



PLANNING DEPARTMENT

27700 Hilliard Blvd.
Westlake, OH 44145

Phone 440.871.3300
Fax 440.617.4324

**WESTLAKE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
AUGUST 3, 2015**

Present: Chairman Dan Meehan, Mark Getsay, Phil DiCarlo, Brad Lamb, Duane Van Dkye

Also Present: Planning Director Jim Bedell, Assistant Planning Director Will Krause, Law Director John Wheeler, Clerk of Commissions Nicolette Sackman

Discussion of agenda items and fact finding was conducted at 7:00 p.m. The regular meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Dan Meehan.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Lamb moved, seconded by Mr. DiCarlo to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of July 6, 2015.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo, Van Dyke

Nays: None, motion passed

COUNCIL REPORT

Councilman Getsay reported on council items.

SELECTED CORRESPONDENCE

7/29/15 request for reconsideration of previous motion for Westfield Apartments, Sign Plan (trees), 29050 Detroit, PP#212-11-010, rep. M. Barron, Ward 3

Motion: Mr. Lamb moved and Mr. DiCarlo second to reconsider the previous motion for Westfield Apartments.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo, Van Dyke

Nays: None, motion passed

Member of the commission were not in favor of removing the large mature trees per the applicant's request. It was suggested to up light the trees to accent them which would be attractive and bring additional attention to the site. The approved location of the sign is visible from the road and can be seen when traveling both directions.

Mr. Michael Barron, Mr. Dan Burk and Mr. John Joyce explained the complex is difficult to locate due to the adjacent neighbor's shrubs, the large trees and minimal frontage on

the street, which is why they would like to remove the trees so the sign is more visible. Frequently clients pass their driveway and end up in their competitor's driveway. Lengthy discussion ensued on the applicant's request with the commission not in favor of removing the trees and upholding the previous motion made at the July 6th meeting. After discussion the applicant decided to keep the plan as approved at the July 6th meeting and if in the future they ever want to revise their sign plan they will come back to the commission with a new proposal.

Motion: Mr. Lamb moved and Mr. DiCarlo second to uphold the 7/6/15 motion and plans for Westfield Apartments as approved 7/6/15.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo, Van Dyke

Nays: None, motion passed

OLD BUSINESS

Canterbury Manor 2 Subdivision Preliminary Plan (12 lots), Center Ridge Rd. & Newbury extension, PP#213-23-023 & 024, rep. C. Szucs, Ward 2

Applicant requests to be tabled.

Motion: Mr. Lamb moved and Mr. DiCarlo second to table Canterbury Manor 2 to the October 5, 2015 meeting.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo, Van Dyke

Nays: None, motion passed

The Reserve at Fox Run Subdivision, fence waiver, Fox Run, PP#214-29-018, rep. J. Orley, Ward 1

Applicant requests to be tabled.

Motion: Mr. Lamb moved and Mr. DiCarlo second to table the Reserve at Fox Run fence waiver to the October 5, 2015 meeting.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo, Van Dyke

Nays: None, motion passed

Miami Nights Development Plan, addition, 857 Columbia Rd., PP#213-08-026, rep., L. Sampat, Ward 1

Mr. Chris Blue, representative from LS Architects, explained they wish to change the color of the roof from the approved silver color to a dark bronze and have prepared a landscape plan as all the previous landscape had been removed and needs to be replaced.

9 Mr. Bedell reviewed his memo and the landscape plan. The plan as drawn does not show where the landscape beds are and it was uncertain if the entire area was all landscape bed with mulch or if there were beds and grass areas. There were concerns with the proposed trees to be planted in the north bed due to the grade and if they would survive. Mr. Dan

Schon, landscape representative, reviewed the landscape plan and felt the trees in the north bed would not be an issue, which Mr. DiCarlo disagreed with. Some of the previous beds were too close to the driveway and the salt splash killed a lot of the old plant materials. The landscape was discussed and it was noted there are not enough details and the actual beds are not shown on the plan. The commission did not have any issues with the proposed planting materials to be used but want more details. Mr. DiCarlo reiterated his concerns with the location of the proposed elm trees in the north bed due to the steep grade along the rear of the property.

It was noted that the signs depicted on the building elevations are different than what was presented at the last meeting and it was questioned if the signage is being changed. As shown there were some concerns that what appears to be martini glasses for the letter “i” in the sign do not read well. It was discussed if they are changing the sign design to what is being shown a sign plan needs to be submitted for approval by the commission.

Findings of Fact:

1. The proposal meets zoning code requirements for landscaping.
2. The standing seam metal roofing material and coping will be a dark bronze color that is in accordance with the design review guidelines.

