

**STRONGSVILLE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
September 24, 2024**

The Architectural Review Board of the City of Strongsville met in the Building Department Conference Room at the 16099 Foltz Parkway, on ***Tuesday, September 24, 2024 at 9:00 a.m.***

Present: Architectural Review Board Members: Dale Serne, Chairman; George Smerigan, Ken Mikula, City Engineer; City Planner; Jennifer Milbrandt, City Forester; and Ted Hurst, Building Commissioner

Roll Call:

Members Present: Mr. Serne, Chairman
Mr. Smerigan, City Planner
Mrs. Milbrandt, City Forester
Mr. Mikula, Engineer
Mr. Hurst, Bldg. Comm.

Also Present: Mrs. Anderson, Administrator

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mrs. Anderson – You have had a chance to review the minutes of September 10, 2024. If there are no additions or corrections they will stand as submitted.

NEW APPLICATIONS:

1) **THE GREENS OF STRONGSVILLE, Wald & Fisher, Inc., Agent**

Recommendation for Revised Master Sign Program for the Greens of Strongsville, eliminating the limitation of colors for tenant branded signage as described in Section 5 of the Master Sign Criteria, property located at 18046-18400 Royalton Road for The Greens of Strongsville, PPN 396-11-001 and 396-11-003, zoned General Business

Architectural Review Board Minutes
September 24, 2024
Page 2 of 14

Mrs. Anderson – Item number one on the agenda is for The Greens of Strongsville. Please state your name and address for the record.

Marc Glick, 3311 Richmond Road, Suite 200 Beachwood, Ohio 44122

Mrs. Anderson – Please take us through a description of your project.

Mr. Glick – I am the manager of The Greens of Strongsville and I am here to talk about the Master Sign Criteria that is currently in place and why we are looking to have it removed from our plan for the shopping center. When these criteria's were put in place back in 1993, there was a drive for lifetime signs by the tenants. We did this at a number of our properties where we as the shopping center owner would dictate the type of sign that would go in for cohesiveness across the view of the center. Recently, over the past 15 – 20 years, tenants have really driven the process more than the landlords. They are looking for the branded type signs so that people may identify them quickly, whether it be by a logo, colors, and be able to identify them without even looking to see who is in a property. We've had several tenants come to us looking to do signs in their branded colors and they have been denied based on the City of Strongsville's Master Sign Criteria. We are here today to request that the color restrictions be removed so, that tenants can put their branded signs in. All signs will continue to come through ARB or the appropriate Board to be reviewed, we use channel letter signs and the goal is to keep the shopping center the first-class center, that it is today and into the future.

Mrs. Anderson – Are there any questions from the Board Members?

Mr. Smerigan – I think this makes sense because people want to use their corporate colors and I don't have any issues with it.

Mr. Hurst – I have no issue with eliminating the color restrictions.

Mrs. Milbrandt – I concur.

Mrs. Milbrandt – I motion to give a favorable recommendation for the Revised Master Sign Program for the Greens of Strongsville, eliminating the limitation of colors for tenant branded signage as described in Section 5 of the Master Sign Criteria, property located at 18046-18400 Royalton Road for The Greens of Strongsville, PPN 396-11-001 and 396-11-003, zoned General Business

Architectural Review Board Minutes
September 24, 2024
Page 3 of 14

Mr. Smerigan– Second

Roll Call:

All Ayes

APPROVED

Mrs. Anderson – The revision to the Master Sign Program, also requires approval from the Planning Commission and that would be the next step in your process. I will email you the packet for the Planning Commission, which includes the application and meeting dates and deadlines for submittal.

2) THE RESERVE II AT PINE LAKES VILLAGE, Scott Goldberg, Agent

Recommendation for replacing existing individual curbside mailboxes with centralized mailbox kiosks for Subdivision Phases 6A, 6B, 6C and 6D, property located at Pine Lakes Village SFD & CD, PPN 398-18-002, 398-18-004, and 398-23-019, zoned R1-75

Mrs. Anderson – Item number two on the agenda is for The Reserve II at Pine Lakes Village. Please state your names and addresses for the record.

Kathy Andrews, 13858 Glenbrook Drive, Strongsville, Ohio

Sam Smeznik, 13848 Woodhawk Drive, Strongsville, Ohio

Scott Goldberg, 5866 Broadview Road, Cleveland, Ohio

Mrs. Anderson – Please take us through a description of your project.

