



**Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes - *Amended***  
**Thursday, March 16, 2023**  
**6:00 p.m.**

Ms. Frazier called to order the regularly scheduled meeting of the Architectural Review Board for the City of Twinsburg at 6:00pm.

**Roll Call – All Members**

Present: Jennifer Frazier, John Midlik, Viraj Sharma, David Marcovitz

Others in attendance: Danielle Waites, Building Department and Karen Labbe, City Council

**Public Participation:** Mayor Sam Scaffide

- Mayor Scaffide would like to share his vision of the City of Twinsburg. He sees some things taking place that are really not part of his vision and he's hoping that once he does share his vision that everyone can come to some type of agreement and move forward from that point on. Mayor Scaffide states that a quick example is some of the sign programs that we have at the plazas in the City they don't really match what he's envisioning and what he would like to do. He's looking to make a lot of those changes and to clean up the community, add welcome signs, and then the sign plazas. He does want to share that kind of stuff with the Boards and see what the thoughts are of the Boards so they can all come to a happy medium and come together.
- Ms. Frazier asked Mayor Scaffide if he would be providing legislative guidelines for design or would he be providing examples?
- Mayor Scaffide stated what he's looking to do is possibly a booklet or plan booklet stating "here is what we are trying to do" and what the Boards responsibilities are and what the Building Department responsibilities are in the city and see where we can meet in the middle of all that.
- Mayor Scaffide thinks a lot of the Boards and commissions are operating under a different rule or opinion, so he would like to create this handbook so everybody's aware of what the handbook says and here are the guidelines and here's where we'd like to go and if we are going to go off of that. Mayor Scaffide stated he knows this Board especially has the right to grant variances and there have been some variances granted that he doesn't necessarily agree with, but he understands that doesn't mean he's right and they're wrong, it just means that maybe they don't all agree but he'd like to at least know where each one's coming from.
- Ms. Frazier commented that there are some neighboring communities that have designed standard handbooks that go with their boards. She believes Chagrin Falls and Hudson both have them so it is not uncommon. She stated we do not have one, we just have individual opinions of the Board.

**Review:**

1. **Case 23-03-08 8934 Darrow Rd, Techy Ohio signage – Kristen Enering, Fastsigns**
  - **Sign is internally illuminated.**
  - **It will illuminate white and blue.**
  - **5” returns that are black like the outline.**
  - **The words repair, install and protect will not be illuminated. These words do not protrude out 5”. They are only half inch thick acrylic and are individually mounted letters.**
  - **Mr. Marcovitz commented that even though it fits right to the edge or it is right to the edge of the panel inset panel area because with it hitting that edge it does not look good. He suggests the lettering be a little bit smaller.**
  - **Ms. Enering stated the customer wanted it as large as they could make it so they fit it in between those two edges.**
  - **Ms. Frazier asked if the sign has already been fabricated. Ms. Enering stated it has not.**
  - **Ms. Frazier said she would be okay with adding a small margin to the top and bottom of the sign. 2” at the top and 2” at the bottom for a total of 4”.**

**MOTION: Mr. Sharma motioned to approve Case 23-03-08 as noted.**

- **Add 2” margin to top and bottom border.**

**Mr. Midlik seconded the Motion.**

**No further discussion was presented.**

**Upon roll call, the Motion passed unanimously.**

2. **Case 23-03-09 10539 Ravenna Rd, Vasser – New Home – Ed Sutliff, Designer**
  - **This new home will be located on Ravenna Road across from Presidential Parkway.**
  - **Ms. Frazier asked Mr. Sutliff to state which colors the Vasser’s will be going with. Mr. Sutliff stated he does not know what they picked. He said he knew they were looking at grays and blues but he didn’t select the colors, they did.**
  - **Mr. Sutliff said he knew they were looking at beige but he was not sure. He stated the Vasser’s wanted to have something that was appealing in the community.**
  - **The siding will be blue in color. Harbor blue vinyl siding with white trim.**
  - **Ms. Frazier asked if there is a header or belt board going across the front and if it was white. She asked if it will be a flat vinyl and Mr. Sutliff said it will probably be a close stock. *There was further discussion but the microphone did not pick it up.***
  - **Mr. Sharma asked what color the shingles will be. No answer was provided at the time of question.**
  - **Ms. Frazier noted the trim around the door is a little thin compared with the windows. Usually the trim around a door is larger than the window trim especially if you are including things like the header.**
  - **Mr. Sutliff stated it will be a 3” trim around the windows and doors.**

