Road and Pearl Road, PPN 395-07-001, 002, 003 zoned General Business.

Mr. Huffman – Second

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

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 13

Mr. Bohac
Mr. Hill

Aye
Aye

APPROVED

AT & T/ Thomas Fogarty, Agent

Site and Landscaping Plan Approval for the above-ground Equipment Cabinet and Cement Pad to be placed within a private easement on property located at 14200 Albion Road, PPN 398-10-081 zoned R1-75.

Mr. Boron – Item Number Two, AT& T. Please state your name and address for the record.

Wendy Bujnovsky, AT &T, 13630 Lorain Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. Boron – This is your new cabinet?

Ms. Bujnovsky – Right.

Mr. Boron – Is this the taller one or the shorter one going in?

Ms. Bujnovsky – This is the shorter one.

Mr. Boron – Frank.

Mr. Bohac – I do take care of that area. You are not going to touch anything except switching the box out?

Ms. Bujnovsky – I am adding a box.

Mr. Bohac – Oh, you are adding another box, so you are going to be pouring another foundation?

Ms. Bujnovsky – Right.

Mr. Bohac – There is a tree there.

Mr. Boron – It says, contract to excavate and move existing pine tree to the west 15 feet for placement of a new pad.

Mr. Bohac – No other questions.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 14

Mr. Boron – Tony.

Mr. Biondillo – No comments.

Mr. Boron – Ken.

Mr. Mikula – I think Planning Commission should handle the issues about notification and that sort of thing. From our point of view, for this Board, I have no other comments.

Mr. Boron – Tim.

Mr. Huffman – I think my only one would be, it looks like they are removing a tree. Can you just slide that one over?

Ms. Bujnovsky – I think that is what, we are going to save the tree and move it over.

Mr. Boron – It says they are moving that tree 15 feet to the west.

Mr. Huffman – I think this is a case where, with the grades that lead from the box down the sidewalk its tough to do much with this one. As long as we don't make it any worse than it is now. It seems to be screened from the residents but it is very visible from the street. All I can add is please move that tree, you will be fine.

Mr. Boron – Jennifer.

Mrs. Milbrandt – No additional comments.

Mr. Boron – Bob.

Mr. Hill – No comment.

Mr. Boron – The only comment I would add is as Councilman Daymut said, the City needs to notify these people, either Building or Planning, just noting that Mr. Daymut came in and said that. If there are no other questions or comments, I would entertain a motion for AT & T.

Mr. Huffman – I motion to accept the Site and Landscaping Plan Approval for the above-ground Equipment Cabinet and Cement Pad to be placed within a private easement on property located at 14200 Albion Road, PPN 398-10-081 zoned R1-75.

Mr. Bohac – Second

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 15

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

AT & T/ Thomas Fogarty, Agent

Site and Landscaping Plan Approval for the above-ground Equipment Cabinet and Cement Pad to be placed within a private easement on property located on Olympus Way Drive, PPN 392-30-034 zoned R1-75.

Mr. Boron –Item Number Three, AT & T, Olympus Way. Ms. Bujnovsky remains at the microphone. This one sets back off of Westwood quite a ways.

Ms. Bujnovsky – This is again adding another cabinet. In the screening aspect of it, I don't know if you received this, this is something I wanted you to see. We were thinking about doing, building this up if necessary with the same bricks that you have and then also taking down this side of the fence.

Mr. Bohac – There is a big tree in the front.

Ms. Bujnovsky – I don't know what we were planning on doing with that.

Mr. Boron – There was no note on that. It is probably too big to be moved.

Ms. Bujnovsky – We would remove that tree in this instance but I wonder if we wouldn't, what they are talking about doing is replicating this, extending this and doing the same thing.

Mr. Huffman – I think you are going that way aren't you? To the right?

Mr. Boron – This is the new cabinet isn't it?

Ms. Bujnovsky – I'm actually not sure about my directions. The new cabinet is going south of this one.

Mr. Boron – Yes, its going closer to the wall.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 16

Ms. Bujnovsky – Going closer, there is a residence here and right here is Westwood.

Mr. Mikula – Do you have an easement?

Ms. Bujnovsky – Yes we do. Actually this is falling within a utility easement versus a private easement. It is in this “J” space which is in . . . we are talking about moving in this area an extension of this. The easement reads that there is a 10 foot utility strip here and there. It is not depicted on this print but it is written.

