



Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes - Amended
Thursday, January 4, 2024
6:00 p.m.

Mr. Marcovitz called to order the regularly scheduled meeting of the Architectural Review Board for the City of Twinsburg at 6:03pm.

Roll Call – All Members

Present: David Marcovitz, John Midlik, Viraj Sharma, Valerie Wales

Others in attendance: Danielle Waites, Building Department, Jason Pastorius, Building Department and David Post, City Council

Public Participation:

Review:

1. Case 24-01-01 9224 Darrow Road, Units N, O & P – Smoke Outlet Signage – Bernard Lagman, All Lit Up Lighting and Sign

- A representative was not present at the start of the meeting.
- Mr. Marcovitz stated this center has their own sign program and it is noted that the sign for the Smoke Outlet does not conform to the sign plan for the center.
- Mr. Marcovitz stated the Board should keep to the sign plan and the regulations that the center set up. He further stated he knows they're fairly old and go back to 2004 but that's been the signage plan out there for years and the owner and developer of the center hasn't changed it.
- Mr. Marcovitz stated that if the owner wants to change the sign program then they need to revise it.
- Mr. Marcovitz stated they would table this case for now because there is another Case in the same center that doesn't comply either.

MOTION: Ms. Wales motioned to approve Case 24-01-01, as submitted.

Mr. Sharma seconded the Motion.

No further discussion was presented.

Upon roll call, the Motion was unanimously disapproved.

2. Case 24-01-02 8875 Darrow Road – Pizza Hut Signage – Randy Snyder, Graphic Detail, Inc.

- Mr. Snyder stated the setbacks are all the same. He stated Pizza Hut corporately has tried to streamline and make the signage just easier to read. They didn't do a lot of colors on them, as they did in the previous one where they were incorporating Wing Street format along with the pizza. He stated they are phasing out the Wing Street.
- Mr. Snyder stated they have gone back to the traditional Red Roof with the white Pizza Hut letters for the monument sign out front.
- Mr. Snyder stated the sign size will remain exactly the same and the electrical work won't be changed. He stated the sign will still be all internally lit with LEDs and all they will be doing is pulling out the old faces and putting new ones in.
- Mr. Snyder stated the building sign will be Pizza Hut letters will look like a straight white canned internally lit letters and will be the same format. The size will be just a little bit smaller but it's so close that they just call it the same square footage.
- Mr. Snyder stated the building sign will be in the exact same spot as the existing sign and will be wired into the exact same electric provided.

MOTION: Mr. Sharma motioned to approve Case 24-01-02, as submitted.

Mr. Midlik seconded the Motion.

No further discussion was presented.

Upon roll call, the Motion passed unanimously.

3. Case 24-01-03 1955 Midway Drive – Cameron Ashley Building Products Signage – Gilbert Macias, Fastsigns Twinsburg

- Mr. Macias stated Cameron Ashley will be taking their existing signage that was at their former building and they want to move it to Twinsburg.
- Mr. Macias stated the building sign will go right above the front entrances to identify Cameron Ashley. He stated they want to move one of their existing signs to indicate shipping and receiving is located to the back of the building.
Correction: Change "sing" to "sign".
- Mr. Macias stated they are also requesting an additional post and panel sign on the road to direct people from the road to where the main office is and to where shipping and receiving is.
- Mr. Midlik asked if this would be a new building. Mr. Macias stated this is an existing building and that they are relocating completely to Twinsburg.

MOTION: Mr. Sharma motioned to approve Case 24-01-23, as submitted.

**Ms. Wales seconded the Motion.
No further discussion was presented.
Upon roll call, the Motion passed unanimously.**

4. Case 24-01-04 9224 Darrow Road, Unit B – RestoDent Signage – Joe Berdine, Signarama

- **Mr. Sharma requested that this Case be tabled until the end of the meeting since it is in the same plaza as the first Case and there will need to be additional discussions on it.**
- **Mr. Berdine asked what the issue was.**
- **Mr. Marcovitz stated they are talking about whether the Board should table this Case until the end of the meeting since it also concerns the same center with the sign program and the signage does not meet the sign program requirements.**
- **Mr. Berdine asked what doesn't it adhere to.**
- **Mr. Marcovitz stated first all the signage has to be red.**
- **Mr. Berdine stated he sent everything the Board has to the owner of the property and she replied back saying that it was approved as far as the location was concerned and the only comment she made to him was the monument sign she would prefer that the be red. He stated they changed that but there was nothing mentioned about all the signs.**
- **The case was tabled until the end of the meeting.**
- **Mr. Berdine stated that had the Memo that Keith sent out on December 26th been emailed to him as well, then he would have had everything changed and taken care of prior to tonight's meeting.**
- ****See additional discussion on page five of these minutes.**

MOTION: Mr. Marcovitz motioned to approve Case 24-01-04, as submitted.

