

CITY OF TWINSBURG
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
May 21, 2015

Chairman, Donald R. Spice, called to order the regularly scheduled meeting of the Architectural Review Board for the City of Twinsburg at 5:30 p.m.

I. Roll Call:

Present: Mike DiCillo, Jennifer Frazier, Marge Gantous, John Midlik, Don Spice

Absent: None

Others in attendance: Ted Yates, Dan Cegelka

II. Approval of Minutes: May 7, 2015

Motion: Approve the minutes of the May 7th meeting as written

Marge Gantous moved and John Midlik seconded, upon roll call the motion passed unanimously.

III. Excuse Absent Members: All members present

IV. Public Participation: None

V. Review:

1. **Case 15-05-33 – 10085 Darrow Rd., new monument sign for CVS/pharmacy by Sign Art**
Collin Sternberg with Sign Art, Inc. proposed a replacement monument sign for CVS. The existing sign needs to be removed and a new sign installed approximately 15' closer to the store because of the city's new round about. The new sign will have an aluminum cabinet with a masonry base without the piers. Jennifer Frazier thought the masonry piers gave the sign stature. Mike DiCillo questioned the measurements as presented on the foundation detail. The applicant stated the 2' measurement was correct. John Midlik inquired and the applicant responded that the new sign will not have foundation plants. The location and various visibility problems associated with this sign were discussed. The sign colors and dimensions are noted on the plans.

The Board noted on the plans:

1. 2'0.5" is the controlling dimension on the foundation detail

The Board is recommending:

1. Adding brick piers to the sign

Motion: Approve as noted

Mike DiCillo moved and John Midlik seconded, upon roll call the motion passed with Jennifer Frazier voting no, to have the brick piers be a requirement.

2. **Case 15-05-34 – 10275 Sandalwood Dr., addition to single family dwelling by homeowner**
Greg Hercik addressed the Board and stated he would like an addition to the rear of his house. Jennifer Frazier questioned the applicant if he had approval from the homeowners association. The applicant replied he did not. Jennifer Frazier informed the applicant that approval by the Architectural Review Board would be pending approval by the Meadowood Homeowners Association. The Board viewed pictures of the house and discussed the plans with the applicant.

The Board is requiring:

1. Relocate the garage man door to the side of the garage
2. Keep the existing window in the same location as the future pantry. This will avoid the necessity of re-siding the entire back of the house
3. Add a trim piece for transforming old to new
4. Contingent upon homeowners association approval

Motion: Approve as noted, contingent upon homeowners association approval

Jennifer Frazier moved and Mike DiCillo seconded, upon roll call the motion passed unanimously.

3. Case 15-05-35 – 10131 Ravenna Rd. (Temp) S/L 24 New single family dwelling by Ryan Homes

The applicant presented plans for a 2,539 sq. ft. Milan model, two story single family dwelling. The siding will be flint; shake, silver mist; trim, white; front door, black; shutters, black; stone, Dakota ledgerstone and the roof will be weathered wood. This will be the model home for the new Fox Hollow sub-division.

The Board is requiring:

1. Full stone return to the top of the soffit on left elevation see page A-2
2. Move window in bedroom #2 six inches to accommodate stone return see page A-2

Motion: Approve as noted

John Midlik moved and Mike DiCillo seconded, upon roll call the motion passed unanimously.

4. Case 15-05-36 – 9251 Helen Ln., S/L 7, New single family dwelling by Ryan Homes

The applicant present plans for the last house in the Chase View subdivision. This will be a 2,265 sq. ft. Palermo model two story, single family dwelling with a cottage style front. The siding will be flint; shake, silver mist; trim, white; front door, naval; shutters, dark navy; stone, Dakota ledgerstone and the roof will be weathered wood.

The Board is requiring:

1. French doors off morning room have a landing with steps to grade see page A-2
2. The third car garage be pushed back approximately 4' and the pitch of the roof would be raised to 6/12 to match the 2 car garage roof see page A-2 & A-7

Motion: Approve as noted

Jennifer Frazier moved and John Midlik seconded, upon roll call the motion passed unanimously.