Mr. Boron – Your extension is what? North or South?

Ms. Bujnovsky – South.

Mr. Boron – Ok, extension is south.

Mr. Mikula – This is one of the issues that were brought up. This is a case where there is a utility easement but its not like a separate purchased easement for one of these cabinets so when something shows up in that easement, it is a surprise to the person and if you are going to propose anything, like adding fence now on somebody’s property or extending fence and modifying some bricks in there. That kind of stuff should be signed off on by the homeowner and then brought to us. How can we really, this Board approve something that we are really not seeing officially. As far as like a fence or something like that. Not that its not all a good idea. I think that this is one of those that really look nice back there, hidden behind this fence but some of the concerns are that even though there is an easement, this would be a surprise to that homeowner.

Ms. Bujnovsky – What is it that you expect of me and that homeowner? What do you want me to do?

Mr. Mikula – I would suggest and this is just my opinion, that first of all, anything that you are proposing to do, such as move the fence, extend the fence or any of the brick work, that should be shown on a plan and given to us.

Mr. Huffman – On other easements, typically the go before the landowner, they must negotiate something.

Mr. Mikula – Right.

Ms. Bujnovsky – When you read this, its in this particular strip of land and it says that it shall include the right to remove trees and landscaping, including lawns within said easement etc. I mean I see it as my right to, I understand, It kind of already been set up

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 17

that I can utilize this and its not that there is no property land, this is a green space if you will. The small little strip.

Mr. Mikula – You are probably right about that but from what we look at from this Board and what we look at things like fences and brick work and things like that.

Ms. Bujnovsky – Right, you really need that plan.

Mr. Mikula – If you are proposing to do something with that, I think that is something that we should see.

Ms. Bujnovsky – It says on the number seven, they didn't give you a drawing, a depiction but it says that number seven construction note, the fence on the north side being removed. Why is it the north side?

Mr. Mikula – North side would be . . .

Ms. Bujnovsky – Well north sided will be removed and placed in line with the section of fence on the street side. A new section will have to be built for the north side once the pad is finished. We kind of said it but we just didn't give you a depiction.

Mr. Boron – There should be a picture of how this thing is going to be enclosed or how that all works.

Mr. Mikula – I would think that from Planning Commission they might want some sort of acknowledgment, you already have an easement so you don't have to buy an easement but they might want some sort of acknowledgement that property owner knows the they are going to have some changes in their front yard.

Ms. Bujnovsky – Ok.

Mr. Mikula – I don't know but that would have to come from Planning Commission.

Ms. Bujnovsky – Cities will frequently require us to put together either a letter or labels for residents in that general area. We just haven't had anything yet from you.

Mr. Mikula – The Chairman of Utilities and Franchises had a door hanger last night at the meeting so you might want to make contact with him and see what approach to take as far as that notification goes.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 18

Ms. Bujnovsky – I think we will have to clear that up to see what the level of responsibility is on our part to notify and how many people, how far do I go?

Mr. Mikula – It is just that person who it directly affects. From my point of view if we are talking about relocating a fence and modifying some brick work or stuff like that . . .

Mr. Boron – You will need to have a plan to show exactly what you are doing.

Mrs. Milbrandt – Can you tell if that is Olympia's property?

Mr. Bohac – it is going right into Olympia, its at the end of that first house on the right hand side.

Mrs. Milbrandt – So it would be just like notifying the Homeowners Associations.

Mr. Bohac – Well just those couple of people. I think this stems from a lot of people have been disgruntled with AT & T and now its coming to a head is what I see. Just like at Pine Lake things are getting out of hand, they are having these big things, driving either way, it looks like you are driving into an industrial parkway. You expect to see that on an industrial parkway.

Mr. Boron – We will Table this one until you bring a plan in to show exactly what you are planning to do.

Ms. Bujnovsky – Rather than going to another Planning Commission meeting on this?

Mr. Boron – This will be Tabled and you will have to come back to us with a new plan.

Ms. Bujnovsky – Ok, that was what I was wondering, what was our next step. Come back here with a new plan.

Mr. Boron – If there is any agreement or notification of the homeowners around the area just say that you are going to be installing a new fence.

Ms. Bujnovsky – If they notify, Ok.

Mr. Huffman – Does that fence belong to the homeowners or does it belong to whoever's box that is in?

