

CITY OF TWINSBURG
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes
January 16, 2020

Board President, Jennifer Frazier, called to order the regularly scheduled meeting of the Architectural Review Board for the City of Twinsburg at 6:05 p.m.

I. Roll Call

Present: Traci Bonvenuto, Don Spice, John Midlik, and Jennifer Frazier

Absent: Marge Gantous

Others in attendance: Jo-Ann McFearin, Councilwoman Dan Cegelka, Building Department

II. Approval of Minutes: December 19, 2019

Motion: Approve minutes from December 19, 2019 as submitted

John Midlik moved and Don Spice seconded, upon roll call the motion passed unanimously

III. Excuse Absent Members: Marge Gantous

Motion: Excuse Marge Gantous from this evenings meeting

John Midlik moved and Traci Bonvenuto seconded, upon roll call the motion passed unanimously

IV. Public Participation: None

V. Review:

1. Case 20-01-01 – 10075 Ravenna Road, City of Twinsburg – Proposed Changes to Ordinance 1173 – Larry Finch – City of Twinsburg Director of Planning and Community Development

- Larry Finch, City of Twinsburg Director of Planning and Community Development presented himself to the Board on behalf of the City's proposed changes to Twinsburg Codified Ordinance 1173 regarding temporary signage. Larry Finch advised the Board that approximately four years ago there was a Supreme Court case Reed vs. Gilbert regarding sign regulations. Larry Finch advised most sign regulations in the United States are no longer content valid and the signs need to remain content neutral. Larry Finch advised the signs will be neutral for both commercial and non-commercial speech. Larry Finch advised there needs to be clear statements of legislation of indent and purpose.
- Larry Finch advised if the regulations are for direct content it would be for strict scrutiny under the law. The strict scrutiny would require compelling interest and regulation of items that show incitement, fraud, obscenity, pornography or defamation unless one of these items are involved it cannot be regulated. The City would need to consider broad definitions for signs of commercial speech restrictions if supplied by factual information. An example would be if a particular sign causes traffic accidents or detriment to the area with supporting information such as traffic studies or property value decrease studies.
- Larry Finch stated classifying signs by use type implies it restricts information or sign content that can be displayed which therefore is not constitutional. However, the City can regulate the time, place, a manner of display related signs that are content neutral and any regulation would have further a substantial government purpose. Larry Finch advised the City must consider reviewing set back distances for signs, number of lanes, or speed of traffic to regulate sign displays.
- Larry Finch stated the City wants to concentrate on temporary signage at this time as most issues associate with constitutionality arose and the City feels it has issues in this particular part of the code.
- Larry Finch then outlined the proposed changes to the Board specific to 1173.07 Designed Tenants Part D Mechanisms for Variances and Augmentation. Since the ARB regulates signage, this change would allow for the normal standards to be modified through a number of methods such as deviation from standards to the possibility of variances, special permit issuance, and sign plan requirements for multiple building / multiple tenant and placing them into one section of the code for clarity.
- Larry Finch then began the discussion of signs allowed without a permit. Larry Finch advised this would be a significant change to the current code. Larry Finch advised that certain signs are allowed to

be in the City without the submission of an application for permit for a temporary sign or miscellaneous sign. Larry Finch advised that currently any content neutral sign that is non-illuminated in a commercial or industrial district at 16 square feet or less or a content neutral sign that is non-illuminated in a residential, public facility, or C-5 district at six square feet or less will be allowed without a permit. An example of this would be a real estate sign, personal message, or a political sign. Jennifer Frazier inquired that the propped change mentions that the allowable time for the temporary sign to be erect would be 60 days. Jennifer Frazier inquired if there was a time frame from when the sign comes down after the 60 days, could the sign go back up with a minor change, such as color. Larry Finch advised that if the sign does not have a permit because it meets the size regulation, it cannot be regulated, however, if the sign does submit the temporary sign permit, the City requires the applicant to submit the dates the sign it to come down.

