

**CITY OF BROADVIEW HEIGHTS
PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Outcome Notification**

Date: June 29, 2018

To: PC Members, City Council, BZA Members, Mayor and Administrative Staff

From: Nancy Grattino
PC/BZA/Bldg. Department Administrative Assistant

At the Planning Commission Meeting of June 27, 2018 the following transpired (minutes will be forthcoming):

The Meeting Minutes of June 13, 2018 were UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED as submitted.

CASE # 18-PC17: PRIMROSE SCHOOL – 1200 W. ROYALTON RD – DALE GRIEDER, REPRESENTATIVE - GROUND/MONUMENT SIGN & SIGN LANDSCAPING

The monument sign and landscaping were UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED as submitted and the wall mounted logo sign on the building (add-on to application this evening) was also UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED as sign #3 on the drawing as presented.

CASE # 18-PC18: PRIMROSE SCHOOL – 1200 W. ROYALTON RD – DALE GRIEDER, REPRESENTATIVE –MODIFY CONDITIONS – CHANGE FENCE STYLE AND SIZE

The revised fence for Primrose School was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED as submitted to include the additional add on portion this evening (see file) and the fencing to the north and south of the trash enclosure.

CASE # 18-PC19: DANNY BOYS – 8158 BROADVIEW RD – DAVID SABOL, REPRESENTATIVE – MODIFY CONDITIONS – REPLACEMENT & EXPANSION OF WINDOWS TO OVERHEAD WINDOWS & ADD AWNINGS-

This case was UNANIMOUSLY given PRELIMINARY APPROVAL and will come back with suggestions from the Board for final approval.

NOTE: *The next Planning Commission Meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 27, 2018 at 7:00 P.M.*

**CITY OF BROADVIEW HEIGHTS
PLANNING COMMISSION & CAUCUS MEETING**

**MINUTES
June 27, 2018**

(Editor's Note: These minutes are not actual verbatim transcript of the meeting but merely intended to be a detailed synopsis of the discussion that took place during this meeting. It is the belief of the author of this document that all pertinent information has been included to represent an overview of discussions and decisions reached.)

CAUCUS:

Discussion of Agenda items took place.

Planning Commission Meeting called to Order by Bill Ridgeway at 7:08 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Ridgeway, Ken Emling, Don Taylor. (No Council Rep. present)

ALSO PRESENT: Michael Skvasik, Building Commissioner; Rich Pignatiello, Assistant Law Director; Joe Fleming, Assistant Fire Chief and Nancy Grattino, PC/BZA and Building Department Administrative Assistant.

Mr. Bill Ridgeway stated there are only 3 members present this evening and in order for something to move forward three affirmative votes will be needed. Mr. Skvasik stated they could also table their case to another meeting with more members present.

CASE # 18-PC17: PRIMROSE SCHOOL – 1200 W. ROYALTON RD – DALE GRIEDER, REPRESENTATIVE - GROUND/MONUMENT SIGN & SIGN LANDSCAPING

Mr. Mike Skvasik stated the Building Department has reviewed this sign; it is a code compliant sign. The only issue that we wish to bring up is that the sign is not on their property. Mrs. Grattino stated she has the property owners (Sam Petros) approval. Mr. Skvasik stated that was his only issue.

Mr. Dale Grieder from ADA Architects and Mr. Joe Kepley, owner of Primrose BVH came forward. Mr. Greider stated he believes the sign was already presented once and has been revised. Mrs. Grattino stated no. Mr. Skvasik stated the concept was provided to him. Mrs. Grattino stated it was submitted on the plan review but has not been to Planning Commission as signs are a separate submittal for approval to the Planning Commission. Mr. Skvasik stated he discussed it with Mr. Greiders predecessor and went back and forth with a couple different variations, but it never got to this point.

Mr. Grieder stated this is for a monument sign which will be located on Mr. Petros' property and he does have approval from him on this. It is pretty straight forward, a brick masonry sign. The same brick that is on the building, the square footage for the sign is 20 sq. ft. on each side and he believes they were allowed to go up to 40 sq. ft. for each side. The height will be no more than 5'; the width will be 9'4". You can see approved landscaping around it with power for two LED spotlights.

Mr. Ridgeway asked if there were any questions or comments.

Mr. Ridgeway stated the allotted space on the sign for “future tenant”, is that with the anticipation of the out lot being developed. Mr. Grieder stated he would assume so, they left provisions so if he does develop that property he is able to use that sign.