Ms. Bujnovsky – I believe that this would be, again this was something that we installed to hide our equipment.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 19

Mr. Bohac – You installed the fence?

Ms. Bujnovsky – Yes, we installed the fence to hide the equipment.

Mr. Mikula – That may have been something that was agreed upon to get the easement.

Ms. Bujnovsky – That is true.

Mr. Huffman – I like the idea of matching the fence because it matches the fence, the neighboring house and fits in nicely and I think it's a good way of hiding these boxes. If you are going north, that surprises me, I was thinking you were going south. That wall, I think that guy living in that house needs to know that wall is being held up and then you do you have an issue of people falling off of it, now its kind of low, maybe a couple of feet, 2 to 3 feet high at the most. If you build that up another 6 feet.

Ms. Bujnovsky – We weren't sure, we will have to look at the grade. Whether or not, it's a matter of would it need it. It was a matter of if it needed it because of grade, if it had to build up then we could do that. I'll make sure that they just go back and look at the whole thing. They look at the grade, they look at replacement of the fence and additional bricks if needed.

Mr. Boron – I think we just need a more detailed plan.

Ms. Bujnovsky – I understand. This is kind of rough.

Mr. Bohac – Just so you know, AT & T did not pay for this fence, the homeowners of Olympia did because originally some one had planted some trees that died and they were fed up with the way it looked so they had a carpenter come in and put in the fence.

Ms. Bujnovsky – Ok.

Mr. Bohac – You guys did not put that in. I know that for a fact. I took care of Olympia, that is how I knew.

Mr. Huffman – If you could go south rather than north because you have that open lot, it probably belongs to the guy to the south.

Ms. Bujnovsky – We are going south.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 20

Mr. Huffman – The way you described it you are going north, you will remove the north fence and pad.

Mr. Mikula – That is a good point. You would have to get more easement. But that takes a lot of the notification out.

Mr. Bohac – You would be better going east. Go towards the back of the property.

Mr. Huffman – Or east, yes.

Mr. Mikula – That takes away a lot of the notification concerns because you would obviously have to contact that person to get more easement and then obviously they would be notified and be aware of the project.

Ms. Bujnovsky – I will look into it. Wasn't this property just sold? I think this property was just sold, a piece of his property was just sold, in fact it was going to be cut up.

Mr. Mikula – I think they did a lot split and split off the back piece. I don't know if it was sold but I think they did. Carol didn't they do a lot split?

Ms. Oprea – Not that I am aware of.

Ms. Bujnovsky – I heard that was what happened. That may have been what why we chose . . .

Mr. Mikula – That is true too. If that is a separate parcel and then you start to get more into the lot.

Mr. Huffman – Is it sold to Olympia?

Ms. Bujnovsky – It was really recently.

Mr. Mikula – This private owner of this piece on the corner, I think split that piece.

Mr. Bohac – The house has been renovated forever.

Ms. Bujnovsky – I will have to go look at it.

Mr. Boron – Ok, so we will table you and you will need to submit a more detailed plan. Thank you.

WESTFIELD/SOUTHPARK MALL/ Larry Powers, Agent

Revision to the Master Sign Program to add (2) signs and 5 awnings for Five Guys Famous Burger & Fries for property located at 500 South Park Center, part of PPN 396-20-001 zoned Shopping Center.

Mr. Boron –Item Number Four, Westfield/Southpark Mall. Please state your name and address for the record.

John Slagter, Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLP, 1375 E. 9th Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44114. Here representing Westfield/Southpark Mall requesting that we have the revisions to our Master Sign Program. There are two signs for this new tenant in addition to 5 awnings. They have the renderings here for you. This is Mr. Sethi from Five Guys and Mr. Schmitz who you may know is from ADA Architects. The two wall signs would be the actual sign that says Five Guys and the second sign is just a hair above this it says Burgers and Fries.

Mr. Boron – Then each canopy gets a sign.

Mr. Slagter – Correct.

Mr. Boron – Tony.

Mr. Biondillo – No comments, the only thing is could we get a complete new Master Sign Program for the mall? Ours has been revised so many times. I didn't get that Carol.

Mrs. Oprea – You got that in your packet.

Mr. Slagter – It should have been included.

Mr. Boron – Six pages and a plan with it.

Mr. Slagter – The signs that would be identified have the ovals M48 through M54. They should be attached to that.

Mr. Biondillo – I'm sure we got them. Fred isn't here and Fred must have it Carol.