- Mr. Midlik asked if the columns on the porch are drawn like it's a natural wood look.
- Mr. Sutliff stated it's going to be a dark **chocolate brown wrapped vinyl**.
- Ms. Frazier asked if the columns weren't a natural cedar, does it have a capital and a base to it. She further asked if it was going straight to the ground. *Mr. Sutliff's response could not be heard.*
- Mr. Marcovitz asked if the columns are structural, they are supporting. Mr. Sutliff confirmed they will be structural and supporting.
- Ms. Frazier said she's glad there are windows balanced on all the elevations. There is also a garage, a man door (which they have been placing on all of them). She said there has been discussion about whether it's required by code but they've been requiring them on all of the new homes for the last 10 years or more. She also stated she noticed an egress window for the basement which is another thing they've been recommending although it is not required by law unless someone is sleeping in the basement.
- Ms. Frazier said one thing that would have been really helpful to have when approving plans is an actual floor plan of the house.
- Ms. Frazier noted the garage does not protrude greatly in front of the house. It's only 4' and there is a porch.
- Ms. Frazier asked Ms. Waites if there is a floor plan. Ms. Waites stated she would go get it from the Building Department.
- Ms. Frazier notes that there is concrete exposed it shows exposed concrete to grade. Usually they have a brick **pattern** or stone **pattern** on it. It was stated that it will be a form so it is a cast in place concrete on both sides, inside and outside.
- Ms. Frazier asked if Mr. Sutliff would like to table this case long enough so he can text or call the Vasser's about colors.
- Ms. Frazier stated that Mr. Sutliff can propose colors and if they come in and change their colors they will have to come back before the Board for approval.
- Ms. Frazier asked Mr. Sutliff to state the colors.
- Mr. Sutliff stated the following: the siding will be Harbor Blue, the shingles will be charcoal asphalt shingles, white trim.
- Ms. Frazier said she couldn't tell if the front door is glass or solid and painted.
- The front door will be a solid 6 panel door with side lights and the color on the door will be red. The columns will be a chocolate brown wrapped columns and the concrete to grade is proposed to be stamped brick formed and will be gray on color.

**MOTION:** Ms. Frazier motioned to approve Case 23-03-09 as noted.

- Siding to be Harbor Blue vinyl
- Shingles to be Charcoal in color, asphalt.
- White trim
- Front door to be solid 6 panel with side lights, door to be red, trim around the door and side lights to match window trim.
- Chocolate brown wrapped columns.
- Concrete to be brick formed, regular gray color.