Motion: Based upon the findings of fact Mr. Lamb moved and Mr. DiCarlo second to amend the Miami Nights Development Plan to change the standing seam metal roofing material and coping to dark bronze with the condition that the approval is subject to approval of the final plans by the Building and Engineering Departments in compliance with the code and the ordinances of the City of Westlake; and, in the development process, should there be any changes necessitated by engineering requirements that visually alter the appearance of the development approved by the Planning Commission, the plan shall be re-submitted to the Planning Commission; the sign plan is to be submitted for planning commission approval at a future planning commission meeting.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo, Van Dyke
Nays: None, motion passed

Motion: Mr. Lamb moved and Mr. DiCarlo second to table the Miami Nights landscape plan to the 9/14/15 meeting.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo, Van Dyke
Nays: None, motion passed

NEW BUSINESS

**Parkside Church of the Nazarene Sign Plan, 23600
Hilliard Blvd., PP#214-23-006, rep. M. Harrison,
Ward 1**

Mr. Harrison explained the church wishes to update their existing internally illuminated sign with an internally illuminated sign with a message center at the bottom of the sign. The sign colors are white and blue and the blue will illuminate.

Mr. Krause reviewed his memo noting as proposed the sign is too tall, too big, the amount of changeable copy is more than the 33% permitted, and internally illuminated signs are not a permitted sign in a residential district. Two active sides of a sign is permitted for an institution on a corner lot but what they are proposing rather than a double sided sign is a sign that is “V” shaped facing Hilliard and Clague roads. The sign is proposed to go on top of an existing base which makes the sign 14” too tall. A lot of modifications are being requested. Mr. Krause advised a letter was received from the church that they will conform to illumination standards and will not change the message more than once in a 24 hour period. He advised that when St. Bernadette’s requested a message center sign that all the surrounding neighbors signed a letter that they supported the sign, as this kind of a sign is not permitted in a residential district, and he suggested the same thing be done here. He also suggested reducing the size of the message center so overall the sign will comply with the 24 sf permitted per side in this zoning district.

Discussion ensued that the commission would rather see a back to back sign placed perpendicular to Hilliard Blvd. than the proposed “V” shaped sign. Hours should be set for when the sign can be illuminated as it is in a residential district and may be seen from inside people’s homes nearby. As for hours of illumination 6 am to 9 pm was suggested, which Mr. Harrison thought would work and would advise his client. The commission would like to see the colors limited to blue and off white for the message center sign. It was also brought up that the raised bed that the sign is located in is full of weeds and needs to be cleaned and maintained. Mr. Harrison wasn’t certain what the church’s plans were for the bed but would bring it to their attention. Discussion ensued that the sign should maybe be tabled until the issues raised have been resolved but it was clear what need to be done and once completed the sign could be administratively approved by the planning staff.

Findings of Fact:

1. The proposed replacement sign requires, at minimum, a 1.08 sf sign area modification and 14” sign height modification. If the whole 32.55 sf sign cabinet structure is counted as sign area it requires an 8.55 sf sign area modification.
2. Section 1223.08(b)(3) states that: “For an institution on a corner lot, one freestanding identification sign, placed parallel to the street shall be permitted per street frontage. Up to a maximum of thirty three percent (33%) of the area of a freestanding identification sign may be devoted to single-color changeable copy...”
3. This provision has been used by Planning Commission to allow single-color electronic changeable copy as long as such a sign complies with the code in terms of not being an animated sign and not exceeding the illumination performance regulations in the code.
4. The electronic message center is described as “full color” but is depicted as using one color (blue).
5. The active portion of the electronic message center is 30% of the proposed sign cabinet and 39% of the sign “face”.
6. Section 1223.02(a)(1) defines an “Animated sign” as “any sign that uses movement or change of lighting including ... flashing to depict action or create a special effect or scene. Animation shall be considered any change or movement more frequent than once per twenty-four hours.”

7. Section 1223.12(a) prohibits animated signs.
8. The message center will replace an existing internally illuminated manual changeable copy sign.
9. Section 1223.07(b) prohibits excessive brightness for signage which is defined as emitting more than 10 lumens of light when measured three feet from the center of the sign face.