Mr. Boron – Frank.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 22

Mr. Bohac – Well as long as it is covered in the Sign Program, I don't have a problem with it.

Mr. Hill – M50 through M54, those are on the awnings, correct?

Mr. Slagter – Correct.

Mr. Boron – Ken.

Mr. Mikula – I have no comment.

Mr. Boron – Tim.

Mr. Huffman – I have no comment.

Mr. Boron – Jennifer.

Mrs. Milbrandt – No additional comments.

Mr. Boron – Bob.

Mr. Hill – No comment.

Mr. Boron – If there are no other questions or comments, I would entertain a motion for the Revision to the Westfield/Southpark Mall Master Sign Program to add Five Guys Burgers and Fries.

Mr. Huffman – I motion to accept the Revision to the Master Sign Program to add (2) signs and (5) awnings for Five Guys Famous Burger & Fries for property located at 500 South Park Center, part of PPN 396-20-001 zoned Shopping Center.

Mr. Bohac – Second

Roll Call:

All Ayes

APPROVED

FIVE GUYS FAMOUS BURGER & FRIES/ Kurt Schmitz, Agent

Site Plan approval of a new 2,500 SF tenant space to be used for a Restaurant located at 500 South Park Center, Part of PPN 396-20-001 zoned Shopping Center.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 23

Mr. Boron –Item Number, Five Guys Famous Burger & Fries. Please state your name and address for the record.

Kurt Schmitz, ADA Architects, 17710 Detroit Ave., Lakewood, Ohio 44107. The good news is, there is almost zero impact on the site because we are not proposing any parking changes. To go over the site location, this is a site plan that we brought in and I can bring forward to the table. We are located off the primary road as you come in on the left hand side. I believe that we included in our package of rendering of the entire façade of the new addition at Southpark. We will be as you are pulling in, on the left hand side, we are a 2,500 SF user. As you can see in the rendering, we are next to Chipolte and then we go around the side of the new addition. Along side of Dillard's and its kind of important to note that Dillard's has the service corridor back here. We are really trying to put a focus on what we had exposed, the Cinemark goes above our building. As you can see, this is the theatre. Although we go back some 65, 75, 80 feet, we have about 40 feet that is actually exposed beyond the face of the actual theatre. What we have tried to do in our design and it was at Westfield's request in several night meetings, is to get to this point, was to create somewhat of a contemporary look, was the intent of what Westfield wanted us to do. There is also a requirement for the tower element which we worked painstakingly with them on getting something that is a little more contemporary than what we had initially come up with, design wise. The palate of materials that we are using is pretty extensive and it is all based around the mall brick, which is one of the requirements. I will quickly try to run through these without trying to step in the way. The red or the Jockey Red is the awning color, we chose to tone it down, its not a fire engine red, its more of a maroon, more a classical color, which is here. These two EFIS colors, we brought in to match the mall brick here. The mall brick, we are carrying the banding that currently comes across around the theatre, through our design. This is the lighter brick color which comes up to a stone capping here, which is also the same element here. We stepped the brick down to this height, matching the mall brick here which is consistent on this side of the entry way. You want to note, as of last week, we were going through the floor plan, going to a lot of fixturing and how you enter the space and seating and what not. There is a revision on this board from what you guys are going to see on your drawings. The door two weeks ago was underneath this element. One of the changes that we have proposed and Westfield has accepted and I am hoping that you will as well, is that we moved the doors to be their own element underneath this awning. It does tremendous things for us interior and I don't think it upsets the exterior. If anything I think it give a little more substance on that side of the tower to combat some of the glass that we have here. This was kind of a punched opening, now it seats on more of a presence.

Mr. Boron – It helps out your patio area too.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 24