**Mr. Midlik seconded the Motion.**

**No further discussion was presented.**

**Upon roll call, the Motion passed unanimously.**

**3. Case 23-03-10 10735 Ravenna Rd, Harmonii Social signage – Kristen Ening, Fastsigns**

- **Ms. Frazier stated this is the second resubmittal. The first was approved but was not constructed. The second time was brought in for a permit and we did not approve it and now here today is the third design seeking approval.**
- **Ms. Frazier noted the Bar & Lounge is no longer the dominant feature on the sign. When she first saw the sign it looked like a double take, you read it twice. Harmonii Social and then Harmonii Social Bar & Lounge. To her it looks a little odd and bothers her that the raceway up above is left there exposed and the sign raceway is not being used.**
- **Ms. Frazier believes, but is not positive, that someone put up a temporary sign on the brick with a canvas banner or something announcing that they were opening and then their sign went up and then the another sign. It looks like the raceway up above has just been sitting there empty this whole time and the duplicate sign right below an empty raceway bothers her.**
- **Ms. Frazier stated she knows that they approved the first sign that came through but she doesn't think this is that great looking.**
- **Mr. Marcovitz stated this sign is different from the others and it's odd to put a **sign** on a wall **face**. Ms. Frazier stated it treats this tenant different.**
- **Ms. Frazier stated she thinks the idea was they were covering up the old sign well first. She thinks it was just a vinyl face change on something, then they were covering up the old sign, She thinks there's a history of how it got here.**
- **Ms. Frazier stated the Board encountered this issue around September of last year when Wish salon came through and they wanted their sign on the brick wall and not on the Raceway. The Board had a lot of discussion. Two members voted no, three people voted yes, so it was passed. The sign was put up and you can't see their sign when you drive into the Giant Eagle plaza because it's obscured by the **overhang** of Giant Eagle. It just looks odd but everyone else has there's on the sign panel and they've got there's on the wall way up high. The Harmonii Social sign is down lower, closer to the door but she can say the sign being presented is better than the one that was presented last time but she still doesn't like it.**
- **Ms. Frazier asked if the plaza owner ever signed off on the sign. Ms. Ening stated she does have a document from the plaza owner that he emailed to her. The plaza owner just wants this settled and he wanted the sign put over where the Rush Hour sign was because you would see holes were the holes were drilled in the brick from the former sign and it saves him from having to do brick repair. Ms. Frazier stated although he hasn't repaired the sign band up above.**
- **Mr. Sharma stated he would like to see the sign up and he knows they approved the first sign. Ms. Frazier stated that if they're still within their timeframe, the original sign could be put up, that's legal, but she's doesn't know if she wants to approve it again.**

- Ms. Eninger asked, as far as the first permit goes, because she is new to this, how long is that for if they just want to not move forward with any new designs. Can they go back to the original that was approved? Ms. Frazier stated she believes as long as you're still within your time frame, but she's not positive what it is. She thinks it's something like six months but again she isn't positive. Ms. Frazier state if you're still within your timeframe from the original permit you have a legal right to put that up but if you make changes or ask for a different sign, then the Board would have to vote again and they've been making more considerations on the size and colors and they just don't fit well. Mr. Sharma stated he knows they approved this the first time, but they keep coming back.
- Ms. Frazier stated it's the duplicate wording, it's the size, it's the blueness (although this was approved once) and it's the empty raceway above that needs to be repaired and also should be the proper placement for a sign in that location.

**MOTION:** Ms. Frazier motioned to approve Case 23-03-10 as submitted.

**Mr. Sharma seconded the Motion.**

**No further discussion was presented.**

**Upon roll call, the Motion was disapproved, 0-4**

**4. Case 23-03-11 8592 Darrow Rd., Crown Hill Cemetery Niche Columbarium for cremations – Dave England, Coldspring**

- **Representative was not present at the meeting.**
- **Ms. Waites asked if the case can be tabled until another time.**
- **Ms. Frazier stated she thinks this case is complex enough, that it's not a quick simple sign. She thinks it's complex enough it would be nice to have a presentation from their representative.**

**MOTION:** Ms. Frazier motioned to table Case 23-03-11.

**Mr. Marcovitz seconded the Motion.**

**No further discussion was presented.**

**Upon roll call, the Motion passed unanimously.**

**5. Case 23-03-12 2700 E. Aurora Rd, University Hospital Urgent Care Building Alterations & Signage – Joseph Kaye, JL Architects**

- **The space is currently vacant but they have signed the lease.**
- **Mr. Kaye stated Urgent Care is looking to take this space and they want to do a somewhat extensive renovation to the exterior and then the entire interior will be completely redone as well.**
- **Mr. Kaye states they are trying to add a tower element to the front. They would like it to be able to pop because obviously that specific center is kind of inset from the street and surrounded by shopping, stores and a bank.**