5. Case 15-05-37 – 10186 Corbetts Ln S/L 66, New single family dwelling by Pulte Homes

The applicant presented plans for a 4,696 sq. ft., two story, single family dwelling, the Crestwood model. The siding will be storm; trim, glacier white; front door, tricorn black; shutters, black; brick, signature blend; shake, platinum grey and the roof will be weathered wood. The corner trim will be the standard 4" vinyl trim.

The Board is requiring:

1. Bonus room window is shown on the plan but not on the right side elevation page 7.18b2
2. Second story shake return on the left side elevation all the way back to the wall page 7.18b2
3. Add 4" vinyl corner on left side elevation at the front of the garage page 7.18b2
4. All corners will be 4" vinyl corners (some show as 6")

Motion: Approve as noted

John Midlik moved and Jennifer Frazier seconded, upon roll call the motion passed unanimously.

6. Case 15-05-38 – 10191 Scenic View Dr., S/L 32, New single family dwelling by Pulte Homes

The applicant presented plans for a 5,270 sq. ft., two story, single family dwelling, the Vanderbilt model. The siding will be storm; trim, glacier white; front door, tricorn black; shutters, black; brick signature blend, board & shake, platinum gray and the roof will be weathered wood. This is a three car garage entry with tandem addition storage. At Jennifer Fraziers request the applicant clarified that there will be full height brick at the back of the porch with a 2' wrap that terminates at the back side of the porch column.

The Board is requiring:

1. All corners will be 4" vinyl corners (some show as 6")
2. Add either a window (30/53 sash) aligned with the hallway or the closed shutters (raised panel to match font elevation) look in the siding (faux window) in loft on left elevation. Faux window to be in same location as functional window. See pages A-1 and A3-HR2M

Motion: Approve as noted

John Midlik moved and Mike DiCillo seconded, upon roll call the motion passed unanimously.

7. Case 14-03-11 -- 10683 Ravenna Rd., Patio for Rush Hour Grille by John Goodworth

On March 6, 2014 the Board approved galvanized steel canopy over half the patio area. Sara, owner of the Rush Hour Grille, is appearing before Board this evening because she can not afford powder coated steel for patio roof and pillars. Sara is asking the Board to approve plans using pressure treated wood, the roofing material will be shingles that match the building, and the structure will be 11 feet wider to cover more of the patio area. Don Spice clarified that the posts would be 6" x 6" treated lumber and the roof would be constructed with wood joists. Don Spice suggested the posts should have a vinyl sleeve. The applicant stated she was going for a reclaimed lumber look. John Midlik asked if this would be free standing. The applicant replied the only thing that would tie into the roof would be the flashing and the shingles. Jennifer Frazier clarified that the connection to the ground would be anchor bolts into the existing concrete patio. The applicant replied yes. Mike DiCillo asked if the concrete slab has a footer or is it a floating slab. Dan Cegelka informed the applicant if you are attaching it to the building you are going have to put in a footer. Jennifer Frazier clarified that the existing fence will stay and it will be outside the canopy. The Board asked the applicant to redesign the plans and resubmit at a future date.

Motion: Table

Jennifer Frazier moved and Mike DiCillo seconded, upon roll call the motion passed unanimously.