Mr. Schmitz – It helps the patio area. It allows us to be a little more gracious with the way we come in to the patio in knocking this corner off a little bit. This line indicates what Chipotle's patio is doing so it allowed us to open up this throat a little bit. Give it a nicer feel with what we have on the patio. The material behind the Five Guys is in a luco bond metal panel. It has been used I noticed elsewhere in Strongsville. It is a nice clean contemporary look. The signage that we have, we are proposing black signage which at night turns white. I have a sample in my brief case. It is actually a black finish during the day, when the light turns on at night it turns white so we get the nighttime signage as well. The Burgers and Fries signage, we are strictly looking at doing black metal cut letters. That was actually at the request of Westfield Mall to give purpose to the canopy. They were also wanting us to give more of a personal scale from the sidewalk and the patio area. It was part of the reason for this signage as well so that we brought a more personal scale lower down into the patio area. This is not illuminated at night, its more there for decoration purposes then it really is for the signage purposes. Although I will admit, it is a benefit for us as well. These two EFIS colors is the banding that we wanted to create up here. We felt that since we only had 40 foot of our massing that we needed to get something to happen on that elevation, to break us away from the theatre and the mass of brick that was happening behind us. We wanted to introduce a little bit of EFIS. In this top color and match the brick but also allow it to be something different for an identifier for Five Guys. When we set this door in here, we changed the site proportions on either side of the door, if you want to take note of that. It did require us to pull this awning, this canopy in. You will notice on your renderings, it kind of takes over the tower. It really splits it in half where we wanted to get some of that verticality back. One because the door got wider we needed to pull these in. It was a win win situation design wise as well as function. I do hate to go to a meeting and ask for changes so these are a copy of what I am presenting today.

Mr. Boron – You will probably have to resubmit 16 sets for Planning.

Mr. Schmitz – Ok. That is just for your records. The glass that we do have does go above this canopy element. We've indicated with a different color from the aluco bond. The EFIS color that we've got on either side of the tower, part of the tower element are these two colors that match this. The black is indicating the store front material as well as the awnings. The framework we are going to have painted black as well. This is the aluco bond, this is the canopy, we've already talked about. The white material is a cementitious board, capping up here. We may also do that out of EFIS, depending on the construction detail once we get into that but that will be the color. We are not looking for a shiny appearance, we kind of wanted something white and dull to cap the element. The stone cap is for the transition of the brick here as well as the cap where the brick transitions into the EFIS. Outside of that, design wise, any questions we would be happy to try and answer.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 25

Mr. Boron – They only question I would have, the bottom portion around the patio area where the fence is going to tie into, is that brick?

Mr. Schmitz – Yes it is.

Mr. Boron – Ok.

Mr. Schmitz – This tie in, this is brick up above that.

Mr. Boron – So there is no EFIS down at the grade level?

Mr. Schmitz – Correct. We don't have any EFIS, this is the lowest point right by the entry. This is all brick and everything else is brick at a minimum up to the glass site.

Mr. Boron – Frank.

Mr. Bohac – Where is your door into the patio?

Mr. Schmitz – We have one door right there going into the patio area.

Mr. Bohac – Right there. No other questions.

Mr. Boron – Tony.

Mr. Biondillo – No comment, I even like the changes.

Mr. Boron – Ken.

Mr. Mikula – I agree, I like the changes. I think its going to look great.

Mr. Boron – Tim.

Mr. Huffman – I like the design. I like how you incorporate the brick and the entrance part where, I like the contemporary design. I thought maybe another option, I'm not going to have any objection to what you've done. Another option might have been if that canopy continued over the entrance. Maybe it was at an angle, came out at you a little bit to emphasize the entrance. I think the entrance wants to be in that tower. Seems like the original design. Now you have moved it over and if there was a better way to emphasize that entrance to the side might have been better. I'm not going to object to that, it's a nice design.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 26

Mr. Schmitz – We looked at pulling that canopy over and did a lot of different things. It ended up going with the canopy is creating a balance. We wanted to pull some of that color over and some of that massing as well. Probably the identifier is going to be the fencing. You are going to walk up to the element before seeing the door.

Mr. Huffman – It is pushed over.

Mr. Schmitz – It was a play of elements. I am impressed you mentioned that because it was one of the things we tried to tackle.

Mr. Hill – How do you access the patio?

Mr. Schmitz – We will have this door from the interior. Overall the entrance you come in, you go through the service line, this is all seating, you basically end up at this point with your food. You will have the option of going out onto the patio, exiting out through here. We've also maintained the 42 inch isle ways between seating areas so you would be able to go back into here and pretty easily get out the doors.

Mr. Hill – So there is no service out here. That is self-serve really.

Mr. Schmitz – Yes, right.

Mr. Bohac – So it is a cafeteria style place.

Mr. Sethi – You are all familiar with Chipotle. Its basically Chipotle style service.

Mr. Huffman – Get your food inside and then you so sit outside if you want.

Mr. Boron – Jennifer.

Mrs. Milbrandt – It looks very nice.