- Ms. Frazier asked if a site plan was provided. Mr. Kaye stated they do not have a site plan.
- Ms. Frazier stated they don't have this building in relation to its entire building. They only have a portion of the building and don't have the plan of the entire building to see how this relates to the rest of the building. They don't have a site plan that shows the approach and how it relates to the street or any parking or driving or anything like that.
- Ms. Frazier stated she really feels like they need to have a site plan for this and she believes that's a qualification for approval. She stated a site plan is a requirement for them to approve a commercial building.
- Ms. Frazier stated she likes the cleanness. She is concerned that there is absolutely no landscaping being proposed. Mr. Kaye stated no because there is pavement right to the door. Ms. Frazier said being able to design in some planters or something that would give some greenery to this area would be helpful.
- Mr. Kaye stated they are not putting in new concrete outside, the only thing that they would be occurring is for a new exterior column to hold the new tower because the existing won't do.
- A Board member asked how big the space is. Mr. Kaye stated it's roughly 3,800 square feet to 4,000 square feet.
- Ms. Frazier proposed adding some greenery up near the building to help soften it. They do need to have a site plan because it is a requirement that the Board receives a plan and they did not receive one with this.
- Ms. Frazier did comment that something that is bothering her in the renderings is a break in the coping and you see vertical elements and she doesn't understand what it is that's going on there. Mr. Kaye stated they're the columns for the building itself or they're just decorative triangular bump outs that exist on the building itself. Ms. Frazier commented so you're not coping over the tops of them. Mr. Kaye stated he actually thinks it's just a graphical error.
- Ms. Frazier stated so there would be a black coping to match the rest. Mr. Kaye confirmed.
- Mr. Midlik asked if this was a preliminary. Mr. Kaye stated the brand actually did approve this and so did the client. He said structural has started and is based on the drawing provided.
- Ms. Frazier stated on the application submitted it stated University Hospitals Urgent Care signage as well. Ms. Waites commented that she thinks they are submitting a separate application for that. Mr. Kaye confirmed the signage is being done through a third party. Ms. Frazier stated okay because there wasn't much detail on the signage. She said it looks appropriate on the drawings but they cannot approve it because there isn't anything about the height.
- Mr. Kaye said he does have a drawing from the sign vendor if that helps. Ms. Frazier stated it's significantly larger than what was on the original renderings submitted.
- Ms. Frazier stated the signage is too large and she liked the imagery of it but its increased significantly from what was on the renderings. The drawings provided

from the sign vendor now fill the entire width of the building and it looks a little bit large and intense at night. She would want to see if brought back down in size probably a twenty to twenty-five percent reduction in size to be more in line with what you had on the drawing.

- Mr. Midlik stated he would be okay with the size it is because it is important to see it.
- Mr. Kaye stated they were worried because it's so set back, far from the street. Mr. Midlik stated you did that size on purpose then, and it lights up at night. Mr. Kaye confirmed.

**MOTION:** Ms. Frazier motioned to table the building and revise/resubmit on the sign for Case 23-03-12.

- Table the building – waiting for site plan which is required for the Board to see.
- Revise/resubmit sign – 15-20% reduction in size for the sign so it has some more room to breathe on the building.

Mr. Marcovitz seconded the Motion.

No further discussion was presented.

Upon roll call, the Motion passed unanimously.

**6. Case 23-03-13 10683 Ravenna Rd., Just In Time Staffing signage – Ben Geschke, A Sign Above**

- Mr. Geschke stated he will break down their signage. It is a PVC rail, three different slats that are going to be mounted to the wall and then carved into that are the half-inch sintra letters that are mounted to the slats.
- Ms. Frazier asked how is this sign in area with the other sign that's already on this wall of the building. Mr. Geschke asked if she was referencing the nail salon sign, to which Ms. Frazier confirmed. Mr. Geschke said it is slightly smaller. Ms. Frazier asked, the two signs together how are they with the area coverage of the whole wall. She asked if it was calculated to find out if it's within the allowable amount including the nail salon sign that's already on the wall. Mr. Geschke said he believes so.
- Ms. Frazier stated it wasn't flagged on the application or drawings but she questioned when she read on there that the wall was 155 inches. She thought the portion of the wall where the sign is being proposed is 155 inches. The face of the building is much larger and there's another sign that exists that would count against signage and she didn't know if that have been calculated that way. They don't have anything that says anything about area of coverage on this and because it's an oddly shaped building it's not easy to quickly calculate.
- Ms. Frazier stated if this is 155 inches and your sign is nine feet, which means you have about 23-1/2 inches on each side, which is a pretty big sign. She thinks in total it's about 18 square feet.
- Mr. Geschke stated they wanted to mimic one of their other location in Mentor. They have pretty much almost the same design and just wanted to mimic that for this location here in Twinsburg.