Mr. Skvasik stated he didn't consider it when he looked at the drawings but he just realized that the wall mounted logo that is in the upper right of the submittal is probably also considered signage. He believes that was on the drawings that were submitted previously for approval of this project. Mrs. Grattino stated that was to be presented separately. Mr. Skvasik stated yes and he does not have any objection if this is added on and voted on this evening. Mr. Grieder stated he did include an elevation where that sign is going over the main gable entry there. Mr. Skvasik stated that was shown on the drawings when this project came through for approval, whether it was approved there or we want to approve it now and include it in their motion. Mr. Skvasik stated he doesn't see anything wrong with it; it is a very nice building. Mr. Greider stated it is only about 9 ½ sq. ft. Mr. Skvasik stated it more than meets the code in terms of building frontage for the building size; it is not an issue as far as he is concerned. Mr. Emling stated not a problem and asked if this should be a separate motion or included with the monument sign. Mr. Ridgeway stated together is fine.

Mr. Ken Emling made a Motion to APPROVE the monument sign and landscaping as submitted and also to approve the wall mounted logo sign which was added this evening and is noted as sign #3 on the drawing as presented. Seconded by Mr. Don Taylor. A roll call vote was taken as follows: Bill Ridgeway - YES, Ken Emling – YES and Don Taylor – YES. With Unanimous Approval, Motion carried.

CASE # 18-PC18: PRIMROSE SCHOOL – 1200 W. ROYALTON RD – DALE GRIEDER, REPRESENTATIVE – MODIFY CONDITIONS – CHANGE FENCE STYLE AND SIZE

Mr. Skvasik stated this is a white vinyl fence. Because of the strict rules in the Special Planning District is why it is back before the Planning Commission. It was discussed in detail at the previous meeting of a wrought iron fence and he believes they are replacing if he understands correctly a portion of the rod iron fence for the distance shown on the drawing. Mr. Skvasik stated the applicant informed him as they were walking into the meeting that he wanted to modify that drawing for a small portion he forgot to show on the drawing. The Building Department has no objection to the vinyl panels; it is totally up to the Board and does meet the requirements of the Special Planning District as to the style of the fence.

Mr. Joe Kepley, owner of Primrose came forward. Mr. Kepley stated the fence would be almond colored to match the essence of the building. They wanted to create privacy and safety along the eastern border of the school. There is a lot of traffic that they noticed then was anticipated; a lot of foot traffic and car traffic that could raise some safety concerns. Mr. Kepley asked the Board if he could approach them and show them on the drawing the portion of the fence that was missed on the drawing. Mr. Ridgeway stated yes, let's see what he has. Mr. Kepley apologized that this wasn't correct on the original submittal; they rushed to get it in a couple of hours before the deadline. Mr. Kepley came forward and showed and discussed the fence with the Board (see file for new drawing). Mr. Ridgeway stated the elevations that were included with the sign drawing actually showed this change. Discussion took place (applicant approached the Board and discussion was inaudible). Mr. Dave Sabol stated in regards to what Mr. Ridgeway was talking about was the fencing hiding the condensing units at the side of the building. Mr. Emling asked then if everything around the perimeter was 6'. Mr. Sabol stated yes.

Mr. Ridgeway asked if they are going to take that on both sides of the trash. Mr. Sabol stated yes. Mr. Skvasik stated the Building Department has no objection to that change.

Mr. Taylor stated they said there was some traffic along that side and asked if it was pedestrian. Mr. Kepley stated foot traffic, you see a lot of pedestrians and delivery vehicles and you see a lot of trucks with a lot of diesel fumes coming in. He believes the fence would minimize some of that and plus take a visual away. There are some smokers at the back of the shopping center as well that he knows wouldn't be pleasing for some of the parents that come up to the playground. Mr. Taylor asked as far as that back line where the wrought iron fence is, that will remain the same correct and is there any traffic back there or anything else that is unsightly. Mr. Greider stated he hasn't noticed anything and in the plans showing the landscaping he thinks there are 12' to 14' trees across the whole northern border in the back. Mr. Greider showed there is an existing mound back there and with the pedestrian traffic there is a dirt path that was worn from the apartments to the shopping center. That is where people kind of funnel. Mr. Taylor stated he was wondering was that the purpose of the fence, along with the other things that was said. Both Mr. Greider and Mr. Kepley stated yes.