Motion: Based upon the findings of fact Mr. Lamb moved and Mr. DiCarlo second to approve the Parkside Church of the Nazarene with the following conditions:

1. The size of the sign be reduced to conform to the code;
2. The shape of the sign be changed from the “V” shape proposed to a flat back to back sign perpendicular to the Hilliard Blvd.;
3. That letters in support of the sign are received from all neighbors that can see the sign from their property;
4. The color of the letters for the changeable copy on the message center sign be limited to blue and off white;
5. The sign shall only be illuminated between the hours of 6:00 am to 9:00 pm;
6. The plant bed around the sign shall be cleaned and maintained;
7. All of the conditions shall be administratively approved by the planning department.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo, Van Dyke

Nays: None, motion passed

**MetroHealth Westlake Health Center Sign Plan, 38
Main St., PP#211-25-004, rep. R. Levitz, Ward 5**

Mr. Levitz reviewed the sign proposal noting all the signs but one have been administratively approved as face changes as this is the location of the previous Phoenix University tenant. The one sign needing planning commission approval is a 51.25 sf fascia sign facing the alley. Mr. Krause reviewed his memo noting the proposal complies with the master sign criteria.



Findings of Fact:

1. The proposal complies with the sign criteria.

Motion: Based upon the findings of fact Mr. Lamb moved and Mr. DiCarlo second to approve the MetroHealth sign plan as submitted.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo, Van Dyke

Nays: None, motion passed

**Westshore Primary Care Sign Plan, 26908 Detroit
Rd., PP#213-03-025, rep. D. Schramm, Ward 3
St. John's Medical Center Sign Plan, 26908 Detroit
Rd., PP#213-03-025, rep. D. Schramm, Ward 3**

Mr. Dean Schram explained the proposal is for two wall signs on the rear of the building facing I-90. The panels in the ground sign will be replaced per Mr. Krause's memo. Mr. Krause reviewed his memo explaining when the building was approved the monument sign



Planning Commission Minutes

August 3, 2015

Page 5 of 11

had a plastic opaque face. A subsequent approval enlarged it with an aluminum panel with cut out illuminated letters for “Associates in Dermatology.” Over time the sign faces were changed and they now have translucent white backgrounds and a multitude of text which is difficult to read creating a traffic hazard. A condition of approval for this wall signage should be that the monument sign faces be made to comply with code.

The wall signs are proposed to be 24’ above grade and code permits 20’ so a modification is necessary. If the signs were moved down to 20’ they would be in the building windows. The commission has the discretion to allow modifications to this based on factors like the architecture of the building. Currently there are no other signs on the building and the only sign that exists is the monument sign.

Discussion ensued on why there is not one sign on each side of the rear entrance rather than both signs on one side of it. Mr. Crook explained due to all the trees on the west side of the property a sign on the west side of the building would not be visible, as originally they would have liked one sign on each side of the entry. As proposed they will be visible from I-90 traveling high speeds.

Findings of Fact:

1. Section 1223.07(b) states that light sources to illuminate signs shall not be of excessive brightness which is defined as emitting more than 10 lumens of light at 3’ from the face of the sign. Excessive brightness avoided through the use of nonwhite background signs. The existing monument sign face has a white background.
2. Section 1223.03(c) states that the frontage width of a building shall be the width of the façade which faces the principal street or contains the main entrance.
3. Section 1223.03(c)(2) states that buildings on lots abutting a freeway shall not be considered to have building frontage on the freeway for sign area calculations and signs shall not be located for visibility from the freeway except for buildings in Interchange Services District or as otherwise approved by the Planning Commission.
4. This building has a main entrance that faces the freeway.
5. The exact height of the proposed wall sign above grade has not been determined but it exceeds the maximum 20’ above grade permitted by code, and is estimated to be 24’.
6. Section 1223.05(b) limits the height of wall signs to 20’ above grade unless otherwise approved by the Planning Commission taking into consideration the location, placement, scale and architecture of the building.

Motion: Based upon the findings of fact Mr. Lamb moved and Mr. DiCarlo second to approve the Westshore Primary Care sign plan with the following modification and condition:

1. Grant a 4’ height modification for the placement of the signs on the building due to the architecture of the building.
2. Condition that the sign face on the monument sign be changed to comply with code and administratively approved by the planning department.

Vote: 5 ayes, 0 nays, motion carried

Findings of Fact:

1. Section 1223.07(b) states that light sources to illuminate signs shall not be of excessive brightness which is defined as emitting more than 10 lumens of light at 3' from the face of the sign. Excessive brightness avoided through the use of nonwhite background signs. The existing monument sign face has a white background.
2. Section 1223.03(c) states that the frontage width of a building shall be the width of the façade which faces the principal street or contains the main entrance.
3. Section 1223.03(c)(2) states that buildings on lots abutting a freeway shall not be considered to have building frontage on the freeway for sign area calculations and signs shall not be located for visibility from the freeway except for buildings in Interchange Services District or as otherwise approved by the Planning Commission.
4. This building has a main entrance that faces the freeway.
5. The exact height of the proposed wall sign above grade has not been determined but it exceeds the maximum 20' above grade permitted by code, and is estimated to be 24'.
6. Section 1223.05(b) limits the height of wall signs to 20' above grade unless otherwise approved by the Planning Commission taking into consideration the location, placement, scale and architecture of the building.