- Mr. Marcovitz stated the look of the sign is okay. He thinks it's just the size and placement of the sign and how it really fits on the wall is hard.
- Ms. Frazier stated she likes the logo and she likes the colors. She did mention they do not have any information on the actual channel letters or know what kind of depth they have to them. Mr. Geschke stated they're half-inch thick letters and are not illuminated. The PVC rail behind it that they are mounting to is about an inch thick and that would be painted to match the wall, beige in color, to help it disappear.
- Ms. Frazier stated she's concerned with the size of the sign on that portion of the building. She worries that it competes with the Divana sign that has the prominent spot on the building, so this should look significantly subsidiary if it's on the side. It's a side wing tenant but she would want to see it on an elevation or a rendering to scale. A measured elevation would be appropriate as well.

**MOTION:** Mr. Marcovitz motioned to approve Case 23-03-13 as submitted.

Mr. Sharma seconded the Motion.

No further discussion was presented.

Upon roll call, the Motion was disapproved, 0-4

***Additional discussion:*** Mr. Geschke asked if the Board has a size recommendation for where it's going. He knows Ms. Frazier said they don't want it to be nearly as big as the Davina Nail and Spa Salon. Would they want it to be less than fifteen square feet in total. Ms. Frazier stated seeing the size of the window below it, she thinks it can be larger than the window but needs to stay in from the sides of the building probably by three to four feet. She said that is her approximation but the sign company's designer should look at how it relates to the Divana sign and make sure that it is definitely smaller because having multiple signs now we're just waiting for the next tenant on the other side to add their sign and then we have signs all over the face of this and she has concerns about that so it would be nice to have a plan of this plaza to see where these tenants are because it's different people divided up and put up their signs. We don't have a raceway and now we're just putting signs on the face of the building. Mr. Marcovitz stated that's what he thinks would look funny with this is how high you put it. He said you're probably going to center it over the window. Mr. Geschke stated there was an existing sign there about eight months ago before they moved out. He wasn't too sure what sign it was but there are holes in the brick where they were going to install the sign.

7. Case 23-03-14 2026 Summit Commerce Park, Intralox signage – Kristen Enering, Fastsigns
  - Ms. Frazier stated she likes the sign. She thinks it has nice color and it has an interesting logo graphic to it. They don't offer see signs with the trademark logo.
  - Wall sign on the building, it's clearly dimensioned on the drawings. It's rendered approximately to scale on the building. She does not think there's any question about the placement location.



- **Mr. Sharma stated they are also proposing some monument signs and other kinds of signs as well.**
- **Non-illuminated pre-fabricated with aluminum channels, they have the PMS color, which looks like red.**
- **Ms. Frazier stated then the monument sign is double-sided translucent graphics and internally illuminated so that means it's going to glow with white and red and the two colors will both light up.**
- **Mr. Marcovitz said his only question is the size of the address. It looks pretty small. He said usually it's a bigger address.**
- **Mr. Sharma stated he wouldn't mind if the logo itself got bigger. Meaning the Intralox letters.**
- **Ms. Enering said she would have to double check because sometimes with these companies, they have their brand standards have to have a certain amount of space around the logo so she would have to look into it and make sure that they can make that bigger. She did state she can make the address bigger though.**
- **Mr. Marcovitz asked if it was necessary to have the street name on the sign. Ms. Enering said she was going to ask that. Mr. Marcovitz stated they usually just request the street address. Ms. Enering asked if that was just the 2026. The Board said yes. Typically the size of the numerals is four inches because it's industrial.**
- **Ms. Frazier stated they can have the 2026 at the four inches and then underneath Summit Commerce Park. She also stated it could also be left justified or right justified to align with Intralox if they prefer.**
- **There are also some truck signs or way finding signs.**
- **Ms. Frazier stated all trucks use this entrance, the arrows are assumed to be pointing the correct directions on the front and rear tube. She also noted that they have the site plan for them as well.**
- **Mr. Marcovitz said his concern is the size of the way finding signs. He said 48 inch square is a pretty big sign and its right there kind of in front of the street. They've talked about the real dominance in there.**
- *The mic kept cutting out so Mr. Sharma's comments could not be heard clearly.*
- **Mr. Midlik asked if the area was very industrial there. Ms. Enering confirmed that.**

**MOTION: Mr. Midlik motioned to approve Part 1 of Case 23-03-13 as submitted.**

**Mr. Sharma seconded the Motion.**

**No further discussion was presented.**

**Upon roll call, the Motion passed unanimously.**

**MOTION: Mr. Midlik motioned to approve Part 2 of Case 23-03-13 as noted.**

- **Increase address numeral size to 4", option to increase Intralox by 5%-10%.**