Mr. Boron – Bob.

Mr. Hill – I think its fine.

Mr. Boron – If there are no other questions or comments, I would entertain a motion for Five Guys Famous Burger & Fries.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 27

Mr. Bohac – I motion to accept the Site Plan approval the revised drawing submitted today of a new 2,500 SF tenant space to be used for a Restaurant located at 500 South Park Center, Part of PPN 396-20-001 zoned Shopping Center.

Mr. Huffman – Second

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

FIVE GUYS FAMOUS BURGER & FRIES/ Kurt Schmitz, Agent

- a) Recommendation of a 2' x 16'-7" internally illuminated Channel Letter Wall Sign having black copy, trim and returns; and
- b) Recommendation of a 1' x 14'-6" non-illuminated channel letter Wall Sign having black laser cut individual metal letters in mounted to the canopy below; and
- c) Recommendation of (2) 7" x 3'-1" awnings having red background and white copy stating "Five Guys"; and
- d) Recommendation of a 7" x 4'-10" awning having red background and white copy stating "Hamburgers"; and
- e) Recommendation of a 7" x 1'-10" awning having red background and white copy stating "Fries"; and
- f) Recommendation of a 7" x 3'-5" awning having red background and white copy stating "Hotdogs" for property at 500 South Park Center, Part of PPN 396-20-001, zoned Shopping Center.

Mr. Boron –Item Number Six, Five Guys Famous Burger & Fries Signage. Mr. Schmitz remains at the microphone.

Mr. Schmitz – The signage has not changed from the original submission. The signs we are talking about are the Five Guys up top. Those are individually internally illuminated letters and there is not a raceway.

Mr. Boron – So this is not on a raceway?

Mr. Schmitz – It is not, it is individual letters on a façade. We are also talking about the individual cut metal letters that are down here. Originally Five Guys typically would put it up here with this signage in more of a box sign type. In working with Westfield, we

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 28

decided to bring that down and put it on the canopy. For the architect in California it was more to give purpose to the canopy and bring that personal scale down to where the people are at. We also have five awning signs that are over the doors on each one of these canvas. Those again are for the signage for the personal scale. I don't think anyone is going to be out on Rt. 82 and looking at the mall and seeing the signage. I don't think anyone is going to walk into the mall and see the signage. I think it is more for, we have Dillard's kind of massing on our left side, I don't think anyone is going to be on the road, looking at and seeing the signage. I think it is again for the purpose of creating interest on the awnings and keeping down on a personal scale. We also feel consistent to what has been done out here similar to the Joseph Banks, having the signage down. Chipotle doesn't have the awnings but they came in with a nice emblem on their glass and again we feel that it is consistent with what is going on out there in trying to pull that down so we ask for approval as well. The signage isn't tricky, it's pretty straight forward. Which is part of the concept of Five Guys, its Hamburgers and Fries. We are asking for it, we feel that the Burgers and Fries is important to us, it is new to the area, there are 150 some stores along the east coast. Down there they know Five Guys, its not as know up here. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Boron – Tony.

Mr. Biondillo – From Building I think they have done a nice job with it. I like the Burgers and Fries over the top of the canopy and even on the red canopies. It gives that whole front and the patio area a very inviting look.

Mr. Hill –What about the Hot Dogs?

Mr. Biondillo – I'm not a Hot Dog guy.

Mr. Boron – Frank.

Mr. Bohac – If Tony approves it, fine with me.

Mr. Boron – Ken.

Mr. Mikula – I think it looks fine.

Mr. Boron – Tim.

Mr. Huffman – Signs look good.

Mr. Boron – Jennifer.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 29

Mrs. Milbrandt – Looks nice.

Mr. Boron – Bob.

Mr. Hill – I think its fine. I would have a suggestion, as far as the motion, that it include a thru f, just one motion.

Mr. Boron – We could do that. If there are no other questions or comments, I would entertain a motion for Five Guys Famous Burger & Fries.

Mr. Huffman – I motion to accept the Recommendation of a 2' x 16'-7" internally illuminated Channel Letter Wall Sign having black copy, trim and returns; and Recommendation of a 1' x 14'-6" non-illuminated channel letter Wall Sign having black laser cut individual metal letters in mounted to the canopy below; and Recommendation of (2) 7" x 3'-1" awnings having red background and white copy stating "Five Guys"; and Recommendation of a 7" x 4'-10" awning having red background and white copy stating "Hamburgers"; and Recommendation of a 7" x 1'-10" awning having red background and white copy stating "Fries"; and Recommendation of a 7" x 3'-5" awning having red background and white copy stating "Hotdogs" for property at 500 South Park Center, Part of PPN 396-20-001, zoned Shopping Center.