Motion: Based upon the findings of fact Mr. Lamb moved and Mr. DiCarlo second to approve the St. John Medical Center Care sign plan with the following modification and condition:

1. Grant a 4' height modification for the placement of the signs on the building due to the architecture of the building.
2. Condition that the sign face on the monument sign be changed to comply with code and administratively approved by the planning department.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo, Van Dyke

Nays: None, motion passed

Travel Centers of America Sign Plan, 24601 Center Ridge Rd., PP#215-27-006, rep. M. Lauretano, Ward 2

Applicant or agent was not present.

Motion: Mr. Lamb moved and Mr. DiCarlo second to table the Travel Centers of America sign plan to the 9/14/15 meeting.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo, Van Dyke

Nays: None, motion passed

Linden Behavioral Pediatrics Sign Plan, 29055 Clemens Rd., PP#212-11-002, rep., K. Miske, Ward 3

Mr. Miske explained the tenant space entrance is at the front of the building by the driveway entrance. The proposal is for non-illuminated white letters mounted on the wall. Mr. Krause reviewed his staff memo advising this proposed sign is uniform with the other previously approved signs for other tenants.

Findings of Fact:

1. The approved sign criteria for this building is plaque signs at each entrance.
2. The proposed sign is uniform with other wall signs previously approved for individual tenants in this building.

Motion: Based upon the findings of fact Mr. Lamb moved and Mr. DiCarlo second to approve the sign plan as submitted with the following modification and condition:

1. Modification from the sign criteria to allow a fascia wall sign of individual letters in addition to the plaque signs approved by the criteria.
2. Conditions of approval that the approval is for this single wall sign only, the criteria for this building has not been changed.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo, Van Dyke

Nays: None, motion passed

**Holiday Inn Express Sign Plan, 30500 Clemens Rd.,
PP#211-15-016, rep. B. Kelleher, Ward 3**

Mr. Bill Kelleher explained the monument sign was reduced in size since the original submittal and reviewed the monument sign. Mr. Krause reviewed his staff memo and noted hard copies of the revised plan have not been received. The reduction proposed for the monument sign now complies. There are no details as to the exact location of the monument sign and it is uncertain how far setback it is from the driveway – possibly 6'. The police department did have concerns with the location of the proposed monument sign. The wall signs are proposed to be 65' and 53' above grade and the code only permit the signs to be 20' above grade in this zoning district. These would require large modifications in height above grade and are too tall up. They are actually on the parapet and are considered roof signs which are not permitted. The plans that were submitted with the development plans showed blue light illuminating the building which is considered attention getting and a sign, which counts as sign area. A letter is needed that they will not illuminate the building with blue lights. The proposed logo signs are oversized and require modifications.

Members of the commission advised Mr. Kelleher that when the development plan was approved the owner of the building was told signs placed high up on the building was not permitted and they are not in favor of the proposal. Mr. Kelleher was unaware of any restrictions that were cautioned when the development plan was approved.

Motion: Mr. Lamb moved and Mr. DiCarlo second to table the Holiday Inn Express sign plan to the 9/14/15 meeting.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo, Van Dyke

Nays: None, motion passed

**Madison Eye Care Sign Plan, 26927 Detroit Rd.,
PP#213-10-007, rep, Dr. Mogyordy, Ward 3**

Dr. Mogyordy explained he is seeking approval for three wall signs on the front of the building, one wall sign on the side of the building and a freestanding monument sign. The three signs on the front of the building will have 20" letters – one being 18' wide, and the other two being allotted 10' wide spaces for future tenants. The sign on the second side of the building will have 16" letters and is a second sign for Madison Eye Care. Dr. Mogyordy realizes the location of the monument sign is problematic as it is proposed to be 4' from the sidewalk. He has looked at locations to place it and all of them have issues. If he pushes it back further it is too close to the parking lot. The color scheme will be black and white (monument sign) and white and grey (for the wall signs).

Mr. Krause reviewed his staff memo noting the police have concerns with the location of the monument sign blocking visibility and being a safety concern. He advised that the commission has the discretion to count the second side of a building on a corner lot toward sign area. Without counting the second side of the building toward sign area they are permitted 116 sf and the request is for 117.2 sf.