Mr. Goldberg – The cluster association is currently experiencing an issue with the individual curbside mailboxes. They are typically on a 4 x 4 pad and is a PVC construct. The previous Boards have given approval and we have received architectural approval by the City for the mailboxes in its inception, around 20 years ago. There were four phases involved, which include 6A, 6B, 6C, and 6D. The latest phase of 6E had two mailbox kiosks in one of the cul-de-sacs that handle the 26 lots in that phase. The earlier phases total about 75 mailboxes and we are now experiencing an issue with maintenance and our association is tasked with the maintenance of the mailboxes, landscaping and snow removal. The mailboxes are becoming problematic, you can't fix them because they are made out of PVC and when it breaks or snow gets in them from snow plowing, they break and it cost a lot of money to fix. This solution of ours is providing for a total of five kiosks and four of

Architectural Review Board Minutes
September 24, 2024
Page 4 of 14

them are 16 box kiosks and one is a 12-box kiosk and that would handle the 75 cluster lots. We have talked to a number of homeowners to determine the best placement and to garner support for doing this. The post office would like for us to do them all at once but we would prefer to stagger it for budgetary reasons, the post office is looking for us to come to the City for approval. There is a picture in your packet that shows the kiosks, which show 16 individually engraved addressed kiosks and that is what we are looking to do. The drawings show typically a 4 x 4 pad, which would be an empennage for most of these right off the existing parking area within an oval, except for one, which by nature of how the subdivision is laid out would need to be near one of the curbs.

Ms. Andrews – Two of them.

Mr. Smeznik – Yes, the one on Woodhawk and on Gleenbrook.

Mrs. Anderson – Are there any questions from the Board Members?

Mr. Hurst – I have a question pertaining to the mailbox on Woodhawk, being in between the two driveways.

Ms. Andrews - There is a current mailbox there now.

Mr. Hurst – You have to make sure that you are not obstructing the view backing out of this driveway.

Mr. Smeznik – That is my driveway. It really does not propose an issue backing out of the driveway because, it is in between the other two houses.

Mr. Hurst – My only concern is the line of sight.

Mr. Smerigan – The concept of going to the centralized boxes make sense, given the nature of the development. That was the only one I had a question on too, on all of the others you are next to parking spaces, which makes a lot of sense.

Mr. Smeznik – Can you give us a suggestion on another place to locate it?

Mr. Smerigan – No, I understand why you located it where you put it and I don't have a problem with that. When reviewing this it was the only one that stood out as being different from the others and you have something there already and have made sure that it is not creating an issue for those two homeowners.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
September 24, 2024
Page 5 of 14

Ms. Andrews – Actually, the mailman is one of the ones who suggested that spot.

Mr. Smeznik – I did speak to both homeowners and they are both okay with it.

Mr. Goldberg – The post office will not take action, until the City takes action first.

Ms. Andrews – The three ovals are technically owned by Pine Lakes umbrella association, which is common ground for them. We got a letter from them saying that they approve the project.

Mrs. Milbrandt – I motion to give a favorable recommendation for replacing existing individual curbside mailboxes with centralized mailbox kiosks for Subdivision Phases 6A, 6B, 6C and 6D, property located at Pine Lakes Village SFD & CD, PPN 398-18-002, 398-18-004, and 398-23-019, zoned R1-75

Mr. Smerigan– Second

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

3) THE RAIL CRAFT KITCHEN AND BAR, Letter Graphics, Inc., Agent

- a) Recommendation of signage for a 53 SF internally-illuminated Wall Sign having copper background and raceway; black graphics, text, trim and return; and a plastic frame for The Rail (east elevation), property located Southpark Center, PPN 396-20-005, zoned SC – Shopping Center
- b) Recommendation of signage for a 102 SF internally-illuminated Wall Sign having copper background and raceway; black graphics, text, trim, return, and a plastic frame for The Rail (north elevation), property located at Southpark Center, PPN 396-20-005, zoned SC – Shopping Center

Mrs. Anderson – Item number three on the agenda is for The Rail Craft Kitchen and Bar. Please state your name and address for the record.

CHRIS BUTDORF, 400 W. MARKET STREET, ORRVILLE, OHIO 44667

Mrs. Anderson – Please give us a description of your project.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
September 24, 2024
Page 6 of 14

Mr. Butdorf – The Rail is rebranding their menu, colors and whole nine yards. As part of the rebranding, the upside-down cow is going away and it will be more straight forward lettering to denote the larger menu that it is not just a burger bar anymore, they are calling it a craft kitchen. On the elevations, basically everything that you see is going away, including the cows and white lettering. The proposal is to repaint all of the siding a Sherwin Williams cooper color with black channel letters they are perforated so it will illuminate white at night.