- Larry Finch advised the Board of the proposed changes to 1173.19. The change to this part would require temporary signage over 16 square feet in a commercial or industrial area or over six square feet in a residential, public facility, or C-5 district. Larry Finch advised if there is a sign that is over the allowable square foot, an application for permit must be submitted. This part of the code would require the temporary signage to be no more than six feet high in elevation, non-illuminated, and ground only sign. Larry Finch also mentioned that the signage would be subject to setbacks and there would only be one sign allowed per subject, issue, or event. Once the City reviews the application and issues a permit, the application must provide the proof of permit/approval on each temporary sign. Larry Finch also advised that the temporary signage over the allowable limit without permit would be restricted to no more than 32 square feet in the commercial or industrial district or no more than 16 square feet in a residential, public facility, or C-5 district. Larry Finch advised the temporary construction signs would remain the same.
- Larry Finch advised the Board to review the proposed changes to 1173.21, which is the criteria for sign requiring a permit. Larry Finch advised that an illuminated sign, permanent exterior neon sign, and ground sign would require a permit regardless of size.
- Larry Finch advised the Board to review the proposed changes to 1173.25 which is the appeal process. Larry Finch advised the applicant has the right to appeal a denial made by the ARB by submitting the appeal to the Board of Zoning and Appeals within 30 days of the denial.
- Jennifer Frazier sought clarification of projecting signs meaning. Larry Finch advised it would not be an illuminated sign projected on the sign, it would be a sign that would project from the sign and that would only be allowable in the C-5 district at this time.
- Larry Finch wanted to clarify 1173.31 Political Signs. Larry Finch advised that political signs cannot be regulated any different from any other temporary sign that would fall in the categories above.
- Don Spiced voiced his concerns regarding LED/digital signage in the City regarding brightness levels. Larry Finch advised there is regulation regarding brightness going forward.
- Jennifer Frazier inquired if there was a limit to use groups utilizing LED/electronic signs and in turn Larry Finch advised those particular signs are not allowed in residential districts with the exception of public facility use in a residential district.
- Larry Finch finished his presentation by asking the Board to put together comments or questions they may have regarding the proposed changes and by providing that information to him directly. If the Board seeks to have Larry Finch back to present, Larry Finch is more than willing to return to speak further.

2. Case 20-01-02 – 10683 Ravenna Road, Unit 4, Allstate – Monument and Wall Sign – Linda Nichols – LAAD Sign and Lighting

A. Monument Sign

- Linda Nichols of LAAD Sign and Lighting presented herself to the Board on behalf of Allstate. Linda Nichols advised there is current internally illuminated monument sign on site that utilizes interchangeable design. Linda Nichols advised that Allstate will be replacing the top two panels with a singular translucent vinyl panel branded with Allstate.

B. Wall Sign

- Linda Nichols remained at the podium to present the wall sign, however, Jennifer Frazier made the motion along with the monument sign. Linda Nichols did not present any information and no information was discussed from the Board in regards to the internally illuminated wall sign.

Motion: Approve as submitted

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

3. Case 20-01-03 – 9254 Wallingford Drive – Addition – James Haas – Westwork Architecture

- James Haas of Westwork Architecture presented himself to the Board on behalf of this project. James Haas presented an addition to the existing home with all exterior materials to match the existing home. The Board members reviewed the drawings at a table that does not have a microphone to pick up the conversation that was had.

Motion: Approve as submitted

John Midlik moved and Traci Bonvenuto seconded, upon roll call the motion passed unanimously

4. Case 20-01-04 – 9385 Shepard Road – Demolition – James Haas – Westwork Architecture

- James Haas remained at the podium to present Westwork Architecture. James Haas advised that the home and two barns on this property are in dis-repair and the owner of the property would like to demo the home and two barns to clear the land for a new home. Jennifer Frazier advised that she does not see a reason not to demo the home as it is not affecting the neighborhood property and there is no architectural character or historical value to the home and two barns.

Motion: Approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition

Jennifer Frazier moved and Don Spice seconded, upon roll call the motion passed unanimously

5. Case 20-01-05 – 9385 Shepard Road – New Single Family Dwelling – James Haas – Westwork Architecture

- James Haas remained at the podium to present the new single family dwelling proposed for this location. James Haas presented a brand new home that will utilize vinyl siding, board and batten, and dimensional shingles.
- James Haas advised this home would also have an enclosed three quarter basketball court. The basketball court will be a metal building but match the look of the home. James Haas advised the owner may want to add windows to the basketball court elevations for natural light. Building Inspector Dan Cegelka advised the windows will need to come back to ARB for approval.
- Jennifer Frazier advised the home and garage presented are approved as submitted, however, there needs to be clarification on the basketball court.

The Board is noting:

Add windows to the basketball building and will need to come back for ARB approval.

Motion: Approve as noted

Jennifer Frazier moved and Traci Bonvenuto seconded, upon roll call the motion passed unanimously

VI. Work Session:

- Don Spice wanted to have on record that the buyer of 10024 Ravenna Road would have the same qualifications that were set forth previously. Jennifer Frazier advised that the buyer of that property came in front of the Board as a work session and the preliminary design was presented. The Board thought the preliminary design would be in line with the qualifications previously set forth.
- Don Spice brought up the demolition of the old school house and how the buildings were 24 feet wide and had a pot belly stove in the front. Don Spice advised it would be nice to build a replica at some point.
- Don Spice advised the need to use the materials that were salvaged from the old school house and gave a couple examples such as the library or at the historical society.

VII. Adjournment: As there was no further business before the Board, John Midlik moved and Traci Bonvenuto seconded and the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 7:20 p.m.