

BZA Meeting Minutes
January 22, 2015

Members Present Leon Vitale
 Daniel Creighton
 Patrick Snyder
 Charles Rohr
 Richard Lutz-Alternate
Zoning Inspector Joni Poindexter

Absent member: Edward McDonnell

Appeal #2292- Brilliant Electric Signs Co. 4811 Van Epps Rd, Cleveland, Ohio 44131 agent for OMCO Building LLC, property owner, 3993 E. Royalton Rd., Broadview Heights, Ohio 44147 requests a variance for four directional signs at 24 sq. ft. 8 ft. in height where signs are permitted to be 6 sq. ft. 3 ft. in height per Art. V Sect. 502.4 of the zoning resolution. Property located at 4476 Applegrove NW, Sect. 12NW, zoned I-1.

Mr. Vitale read the file application and reason for the appeal. The file contained a drawing of the proposed signage, an aerial view of the property in question, and a site plan dated 9/11/14.

Mr. Vitale swore in Major Harrison, 4811 Van Epps Rd., Cleveland, Ohio, Mark Ricchiuto, 1702 Joseph Loyd Pk, Willoughby, Ohio and Robert Ciekanski, 540 5th St. SW, Strasburgh, Ohio.

Mr. Harrison stated they would like to have three directional signs along Freedom and one along Applegrove. The code allows a 6 sq. ft. sign that is 3 ft. in height. This is a large complex and the use of the property has a lot of industrial vehicles and semi-trucks. They need a large sign for visibility and way finding purposes. If conforming to the resolution, the signs would be hard to read for the larger trucks. They feel it is necessary to be legible to read them to properly navigate the property. They don't feel it is uncharacteristic to the neighborhood and the size of the property is the reason the larger size is needed. The characteristics of the neighborhood are in conformance and it reduces any hazard.

Mr. Ricchiuto stated they have 54 distributors and the size of equipment helps dictate what is needed. The roads are two lanes and the letters need to be big enough to see because there is no place to turn around so it is a safety issues.

Mr. Vitale stated safety was mentioned and he thinks they received a variance to open up the approaches in the past for ease of the truck traffic so a semi can get in there. With that being said the verbiage is not that large compared to the height of the sign. It appears it could fit in a 2 x 3 ft. sign. He wonders why they have all the blank space.

Mr. Ricchiuto stated they didn't want to go this high but there were certain packages they had to get. If the height is reduced then it reduces the size of the letters. This is the best they could work out due to their production and fit a certain perimeter.

Mr. Harrison stated a 3 ft. high directional sign is only permitted and is very low for these types of vehicles. The location is in a grassy area that could be covered by snow. The signage could be read at the requested size.

Mr. Ricchiuto stated the sign area gives Ohio Cat flexibility. They may need to add additional language which gives them flexibility.

Mr. Vitale stated because they are mass produced signs is not a practical difficulty. Everyone wants a little more with their signage. The semis are coming into a T intersection so they are going fairly slow and if they miss the entrance there are plenty of places to turn around. He drove around the area and other signs aren't that high. There are other signs in the area that meet the regulations so he struggles with the variance.

Mr. Ciekanski stated he would like to thank the board for the previous variance for the drive width because it has helped a lot. The directional signs aren't to draw traffic in but to have better communication with the flow of traffic. The higher the sign, it is better to read from a truck. The signs would be professionally done and are needed for safety.

Mr. Harrison stated the signs aren't to attract new customers and the trucks need to know which drive to navigate to for safety reason so they aren't passing by and having to turn around. No one wants a huge semi to pass their entrance and have to turn around.

Mr. Creighton asked if the signs would be lit.

Mr. Ricchiuto stated yes, the yellow area shown on the drawing would be lit. The signs don't have any signage for Ohio Cat. It is just for people to find the way around the site.

Mr. Snyder asked if sign #1 would be on Applegrove for visitors and sign #2 and #3 is machinery pickup and delivery and sign #4 is for parts and freight delivery.

Mr. Ciekanski stated yes.