Mrs. Anderson – Are there any questions from the Board Members?

Mr. Smerigan – I have no issues with the sign change or the color change.

Mr. Hurst – I do not have a problem with the color or change of the graphics. Have you reviewed these to see if they meet the zoning code?

Mr. Butdorf – All I know is that Mike, the owner of The Rail, sent this material to the landlord and he sent back a letter basically approving the recommendation. I don't know what the Master Sign Plan says for this particular property.

Mr. Mikula – He is just talking about the square footage.

Mr. Smerigan – If you look at it the sign itself is bigger; however, you are eliminating all of the signs that are on the awning so, the square footage is close to being a wash.

Mr. Hurst - I don't know what the Code says about the one wall sign or two wall signs because it is a corner business. I will have to review it.

Mr. Butdorf – I can't speak to specifics but I am pretty sure when the original signs were approved, the square footage was approved for both sides.

Mr. Hurst – I can approve the two signs, like for like without a problem. When we get into the square footage of each sign that is what I will have to look at.

Mr. Butdorf – One sign is 102 SF and the other one is 53 SF.

Mr. Smerigan – As I recall, when this was originally done, they had approval for multiple signs. If you take all of the signs and add up the square footage, you have to be close.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
September 24, 2024
Page 7 of 14

Mr. Hurst – I think with the total square footage you are fine but the sign itself is restricted in size for the wall sign. I don't know what it is in our Code and if there is a Master Sign Plan that may supersede everything.

Mr. Smerigan – There is a Master Sign Program.

Mr. Hurst – I don't have a problem with the size or the change and I have to make sure the sizes work. I will try to do everything to make sure that the size works.

Mr. Smerigan – You and I are on the same page. When we approved the Master Sign Program, they had originally wanted a freestanding sign. However, we gave them these extra wall signs in lieu of a freestanding sign.

Mr. Hurst – I will have to review it and I wanted you to be aware of it so, that when you leave here you don't think that everything is approved.

Mrs. Milbrandt – I motion to give a favorable recommendation a for 53 SF internally-illuminated Wall Sign having copper background and raceway; black graphics, text, trim and return; and a plastic frame for The Rail (east elevation), property located Southpark Center, PPN 396-20-005, zoned SC – Shopping Center

Mr. Smerigan– Second

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

Mrs. Milbrandt – I motion to give a favorable recommendation for a 102 SF internally-illuminated Wall Sign having copper background and raceway; black graphics, text, trim and return; and a plastic frame for The Rail (north elevation), property located Southpark Center, PPN 396-20-005, zoned SC – Shopping Center

Mr. Smerigan– Second

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

Mr. Butdorf – Mr. Hurst, what are my next steps?

Mr. Hurst – You can submit your application for a permit. I will review that to make sure the square footage works. If it does not work, I will come back to you to see what you would like to do, if you would like to go for a variance or reduce the size.

Mr. Butdorf – Thank you, it is much appreciated.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
September 24, 2024
Page 8 of 14

4) CORENO CONTRATOR UNITS, Greg Coreno, Agent

Recommendation of the building, site, elevations, material, colors, landscaping, lighting and photometrics to construct two (2) 10,000 SF storage buildings, property located on Foltz Parkway, PPN. 394-10-005, zoned General Industrial

Mrs. Anderson – Item number four on the agenda is for Coreno Contractor Units. Please state your name and address for the record.

Stephanie Whitman, 2850 B West Market Street, Fairlawn, Ohio 44333

Mrs. Anderson – Please give us a description of your project.

Ms. Whitman - We have two storage buildings and each building is 10,080 SF, one story units. Each of the units have mezzanines with a restroom underneath, an overcut door for ease of access for loading materials. The idea is to provide storage and also client meeting spaces for contractors. The site plan shows the proposed inlet and outlet areas, this is on a corner lot so, we would have two drives. One will lead to a dumpster on site and the other one has the retention pond nearby and we left space on the site in case Greg wanted to add a third building later, potentially with the same layout because the buildings are pretty modular. I have material samples if you would like to take a look at it. It is a straight forward design with rib siding and at the entrances we wanted to spruce it up a little bit with a wood tone material.

Mrs. Anderson – Are there any questions from the Board Members?

Mr. Hurst – On the north side of the building, Building A, you meet the 25' building setback by zoning. How will you meet the Building Code with it being within 30' of the property line? Will there be a three-hour firewall there?

Ms. Whitman – I was not aware.