Mr. Bill Ridgeway made a Motion to APPROVE the vinyl 6' fence in replacement of the rod iron fence that was shown on the east elevation to include the portion that was added and shown this evening and the fencing to the north and south of the trash enclosure. Seconded by Mr. Ken Emling. A roll call vote was taken as follows: Bill Ridgeway - YES, Ken Emling - YES and Don Taylor - YES. With Unanimous Approval, Motion carried.

Mr. Skvasik stated to the applicant that the fence is included in the permit that they have for the building, there are no additional permits required for the change in the fence. A permit is required for the signs.

CASE # 18-PC19: DANNY BOYS – 8158 BROADVIEW RD – DAVID SABOL, REPRESENTATIVE – MODIFY CONDITIONS – REPLACEMENT & EXPANSION OF WINDOWS TO OVERHEAD WINDOWS & ADD AWNINGS

Mr. Skvasik stated there are two windows on the north side of the building; they are two small windows as he would call the driveway side / north side and two larger overhead doors going to the east. The only comment he has is in regard to the height of the ledge that is going to be underneath the windows. He pointed this out in caucus as to a question on what their considerations were as to the height of the ledge on the two overhead doors that would be installed on the east elevation of the building. Mr. Skvasik stated other than that he has no objection to the project as it stands.

Mr. Dave Sabol, the architect for the project and Mr. Matt Hollingsworth, owner of Danny Boys came forward. Mr. Sabol stated a couple years ago they came before the Board with a little bit more of an aggressive project that was going to add some outdoor seating, make some modifications to the inside of the building as well as add some overhead doors to the side there. Basically that impacted some of the parking issues; so this project here is really scaling that down. They would be expanding some of the window openings so they can get some additional natural light coming into the space and adding some windows to the north side of the building. It is kind of a dark area for the eating space; they are just trying to add some additional natural light. The overhead doors / windows do not go down to the floor; there is a sill where it ends above the sill; so you cannot walk outside into the landscape area. The

intention wasn't to open it up to the outside so that you can walk through; it was for some additional natural light into the space on the inside.

Mr. Ridgeway stated they understand the concept of trying to introduce the natural light. In the discussions they had in Caucus, they are concerned how low that sill is; it will give the opportunity for those to just step out from the dining area and take a short cut right out to the parking lot. Mr. Ridgeway stated the rest of the presentation and concept makes a lot of sense. They wanted to have an open discussion about raising that sill to a table height would be more beneficial in the sense of keeping patrons from taking a quick exit. Mr. Hollingsworth asked what if something was installed across there, a rail or bar of some sort that someone couldn't walk through it or fall through it or anything like that. That way they could save the esthetic look of having it go down but prevent people from walking through or walking into landscape or using it as a doorway. Mr. Emling stated he wouldn't be opposed to it, he thinks they would need to see what they would be proposing. Mr. Emling stated he is okay with the concept, but if the intent is to bring in natural light; did they entertain the idea of just doing a fixed window. Mr. Hollingsworth stated the other thought is to be able to open it up as is seen in a lot of restaurants where you get that feeling of being able to sit inside in the air conditioning but get that feel of being outside. This was the intention, a fixed window would be good but this just gives it that different feel. Even though they do not have a patio they are trying to provide a little bit of that feeling and kind of open it up a little more. That is the intention on the side also. If you have been in Danny Boys, that dining room area has more like a basement feeling; so they are trying to work around that and open that up a little bit and make it a little more comfortable in there.

Mr. Emling stated again that he wouldn't be opposed to some type of either rail or something across that opening, just so that the door closes behind it. They had talked in Caucus about a 30" height and he knows that will not limit the natural light. They are just concerned that people, whatever state they are in may decide that there car is right over there and would just step over that little wall. Something that would prohibit that he thinks would be okay. Mr. Emling stated of course they would like to see that first. Mr. Emling stated the question about the other two punched windows on the north side are you going to be introducing a soldier course and rowlock sill; is it your intention and are you able to use some of the existing brick to make sure it matches. Mr. Sabol stated the hope is that they can use some of that, which is the intent. There is a soldier course and rowlock sill on the upper window and they are just trying to go with what is already there. Mr. Emling stated if it is possible to reuse what they take out to infill that would be great. Mr. Sabol stated if you get matching brick it is obviously worn from over the years so trying to use what they have there would be the best thing they can do.