Mr. Bohac – Second

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

CITIZENS BANK/ George Dragon, Agent

Recommendation of a 1'-11" x 20'-1" (38.5 SF) internally illuminated channel letter Wall Sign having white copy grey PMS 242C trim and returns and 3630-83 Blush Red graphics for property located at 15312 Pearl Road, PPN 393-27-012 zoned General Business.

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

George Dragon, Cicogna electric & Sign Company, 4330 N. Bend Road, Ashtabula, Ohio 44004.

Mr. Boron – You are back with the revisions?

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 30

Mr. Dragon – Yes. I was reading and the new agenda needs to read 40 SF with channel letters.

Mr. Boron – The sign is actually 1'-11" x 20' 1" (38.50 SF)

Mr. Dragon – They are individually illuminated letters, LED letters, flush mount against the drivet. The drivet will be patched and the remote transformers inside the fascia basically what is there now. I

Mr. Boron – Tony.

Mr. Biondillo – Looks good, no comment.

Mr. Boron – Frank.

Mr. Bohac – Looks very nice.

Mr. Boron – Ken.

Mr. Mikula – Looks fine.

Mr. Boron – Tim.

Mr. Huffman – Both signs are well done. I appreciate the channel letters and especially the ground by going to the ivory that goes with the rest of the sign much nicer than with the Republic Bank on there.

Mr. Boron – Jennifer.

Mrs. Milbrandt – Very nice.

Mr. Boron – Bob.

Mr. Hill – I think its fine.

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

Mr. Bohac – I motion to accept the Recommendation of a 1'-11" x 20'-1" (38.5 SF) internally illuminated channel letter Wall Sign having white copy grey PMS 242C trim

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 31

and returns and 3630-83 Blush Red graphics for property located at 15312 Pearl Road, PPN 393-27-012 zoned General Business.

Mr. Huffman – Second

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

THE INDUSTRY SOURCE/ Robert Milburn, Agent

Recommendation of a 2' x 20'-2" (40.33 SF) internally illuminated channel letter Wall Sign having white copy and black trim and returns for property located at 17970 Royalton Road, part of PPN 396-12-1 zoned General Business.

Mr. Boron –Item Number Eight, The Industry Source. Please state your name and address for the record.

Rob Milburn with Boyer Signs & Graphics, 21611 Tungsten Road, Cleveland, Ohio 44117.

Mr. Boron – Please explain to the Board what you are planning to do.

Mr. Milburn – We have a proposal for the wall sign for the Industry Source. It is channel letters with white lighting inside. It will 40.33 SF, 24" and also they had a ground sign that they are replacing the plastic frontage which will be ivory.

Mr. Boron – These are individually mounted right?

Mr. Milburn – Correct.

Mr. Boron – Tony.

Mr. Biondillo – No comment.

Mr. Boron – Frank.

Mr. Bohac – If its ok with Tony, its ok with me.

Mr. Boron – Ken.

Mr. Mikula – No comment.

Mr. Hill - Where does this go? The ground sign?

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 32

Mr. Milburn – This replaces be beautiful.

Mr. Huffman – This one is different. This one is black. Is it going to be black or white?

Mr. Milburn – I guess they submitted this one now. I am sorry. I had a white one too and it came in with black.

Mr. Hill – What is the Industry Source? What do they do?

Mr. Milburn – I'm not familiar with that.

Mr. Huffman – I think the original submittal was just this. This came later?

Mr. Milburn – Correct. Well I talked to I believe Carol and the ground sign for the change wasn't a big thing. I'm not sure if it was supposed to come to you or not.

Mr. Boron – We can look at it and approve it. Is it white or black? Do you know?

Mr. Milburn – I'm going with the black because this is the one I had and this is the one I submitted, this is the one that came in.

Mr. Boron – The black will show up better. Ken.

Mr. Mikula – No comments.

Mr. Boron – Tim.

Mr. Huffman – I have no issue. I'm sort of glad you are going to black because I was worried that the white would not show up. I see After Hours down here. I'm not sure how well their's shows up. Maybe at night it show up. I have no objections, looks good.