**Mr. Sharma seconded the Motion.
No further discussion was presented.
Upon roll call, the Motion was unanimously disapproved.**

5. Case 24-01-05 10683 Ravenna Road, Unit 1 – Trim Deluxe Barbershop Signage – Kaldon Al-Falih, Digital Graphics & Signs

- **Mr. Al-Falih stated they are putting new sign faces on an existing wall cabinet sign and monument sign face.**
- **Mr. Al-Falih stated they are not touching the electric work or the cabinet sign. The only thing they are doing is taking the sign face down and putting new graphics on top of it.**
- **Mr. Sharma stated he was fine with the size but he is concerned about the black background with the El Torito Taco's place, and thinks it sticks out a little bit.**

MOTION: Mr. Midlik motioned to approve Case 24-01-05, as submitted.

Ms. Wales seconded the Motion.

No further discussion was presented.

Upon roll call, the Motion passed 3-1.

Mr. Marcovitz (Yes), Mr. Midlik (Yes), Ms. Wales (Yes), Mr. Sharma (No)

6. Case 24-01-06 2644 East Aurora Road – New Building, Child Day Care Facility – Meaghan O'Connor, GV Land Holdings, LLC

- **Mr. Marcovitz stated to the Board that it was brought to his attention there is a Business district architectural design standards. It is section 1148.20 and it states that based off of the zoning and the location of where this building is, that the front façade facing Aurora Road is required to have mainly almost all masonry front. It's a minimum of 80% of all the sides, 50% of side elevations and 35% of rear elevations.**
- **Mr. Marcovitz stated that looking at the building there is not that much masonry on the front.**
- **Mr. Marcovitz stated that there is a note that says if the Architectural Review Board approved the building as it is without meeting the requirements of the section 1148.20 that they can override what that section says.**
- **Mr. Sharma asked Mr. Marcovitz when did this regulation go in place or has it always been like this. Mr. Pastorius stated 2015 was when it was revised.**
- **Mr. Sharma stated that if they already have one regulation he thinks the Board should stick to it.**
- **Ms. O'Connor stated they were just made aware of this provision an hour before the meeting and had they of known this six months ago when they began the process they would have adjusted their plans so that they would have complied.**
- **Ms. O'Connor stated they have went before the Planning Commission for a use approval and they did received that. She stated one of the requests from the Planning Commission was to reduce the parking towards the front so the corner of the building where the main entrance is, is really the focus and it's the hope to make this a little bit more pedestrian friendly so when you're driving down Aurora Road you really are looking at landscaping and this corner which they have complied with so it is their thought it may be a better product if they actually had closer to fifty or sixty percent brick or stone on both sides rather than eighty percent on just the Aurora Road side and thirty or forty percent or whatever is the requirement on the side of that is along the parking lot.**
- **Mr. Sharma asked Ms. O'Connor if they could provide multiple designs. Ms. O'Connor said they could certainly provide that.**
- **Ms. O'Connor stated their hope would be that they could get an approval here today conditioned on that. Mr. Marcovitz stated there could be except it depends on how it's distributed across the front so the Board really needs to see an elevation showing what that sixty percent looks like and what the eighty percent would be.**

- It was determined that the elevations that were submitted are mislabeled and for a proposed building in a different city.
- Ms. O'Connor stated Bright Path Kids will be the ultimate tenant and they're a child care operator. Ms. Wales stated so GV Land Holdings will do the construction and you lease to daycare operators. Ms. O'Connor confirmed this.
- Mr. Marcovitz stated he would like for them to resubmit.
- Mr. Marcovitz stated when they resubmit to make sure they get the elevations marked right so they're in the right relationship to the building.

MOTION: Mr. Sharma motioned to approve Case 24-01-06, as submitted.

Ms. Wales seconded the Motion.

No further discussion was presented.

Upon roll call, the Motion was unanimously disapproved.

Approval of Minutes: December 7, 2023

MOTION: Mr. Midlik motioned to approve the Architectural Review Board meeting minutes dated December 7, 2023, as submitted.

Mr. Sharma seconded the Motion.

No further discussion presented.

Upon roll call, the Motion passed unanimously.

Additional Discussion:

- Mr. Marcovitz stated the Board needs to discuss Case number One and Case number Four which is the signage at 9224 Darrow Road. He stated the existing sign plan that center has, has been in effect for twenty plus years. He stated the ARB has to hold precedence over whatever else has been submitted or what needs to be done. That sign program states specific things about the color of the sign, the color of the trim and specific being an exact one color red, one color trim and no other options to that. **Correction: Change "presidents" to "precedence".**
- Ms. Wales asked if the current owner is the one who was also the owner twenty years ago when this went into effect. No one on the Board could confirm this question.

Excuse Absent Members:

MOTION: Mr. Sharma motioned to excuse Gursimran Khatra.

Mr. Midlik seconded the Motion.

Upon roll call, the Motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment:

MOTION: Mr. Sharma motioned to adjourn the meeting at 7:07pm.

Ms. Wales seconded the Motion.

Upon roll call, the Motion unanimously passed to adjourn the meeting.

David Marcovitz, Chairman

John Midlik, Secretary