Discussion ensued on how the wall signs will be mounted as those details were not provided. Dr. Mogyordy is reviewing options with sign contractors as the best way to do that as he wants to maintain the clean lines and architecture of the building. More details will need to be provided and administratively reviewed and approved by planning staff. Discussion ensued regarding the monument sign may not really be necessary as it will be difficult to find a location on the site where it would comply with code. Dr. Mogyordy advised he has wondered that himself and would like to move forward with the wall signs and in the future may proceed with the monument sign. Mr. Krause noted that the newly built building has lights that appeared to be shielded but with the LED bulbs used they go below the fixtures and need to have further shielding so to not provide glare. Dr. Mogyordy has spoken to the contractor about the issue and at this point does not have a resolution but is working on one and will resolve the problem with the planning staff.

Findings of Fact:

1. The proposed wall sign area complies with code as long as a modification is granted to allow the second side of the corner tenant space to count toward sign area.
2. The monument sign is proposed to be located 6' within the planned right-of-way, within an easement granted to the city with the lot assembly plat approved by Planning Commission 6/2/14.
3. There are a number of details regarding color, illumination and materials which have not been submitted.


Motion: Based upon the findings of fact Mr. Lamb moved and Mr. DiCarlo second to approve the wall signs since they are proposed to be internally illuminated channel letters with gray, and white faces with a modification permitting the second side of the corner tenant space to count toward sign area and a condition that the illumination not exceed 10 lumens when measured 3' from the center of the sign face and the freestanding monument sign is not approved.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo, Van Dyke
Nays: None, motion passed

**Market Square & Crocker Commons (Westlake
Civic Space) at Crocker Park, PP#211-24-003 &
004, rep. B. Garrett, Ward 5**

Mr. Brandon Garrett and Mr. Brian Olangot reviewed the proposed landscape and hardscape plans. The building is not changing and the landscape and hardscape plans are similar to the conceptual ones shown on the development plan for the building. The site will have raised flush curbs by the parking garage with removable bollards for access to the building. The alley was changed in size from 15' to 20' wide per the request of the fire department. There will be a trellis area west of the building and there is an alternate proposal for a walking path through the lawn area for pedestrian traffic. The site will have benches, bike rack, drinking fountain, trash cans, light poles, landscape lighting, variety of trees, bushes, perennials and annual flowers.

 Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo noting the proposal was well done with nice details. He, as would the commission, like to see the walking path installed but realize it is an alternate pending the budget.

Findings of Fact:

1. The proposal meets zoning code requirements for landscaping and lighting with the exception that details were not provided for the “L4 wall mounted fixture” and “SA Light pole” that may have been approved in other adjacent development plans.
2. The alternative for grass pavers to provide access between the building and adjacent parking garage will reduce damage to the lawn by pedestrians, while maintaining the appearance of the large green space.
3. Details of the wood trellises and benches, including stain color, that were not provided are needed for administrative approval.
4. A sign is shown on the canopy that is called out in the exterior finish legend as being backlite white acrylic – post mounted. Details and a sign application are required for Planning Commission approval.

Motion: Based upon the findings of fact Mr. Lamb moved and Mr. DiCarlo second to recommend approval of the Market Square and Crocker Commons (Westlake Civic Space) development plan with the following conditions:

1. Metal halide lamps will be color corrected like other metal halide fixtures in Crocker Park.
2. The “L4 wall mounted fixture” and “SA Light pole” are not included in this approval.
3. The alternative for grass pavers is approved.
4. Details of the wood trellises and benches, including stain color, shall be provided to staff for administrative approval.
5. The sign shown on the canopy and any other signage is not included in this approval.


6. This approval does not alter the plan and building elevations for the Market Square Pavilion approved by the Planning Commission on 9/8/14 with the exception of the exterior lighting.
7. Approval is subject to comments received in Part III of the 7/29/15 staff report and approval of the final plans by the Building and Engineering Departments in compliance with the code and the ordinances of the City of Westlake; and, in the development process, should there be any changes necessitated by engineering requirements that visually alter the appearance of the development approved by the Planning Commission, the plan shall be re-submitted to the Planning Commission.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo, Van Dyke

Nays: None, motion passed

Westlake Guide Plan, proposed updates

 Mr. Bedell reviewed his memo noting he has been working on suggested revisions to the guide plan as it has not been updated in many years and needs to be modernized. He suggested that a separate work session be schedule in the future for the discussion of the proposed updates.

MISCELLANEOUS - None

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Monday, September 14, 2015 in the Westlake City Hall Council Chambers.

Chairman Dan Meehan

Nicolette Sackman, MMC
Clerk of Commissions

Approved: September 14, 2015