Mr. Boron – Jennifer.

Mrs. Milbrandt – No comment.

Mr. Boron – Bob.

Mr. Hill – The tpestyle isn't, it looks like industry. David's Bridal and the others, there is a little more fancy.

Mr. Milburn – More elegance.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 33

Mr. Hill – I don't think it really matches.

Mr. Huffman – Be beautiful had that art to it.

Mr. Biondillo – Is the sign on the building black letters and then back lit white or . . .

Mr. Milburn – No, the light is coming through the letters, its supposed to be white.

Mr. Hill – This may be their corporate.

Mr. Huffman – Yes, that is what I'm guessing.

Mr. Hill – That is why I asked, what Industry Source does.

Mr. Boron – If there are no other questions or comments, I would entertain a motion for The Industry Source.

Mr. Huffman – I motion to accept the Recommendation of a 2' x 20'-2" (40.33 SF) internally illuminated channel letter Wall Sign having white copy and black trim and returns and their reface of the existing ground sign replacing the 5" tenant panel and having black copy stating Industry Source for property located at 17970 Royalton Road, part of PPN 396-12-1 zoned General Business.

Mr. Bohac – Second

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

PEARL VISION/ Shelly Bell, Agent

Recommendation of a 3' x 15' – 1" internally illuminated channel letter Wall Sign having green copy and duronodic bronze returns for property located at 10854 Royalton Road, PPN 396-11-003 zoned General Business.

Mr. Boron –Item Number Nine, Pearl Vision. Mr. Milburn remains at the microphone.

Mr. Milburn – They are requesting a 36" x 181.43 coming to 45.3 SF. It will be the green jewel light and its going to have a bronze pan around the sides. Its going to have the white neon inside so the green will show up better.

Mr. Boron – Tony.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 34

Mr. Biondillo – From Building, it exceeds the allowable area of our ordinances for the sign in relations to the frontage. You are proposing 45.35 SF and 37 SF is allowed. The Master Sign Program requires you with a single one row of letter to be 36” in height. If you were to go two 2 rows of letters you could have that 36” height but you would be able to reduce your overall square footage area of the sign.

Mr. Milburn – Ok, now there was an adjustment that came in and I’m not sure if she sent it in or not. This one brought it down to 36.9 SF. I don’t know if you received it.

Mr. Boron – What do we need to be at?

Mr. Biondillo – Thirty Seven point five square feet.

Mr. Huffman – They won’t make 36” high.

Mr. Boron – The sign height is 32.5”

Mr. Biondillo – Well, according to their criteria for their program its got to be 36”, it doesn’t say minimum or maximum it just says a height of 36”.

Mr. Boron – We could go with this sign, the only problem is that we have to deny it so that you can go to BZA for a zoning appeal to get the 36” sign and a variance on your square footage.

Mr. Milburn – I think the reason that they came in, they were thinking to get the square footage.

Mr. Biondillo – What does this one propose?

Mr. Milburn – That is 45.3.

Mr. Huffman – That is the one they sent in originally.

Mr. Boron – The revised gets you under the square footage but it doesn’t fall into the sign program.

Mr. Hill – The sign program says what? Thirty-Six? What is this?

Mr. Boron – 32.5 SF.

Mr. Mikula – So you could either go to the BZA or you revise your sign program.

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 35

Mr. Boron – That would require another meeting back here or go to BZA and get a variance for this.

Mr. Milburn – They will probably just go with the BZA.

Mr. Boron – Ok, we will have to deny you on this so you can go to the BZA.

Mr. Milburn – Ok.

Mr. Huffman – I don't think any of us have any objections to the sign itself.

Mr. Boron – The sign is fine. Its just code wise, we can't approve it.

Mr. Biondillo – It is easier to revise the sign program.

Mr. Bohac – Or you switch it to a double line like the one next door that you can see in the picture.

Mr. Milburn – It is probably not their logo.

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

Mr. Huffman – I motion to accept the Recommendation of a 3' x 15' – 1" internally illuminated channel letter Wall Sign having green copy and duronodic bronze returns for property located at 10854 Royalton Road, PPN 396-11-003 zoned General Business.

Mr. Bohac – Second.

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

DENIED

Architectural Review Board Minute
March 20, 2007
Page 36

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

Hearing no further business. The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:30 a.m.

William P. Boron, Chairman