**Mr. Marcovitz seconded the Motion.**

**No further discussion was presented.  
Upon roll call, the Motion passed unanimously.**

**MOTION: Mr. Marcovitz motioned to approve Part 3 of Case 23-03-13 as noted.**

- **Way finding signage – reduce the overall size to 36” in lieu of 48”.**

**Mr. Sharma seconded the Motion.  
No further discussion was presented.  
Upon roll call, the Motion passed unanimously.**

**Approval of Minutes: February 16, 2023:**

**MOTION: Mr. Midlik motioned to approve the Architectural Review Board meeting minutes dated February 16, 2023, as submitted:**

**Mr. Sharma seconded the Motion.  
No further discussion presented.  
Upon roll call, the Motion passed unanimously.**

**Additional Discussion: Mr. Geschke came back up to the podium to state that their designer did provide a rendering and he failed to attach it to the sign for the application. He wanted to just give them an idea of what it’s supposed to look like. Ms. Frazier stated it is much smaller than what was proposed because just based on the number of inches and feet that they had on the first document which was nine feet and what is shown on this rendering is much smaller. She would like to see it with the other sign. Ms. Frazier stated the rendering shown to them now, the image is significantly smaller than what was proposed. She said they are going to need an elevation of the building that shows the relation that shows where you are in relation to the other sign. That way the Board can really see what that elevation is.**

**Ms. Frazier would like the Board to know that new candidates were accepted and appointed to this Board. She was not notified until she called the City this afternoon at three o’clock and found out that she hadn’t received an email from them. She stated she was not reappointed to the Board although she did apply. There will be two new people but she congratulated David because he will be continuing on. Ms. Frazier said she wanted to thank everybody for her time on this Board and that she appreciated it. Mr. Marcovitz said she’s done a good job and thanked her for her time. Ms. Labbe also thanked Ms. Frazier.**

**Ms. Frazier stated she wanted to hand off a few issues that are out there that she knows of. Ms. Frazier stated that Mr. Marcovitz is a licensed architect in the state of Louisiana. Ms. Frazier said she looked into some codes because she felt professionally obligated to do so. She stated that according to the Ohio Revised Code title 47 chapter 4703 that you have to be a licensed architect in Ohio to be referred to as “architect”. Legally he is definitely an architect, he is an architect emeritus in Louisiana and he has full knowledge of an architect but according to what she had**

been reading, legally it seems that this Board has to have an architect on it and according to Ohio section 4703.18 you're prohibited to practice without a certificate and may not hold forth as an architect or registered architect and the term "consultant" may be used if qualified for such professional service in your own state or country. But she worries that there could be a legal issue. Going forward as long as there's an architect on the board and if you're working with one you're allowed to use the title of architect. Ms. Frazier stated she has the utmost respect for Mr. Marcovitz but this came up and she had the professional obligation to delve into it. She stated she checked the Louisiana Administrative Code section 1539 and it says that you need to use the title architect emeritus if you are *words unclear*. Your license is now architect emeritus and then section 1105C says that Emeritus cannot receive compensation as an architect so if you're being paid to be on the board and you're serving as the architect of the Board. First of all Ohio doesn't recognize that as an architect and Louisiana would then not recognize you as emeritus. Mr. Marcovitz stated he gets paid the same as any other member. Ms. Frazier stated you are as long as you are on the Board as a board member but if you take the position as architect of the board and you're the only architect on the board. She thinks that that causes some legal issues. Mr. Marcovitz asked if there has to be an architect on the Board. Ms. Frazier stated there does need to be one according to Chapter 1321 of the Codified ordinances. Mr. Marcovitz stated that for three to four hundred dollars he can submit an application to the State of Ohio to become a licensed architect because his national accreditation, as long as you've kept *word unclear wording*. Ms. Frazier thinks it's like another five hundred dollars which is what she has done taking the risk that she's not moving out of Ohio in the next five years. *There was additional conversation that was not picked up by the microphone.* Ms. Frazier stated the other option in the ordinance is that the Mayor, through a professional services contract, can hire an architect and then the architect would not be one of the five voting members because the five members are already appointed and then they would just need to attend the meetings. Mr. Marcovitz said they could put an ad out for an architect for the City if he decides not to do it. Ms. Frazier stated that on May 14<sup>th</sup>, the Board was notified that the City was going to post a position for a City architect to help with code enforcement and reach, As well as help prepare the Board for future ARB meetings. The advertisement was supposed to be posted that week and she never saw an advertisement for it so she doesn't know that that ever happened but the City must have changed its mind. She stated she doesn't know who the "city" is. Ms. Labbe stated she thinks it probably would have been Ted before he left. Ms. Frazier stated if an architect position does come up, she'd be interested to know what the application process and approval process is for that to occur and how that works with the timeline. Mr. Sharma and Ms. Frazier both feel the chair person should be an architect. Ms. Frazier also stated they are supposed to have a secretary on this Board so that's another position that would be voted on. It would be the chairperson and the secretary. She'd like to remind the Board that this Board has a seat on the CIC that was earned through negotiations with the Mayor \_\_\_\_\_ and when they were negotiating the demolition of the old school they were brought on particularly to help with the downtown redevelopment. She wanted to make sure that nobody forgot about that. She knows that David has attended and that she has attended at least two meetings.