Mr. Ricchiuto stated there is a clean zone and dirty zone so the dirty vehicles can't be in the clean area and the signage helps this.

Mr. Ciekanski stated their goal is to not have any dirt on the other side of the fence where the clean equipment is kept.

Mr. Harrison stated sign #3 on freedom is where you enter in to the wash area and next to it is the exit for safety so they need the signage to direct everyone.

Mr. Rohr stated that the final signage wasn't ready when the project started and asked how they got to the point that the signs are on premises.

Mr. Ricchiuto stated he didn't realize the board seen the signs that were stored on the property. There was a miscommunication with the project and there was a conflict with the date for the BZA meeting. In

the course of construction the job doesn't always go the way you want it to. This is something they have to deal with.

Mr. Ciekanski stated the signs on the property are temporary signs.

Mr. Ricchiuto stated they have temporary signs because of the delay.

Mr. Ciekanski stated Ohio Cat is something the Township can be proud of.

No one else spoke in favor of or in opposition to the appeal.

Mr. Vitale closed to public input.

Mr. Lutz stated he drove around the area and asked if there has been precedence in the area.

Ms. Poindexter stated the reason for the height requirement is so people in cars are able to see over the sign and it doesn't block the view.

Mr. Creighton stated he is struggling with this because they are requesting 4 times what they are allowed. If they permit these signs and someone puts McDonalds across the street they might want the same thing and precedence might be set. Four times what is allowed is bugging him.

Mr. Snyder stated he has to sometimes order signs for work and he knows these could be produced smaller.

Mr. Vitale stated he struggles with the size of the sign and he understands they want them higher for semi-trucks, but they can see a short sign. They are coming to a T intersection so they aren't going very fast. The verbiage of the sign isn't that large so they don't need such a high sign. He doesn't see that as a practical difficulty. The most verbiage is sign #1 telling the visitors they have to check in and he doesn't think a visitor coming in a semi. They have had so many sign issues over the years where people want a bigger sign. They could take the machinery pickup and delivery and put it on a white board and it would be visible.

The board had no further comments.

Mr. Creighton made motion to approve appeal #2292 as requested and Mr. Snyder seconded the motion.

Mr. Harrison asked the board to table the request.

Mr. Vitale opened the hearing back up to public input.

Mr. Harrison stated it appears it won't go in their favor so they would like to rethink what they would like to do. It is necessary to have something larger and higher. He would like to go back and see what their options are.

Mr. Vitale asked how long they needed to rethink their plans.

Ms. Poindexter stated the next meeting is February 12th.

Mr. Vitale stated the board needed to withdraw their motion and second for discussion.

Mr. Creighton withdrew his motion and Mr. Snyder withdrew the second.

Mr. Vitale stated the board could continue the meeting until February 12th.

Mr. Harrison stated they would like to continue the hearing.

Ms. Poindexter stated that they already have a hearing scheduled for 5:30 PM which is a conditional use renewal and notices have been printed so if possible she would like to schedule the continuance at 5:20 PM.

Mr. Creighton made a motion to continue appeal 2292 until February 12th at 5:20 PM and Mr. Rohr seconded the motion.

The vote was: Mr. Lutz-yes, Mr. Rohr-yes, Mr. Snyder-yes, Mr. Creighton-yes, and Mr. Vitale-yes.

Mr. Snyder made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the December 11, 2014 meeting and Mr. Creighton seconded the motion.

The vote was: Mr. Snyder-yes, Mr. Creighton-yes, and Mr. Vitale-yes.

Mr. Creighton made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the January 8, 2015 meeting and Mr. Snyder seconded the motion.

The vote was: Mr. Snyder-yes, Mr. Creighton-yes, and Mr. Vitale-yes.

Mr. Vitale made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Creighton seconded the motion.

The vote was: Mr. Lutz-yes, Mr. Rohr-yes, Mr. Snyder-yes, Mr. Creighton-yes and Mr. Vitale-yes.

Respectfully submitted,

Joni Poindexter
Jackson Township
Zoning Inspector