Mr. Ridgeway stated he can't focus real well and asked if the awning has a railing there. Mr. Sabol stated it does, there is like a black aluminum rail. Mr. Sabol stated his thought; if that is a big concern walking out then you would use something very similar to an aluminum rail, just put it into the landscaping there so the people can't and put it right adjacent to the building. Mr. Taylor asked if this would be a permanent fixture. Mr. Sabol stated yes you would want it permanent, a little bit of a barrier. Mr. Ridgeway stated he thinks this would be a good compromise. Mr. Emling stated or as opposed to it being in front of the building it could be inset within the punched opening but in front of the door. Mr. Sabol stated they could do it that way but they would give it a little less openness. Mr. Emling stated he would ask that they look at that, to him it would like part of the building as opposed to something they just through in front of it to block; it will look more integrated. Mr. Ridgeway stated that would make sense and do what they are saying to try and block the egress.

Mr. Skvasik asked why they are zeroed in that 1'4" number. Mr. Sabol stated it was just to give it a nice feeling of openness. They just sat there one day and kind of looked at the opening, mapped it out with the brick sill that was already there and used a chair placement to kind of give it a height reference. They looked at that again to try and bring an open air, natural light into this space. Mr. Skvasik stated so they were just trying to get as much natural light as they can. Mr. Hollingsworth stated that and it just looked right from the inside when you're sitting in the restaurant looking out. Mr. Skvasik stated he was just curious why they were zeroed in on the 1'4'. Mr. Sabol stated it is all exposed brick on the inside so they were trying to match the brick. Mr. Skvasik asked how high the ceilings were on the inside. Mr. Sabol stated that area there is like an 8'6" – 8'8"; somewhere in that range. It is a little bit higher. Mr. Skvasik asked if it is a drop ceiling there. Mr. Sabol stated yes, it is a lay in ceiling directly adjacent. Mr. Skvasik stated so there is some room above that. Mr. Sabol stated right now they are looking at somewhat kind of exposed right under that ceiling, in terms of the rails itself. Mr. Skvasik stated but below the drop ceiling. Mr. Sabol stated yes, below the drop ceiling; above the drop ceiling it is pretty jammed. In terms of trying to get that hidden is what is going to be tough because of duct work and lights and those kinds of things.

Mr. Ridgeway asked if there are any sprinkler heads lying there where the doors would be. Mr. Sabol stated he could check. There are sprinkler heads in that area and he doesn't think they will be impacted because of where the rails are at but he will check that. Mr. Emling asked what about when the doors are opened. Mr. Sabol stated he will look at that and verify. They will have to submit in for plan review and they could certainly address that then.

Mr. Taylor asked just for clarity, do you believe the railings should be coming out or should they be underneath the new archway they would be building. Mr. Emling stated he thinks it should be installed within the building. Mr. Emling stated it is exterior space but it is within the thickness of the wall; is his suggestion. Mr. Emling stated for them to take a look at this and for final approval they can show them details of what they propose there. Mr. Sabol stated so basically you don't want them to explain what they are putting in there; the Board will want to see revised drawings? Mr. Emling stated he thinks it would be worth it; they talked that depending on the outcome of the vote here, they would grant preliminary approval today and again it depends on the vote; but they would then like to see samples of the awning, the door, what material and a little bit more information on what they are proposing for that guard rail there. Mr. Sabol stated okay. Mr. Emling stated they like the idea, they like the restaurant and they would like it to look as good as it can.

Mr. Ken Emling made a Motion to give PRELIMINARY APPROVAL for the two punched openings on the north side of the building as shown on the drawing and for the two new openings proposed on the east side with the black canvas awning over the entrance and with the stipulation that the architect and owner come back with some type of proposal for a guard rail within the window openings and the entranceway for the awning; to include material samples for the final approval. Seconded by Mr. Bill Ridgeway. A roll call vote was taken as follows: Bill Ridgeway - YES, Ken Emling – YES and Don Taylor – YES. With Unanimous Approval, Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS / OLD BUSINESS:

Mr. Bill Ridgeway made a Motion to APPROVE the minutes of June 13, 2018 as submitted. Seconded by Mr. Don Taylor. With Unanimous vote, Motion carried.

Mr. Bill Ridgeway made a Motion to Adjourn, Seconded by Mr. Ken Emling. With Unanimous Vote, Mr. Kinzer adjourned the meeting at 7:40 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nancy Grattino
PC/BZA/Bldg. Department Secretary
City of Broadview Heights

Attested to by: Todd Kinzer Date: 7/11/18
Todd Kinzer, Chairman