Ms. Frazier stated that still outstanding is the ordinance 84 2021 which amended chapter 1321 of the codified ordinances. That ordinance states in section 1321.09 recommendations upon building code changes the Board shall consider, the Board meaning the Architectural Review Board that's defined in here as well, the Board shall consider all proposals or requests for changes or

amendments in this building code. Including all components thereof and make that show it's approved. It used to say and make their recommendations thereof to council. This Board was supposed to see and approve any of these proposed changes that were made in 2021 in the fall. We were not given any drafts of the changes that were made. We did not get to voice any opinions and we have some strong opinions on some of the changes that were made. We voiced those opinions in January after it was adopted. Ms. Labbe asked who the council person was. Ms. Frazier stated it was Bill Fury. Ms. Labbe asked what he said to this. Ms. Frazier stated he silenced it. He did what he could to erase it from the meeting minutes that we even brought it up. The reason I did bring this to, I obtained legal counsel myself, and then brought it to the attention of the Twinsburg legal counsel in the summer. She told them what had been going on and the concerns about this and Twinsburg legal counsel stated that it was approved sloppily. There were several typos within this and the fact that even their recommendations to council were deleted out of the middle of the sentence was concerning and not able to be left as it is. She stated she has not heard back since and because of the great difficulties she was receiving from Council, a certain member of council, Bill Fury. She was advised that if she did not let it drop that she would be removed from her position and so she let it drop for a long time. Ms. Frazier stated someone brought it up on this Board a month or so ago and they looked into what is fishy or what are the loopholes. Their loopholes have to do with that twenty-five percent any one can put on a two-car garage on their house now and not come to this Board. All they have to do is get in with the Building Commissioner. That gives the Building Commissioner a great amount of power this Board didn't even get a say in these changes being made, not even a voice, not even a vote. Ms. Frazier stated this Board gets a voice and they did not get that. She stated the Board had been approached in the past with any changes such as signage, the Building Department or Larry Finch (he's part of the department) would bring the Board changes being proposed. The Board would read through it in detail, once or twice, two different meeting possibly and give them our feedback and then the changes are made. In this case we were not consulted at all. It was slipped by us and we didn't know it happened until January when we received a copy of it already having been passed sloppily. Ms. Frazier stated in general they are adding things like the Board shall only consider the exterior design features. She stated sometimes the Board needs to see the interior to understand how it relates to the exterior. She understands they aren't trying to pick apart someone's kitchen, but they need to know if there's a reason why you can't put a window there is because that's where the refrigerator is. She stated there are reasons why they need to see and consider the interior of the building when designing the exterior building or considering the exterior of the building.

**Excuse Absent Members:** All members present.

**Adjournment:**

**MOTION:** Ms. Frazier motioned to adjourn the meeting at 7:50pm.

**Mr. Sharma** seconded the Motion.

Upon roll call, the Motion unanimously passed to adjourn the meeting.

---

Jennifer Frazier, Chairman

---

Viraj Sharma, Secretary