VI. Work Session:

Case 15-01-06 -- 2058 Meadowood Blvd., requesting use of 1x6 corner trim vs. 1x4 corner trim by Pulte Homes

The applicant passed out pictures to the Board. The applicant stated that historically in the community they have used 4" vinyl corners everywhere. The discrepancy on the corner trim was just recently noticed. In this case the field operative installed 6" wood composite corner trim vs. the intended 4" vinyl. John Midlik clarified this is just the outside corners, not trim pieces around windows and doors. The applicant will go back to the homeowner and ask, "Do you want the 4" vinyl corners to match the community or should we leave the 6" wood corners the way you see it?" The applicant wanted to make sure the Board was on the same page. John Midlik stated he would not mind if some houses had 4" corners and some had 6" corners. Jennifer Frazier agreed. Don Spice thought for the scale of the house he thought the 6" corners looked better. The applicant is asking the Board to afford them the opportunity to give the home owner the option as to whether they want the 4" vinyl corners or the 6" wood corners. Jennifer Frazier pointed out the Board approved plans that said 6" on them, and 6" was built she would leave it rather than change it. The applicant pointed out the homeowner may want the 4", maintenance free, vinyl and the Board stated that would be acceptable to them upon confirmation from the homeowner. Mike DiCillo stated the record should show that the builder has to rectify it with the owner so that we get rid of the agenda item. They would change it to 6" corners.

Case 15-05-31 -- 2150 Highland Rd., non-illuminated planter sign by Central Graphics for General Die Casters, Inc.

Central Graphics submitted the re-designed plans for the planter sign for General Die Casters with all six items noted at the meeting of May 7, 2014 shown on the plans.

Memo from David M. Maistros, Law Director RE: Sign Variances and Appeals

Jennifer Frazier recapped the memo by saying the Law Director opined that the Architectural Review Board has the first voice (decision) regarding signs. If someone wants to appeal the Board's decision they appeal to BZA.

Mike DiCillo stated, "It is my opinion that the ARB has the authority to grant variances to the sign regulations under the criteria established under § 1173.47. That being said, I am not of the opinion that the ARB shall also be permitted to hear appeals of its own denial of a sign application or grant variances to any existing set-back regulations."

Jennifer Frazier clarified by saying the Board could approve a sign pending the approval of BZA for a set back variance.

Mike DiCillo commented, it doesn't say that in the code right now. It will require action by Council to change the codes. The further point is that Maistros didn't address the issue the Board brought up. Which was a non-conforming sign can not be altered unless it is moved into the required set-back.

Jennifer Frazier is of the opinion that someone should have the right to appeal a decision to BZA for location on site. In the case the Architectural Review Board has pending on Ravenna Road you can't say they are modifying their sign you have to say they are taking down the old one and putting up a new one. And the applicant is asking why he can't put a new sign in the old location, because that spot is no longer in compliance with the code.

Mike DiCillo said in other words when the ARB gave the variance for the sign in the industrial park (Cardinal Health) we allowed them to put the sign in the right-of-way. But we had the authority to do that.

Jennifer Frazier asked do you think the ARB should have the authority to decide what goes into the right-of-way?

Mike DiCillo stated that is where the conflict arises in the Law Directors opinion.

Marge Gantous directed everyone's attention to the second paragraph on page two of the memo.

Jennifer Frazier thought it was not the authority of the Architectural Review Board to decide who can go into set-backs. She thought the ARB give a recommendation to the BZA, but if someone wants to encroach into a set-back it should go to BZA as you would for any other encroachment issue.

Mike DiCillo further commented if the Building Commissioner and ARB looks at a sign and says it is okay but you can't put it there. They can appeal that decision to the BZA rather than the ARB making the decision. He doesn't agree that the ARB should be hearing an appeal of the ARB's own decision.

All Board members agreed to that.

Jennifer Frazier asked, what if, Pulte or Ryan homes did not like the ARB's decision about windows, who would the applicant appeal that to?

The majority of those present thought that kind of appeal would go to Council.

Mike DiCillo would like to see the amendments before they are presented to Council.

Mike DiCillo closed by stating, "I would like to have a non-conforming thing, that anything is non-conforming, still stays the way it is. That they don't touch that portion because otherwise you'd never get rid of non-conforming uses."

VII. Adjournment: As there was no further business before the Board Marge Gantous moved and Jennifer Frazier seconded and the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Donald R. Spice, Chairman
Donald R. Spice, Chairman *MLF*

Marilyn L. Freed
Marilyn L. Freed, Secretary