Mr. Hurst – We need to take a look at that to make sure you meet the Building Code. The building review is going to pick up on the fire separation from the property line so, you need to look at that. George and I were talking and you may have to move the building east a little bit and to the south, in order to make that work. I think you can still make it work.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
September 24, 2024
Page 9 of 14

Ms. Whitman – Thank you for noting that.

Mr. Smerigan – It probably makes sense for you to slide it because, it changes the cost.

Mr. Hurst – There may be an exception in the Code that allows it but I am not aware of it.

Mr. Serne – You have the room for it.

Mr. Smerigan – Zoning wise you have no issues. I think you sent these to me earlier and I noted that.

Mrs. Milbrandt – In reference to your landscaping, there are several species that I have concerns about. All of the flowering dogwoods and the eastern hemlocks are going to be too sensitive for this site. Those are more residential; this area is going to be more prone to winds and I think you are going to have a lot of issues with those not surviving. Also, the black willow is a maintenance issue so, you might not want to consider that one because it doesn't have a high survivability. It has very weak wood so, they will be breaking constantly. The red hickory, I mentioned to you earlier, you will not find that in any of our local tree farms or nurseries especially in a 3" caliber, I don't even know where you would find that. The white ashes, they don't have those anymore because of the emerald ash borer in the State of Ohio. I would recommend that you come back with a revised landscape plan and the tree count is fine but none of these species will probably work, you will need something that is hardier. If you need me to make recommendations, we can come up with substitutions.

Ms. Whitman – Okay, I would like to hear your thoughts on recommendations.

Mrs. Milbrandt – In place of the hemlock, I would probably put in a black hills spruce or white spruce. I can make recommendations for you overall on things that are locally available.

Mr. Smerigan – As far as the materials and colors, I am fine with it and have no issues with the design or lighting. What you need to do is fix the landscape plan and you will need to take a look at the one setback issue.

Mrs. Anderson – Are there any additional questions?

Mr. Mikula – Are we tabling this request?

Architectural Review Board Minutes
September 24, 2024
Page 10 of 14

Mr. Smerigan – We can approve it subject to receiving a revised landscaping plan.

Mrs. Milbrandt – Which they can submit to me and I will forward it to Mitzi.

Mrs. Milbrandt – I motion to give a favorable recommendation for building, site, elevations, material, colors, lighting and photometrics to construct two (2) 10,000 SF storage buildings, property located on Foltz Parkway, PPN. 394-10-005, zoned General Industrial, Landscaping approval is pending the submission of the substitution of trees on the landscape plan

Mr. Smerigan– Second

Mr. Smerigan – As a point of clarification, since we do not have an issue with the actual landscaping plan and the number of trees. This would be for the substitution of trees to be approved by Jennifer.

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

Mrs. Anderson – This request requires approval from the City Planning Commission. I will email you the application and meeting schedule. You will also need to submit your full set of civil engineering drawings to the Assistant Engineer for review. Generally, with new construction she requires the drawings to be submitted three weeks prior to the meeting.

Ms. Whitman – I did drop off those hard copies of the civil drawings that we had at the time and I think our civil engineer has been in contact with her.

Mrs. Anderson – I believe she has been in contact with your civil engineer.

5) SMARTIK ACADEMY, Larsen Architects, Agent

Recommendation of site plan for parking improvements, photometrics and lighting for Smartik Academy, property located at 16939 Pearl Road, PPN. 397-09-036, zoned GB- General Business and R1-75

Mrs. Anderson – Item number five on the agenda is for Smartik Academy. Please state your names and addresses for the record.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
September 24, 2024
Page 11 of 14

Roman Dutka, 16939 Pearl Road, Strongsville, Ohio 44136

Halyna Dutka, 16939 Pearl Road, Strongsville, Ohio 44136

Ken Esry, 12815 Detroit Avenue, Lakewood, Ohio, 44107

Mrs. Anderson – Please give us a description of your project.

Mr. Esry – This is for an expansion of the existing parking lot for Smartik Academy. The expansion proposes forty-seven additional parking spaces with curbing and it is a concrete lot. There will be additional parking lot lighting, with four pole lights and most of the parking is in the back of the building. As you see on the site plan with four spaces for quick access on the front of the lot. We also have some landscaping that we are proposing on Pearl Road and we have some technical civil sight drainage that we are proposing with this as well. We had previously presented this site for the addition of fencing on this site and we gained approval for that and now we are going on to Phase II, with the parking lot.

Mr. Hurst – I do not have an issue with the parking lot. Did you look at the quantity of ADA spaces for this parking lot?

Mr. Esry – Three is the correct quantity and we meet the ADA requirements.

Mr. Hurst – The only other issue I may or may not have is regarding the pole lights. If they become a problem with the residential areas we may require shrouds on them. The new LED lights, although they may not spread light and the photometrics work; however, when you walk out the house it is like looking at the surface of the sun.

Mr. Esry – We talked about that.

Mr. Hurst – Once these are up, if there needs to be shrouds to protect the residents, I want that on the record.

Mr. Esry – The light fixture that we are proposing, if you look at the second sheet in the packet of the cut sheets, the light fixture is an extreme cut off light fixture. That shows that the light falls off and does not encroach beyond the limit of the site. If after the lights are installed and it becomes a problem, these fixtures are equipped with an optional and additional light shroud and we noted that on the drawings, specifically because we have talked about it a couple of times. I know everyone is a very sensitive to that.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
September 24, 2024
Page 12 of 14

Mr. Hurst – The LED's are so bright at the surface of the light and they are up in the air and because there are some residents, I wanted to make sure it was on the record.

Mr. Esry – Also, on the electrical site plan, we have a note on the plan to provide that, if needed. We wanted to make sure that we specified a light fixture and have that available, if it became an issue.

Mr. Smerigan – I am fine with the lighting in the parking lot, the only issue I had was with the landscaping.

Mrs. Milbrandt – I am not sure, if you are aware that we have a Pearl Road Corridor Program. It is required by every business that does any improvements to the frontage of their building. You will notice along Pearl Road that they have fence sections and landscape requirements, which has to be incorporated into the frontage of the building. Where you have the trees up here, you have to incorporate the Pearl Road Corridor Program, that was enacted by City Council and given to the Architectural Review Board to implement.

Mr. Smerigan – You will see it as you go up and down Pearl Road. It is the masonry columns with the black aluminum fencing in between. You are going to need to incorporate that in the front streetscaping plan.

Mr. Esry – Is this in addition to what is already in the Zoning Code? I didn't see that in the Code.

Mr. Smerigan – Yes, it is a streetscaping plan adopted by City Council. It should be located in the stretch between your two drives. At the corner, you have a large tree shown there and I am fine with that.

Mrs. Milbrandt – You can incorporate your landscaping in there.

Mr. Esry – We would like to add the south corner, as well. It will be in the stretch between the two drives and in the south corner.

Mr. Smerigan – Since we are good with the rest of the project, I don't have a problem with approving this and having the landscaping come back for approval.

Mr. Mikula – There is a little bit of a discrepancy between sheet T1, which looks correct as far as your drives and property lines and the fence that you put in but compared to sheet C3, I don't think this plan reflects that change. Sheet T1, is shifted down south

Architectural Review Board Minutes
September 24, 2024
Page 13 of 14

more so, when you submit your civil drawings you will need to make sure that they have it right. There is a pole that is to remain that is shown on sheet T1 and it is in the middle of the drive on sheet C3 so, you have to get the site plan correct.

Mr. Esry – The civil drawings were not as well developed as the rest of our package. The civil engineer told us to submit and they would pick up with additional progress as we move forward. Thank you for letting us know.

Mrs. Anderson – Are there any additional questions from the Board Members?

Mrs. Milbrandt – I motion to give a favorable recommendation for the site plan for parking improvements, photometrics and lighting for Smartik Academy, property located at 16939 Pearl Road, PPN. 397-09-036, zoned GB- General Business and R1-75, The landscaping plan will have to be submitted and reviewed by the Architectural Review Board

Mr. Smerigan– Second

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

Mrs. Anderson – This request also requires approval by the City Planning Commission. When submitting your plans, (2) full sets of civil engineering drawings are required for the Assistant Engineers review. The next Planning Commission meeting is on October 10, 2024, I don't know if you will be prepared to submit for that agenda. I will forward you the paperwork for the Planning Commission and their meeting schedule.

Mr. Esry – Can we prepare to submit to this Board for landscaping at the same time.

Mrs. Anderson – Yes, you have received approval for this request so, you can proceed to the Planning Commission for your site plan approval. However, your landscaping plan will have to come back to this Board for approval.

Mr. Esry – Thank you, so much.

Architectural Review Board Minutes
September 24, 2024
Page 14 of 14

Mrs. Anderson - Hearing no further business. The meeting was adjourned.

Dale Serne /s/

Dale Serne, Chairman

Mitzi Anderson /s/

Mitzi Anderson, Administrator
Boards & Commissions

10/8/2024

Approved