



**Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes
Thursday, July 20, 2023
6:00 p.m.**

Mr. Marcovitz 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: David Marcovitz, Viraj Sharma, John Midlik, Valerie Wales, Gursimran Khatra

Others in attendance: Danielle Waites, Building Department, Jason Pastorius, Building Department, and Daisy Walker, City Council

Public Participation:

Review:

1. **Case 23-07-32 2496 E. Aurora Rd., Circle K – Gas Canopy Replacement – Susan Moore, Cupkovic Architecture, LLC**

- **Ms. Moore stated the canopy will be a direct replacement of what is existing.**
- **Ms. Moore stated Circle K assesses and surveys their buildings and their canopies to make sure everything is structurally sound. This one isn't falling apart but it's reaching the end of its useful canopy life.**
- **Mr. Midlik asked if it's not signage, just the canopy. Ms. Moore stated there will be signage on it but it will look identical to what's on it already.**
- **Ms. Moore stated it will be the same size, location and colors.**

MOTION: Mr. Midlik motioned to approve Case 23-07-32 as submitted.

Ms. Wales seconded the Motion.

No further discussion was presented.

Upon roll call, the Motion passed unanimously.

2. Case 23-07-33 9198 Darrow Rd., Wilcox School – New Pavilion – Scott Alleman, ThenDesign Architecture

- **Mr. Alleman stated Wilcox school and the PTA would like to build an exterior pavilion behind the school and playground that they want to use as an exterior outdoor learning area for the students.**
- **Mr. Alleman stated it's a simple structure pavilion that is twenty feet wide and thirty feet long.**
- **Mr. Alleman stated it will have vinyl siding on the front gable faces of it. It will have stained finish to the supports.**
- **Signage is being proposed on the East elevation side that faces the parking lot.**
- **Ms. Wales asked how often the stained parts will need to be redone. Mr. Alleman stated they will probably need to be done every three to five years to keep it up and that would be a maintenance thing that would need to be done.**
- **Ms. Wales asked if the concrete slab is just to keep the surface dry rather than have grass or wood chips. Mr. Alleman stated they want to have a concrete slab for it to be accessible and they want ADA accessibility for those students that would need it.**
- **Mr. Khatra asked if there is any power to this pavilion. Mr. Alleman stated there is no power or water.**

MOTION: Mr. Sharma motioned to approve Case 23-07-33, as submitted.

Ms. Wales seconded the Motion.

No further discussion was presented.

Upon roll call, the Motion passed unanimously.

3. Case 23-07-34 2238 Gary Dr., Donatelli Home Addition – Nick Donatelli, Homeowner

- **Mr. Pozek, the Architect, stated they would be constructing a three-car garage, bedrooms and bathroom upstairs and adding a laundry room to get the washer and dryer out of the kitchen.**
- **Ms. Wales asked if they would be doing vertical siding.**
- **Mr. Donatelli stated they would like to do vertical siding on the ranch side and then horizontal siding on the second story and maybe a shake at the peak.**
- **Mr. Donatelli stated that the only thing that they have changed that is different from the drawings provided, is he doesn't think they are going to veneer the four foot line across the front. What he would like to do is veneer just in the entrance way and then just over the garage where the second floor would be. Mainly because the existing home is so short and he thinks with the vertical siding and if they take it half the side up it'll look weird.**
- **Mr. Khatra asked if they are changing the whole roof. Mr. Donatelli stated yes the roof will be all brand new.**

MOTION: Mr. Midlik motioned to approve Case 23-07-34 as submitted.

Mr. Sharma seconded the Motion.

No further discussion was presented.

Upon roll call, the Motion passed unanimously.

4. Case 23-07-35 8934 Darrow Rd. Suite C101, Resubmission – Studio Wish Additional Signage – Rowena Yeager, Studio Wish business owner

- **Mr. Marcovitz asked Mr. Macias to confirm they submitted the same renderings for this meeting as they did during the previous meeting. Mr. Macias stated they made minor modifications that they would like to review with the Board.**
- **Mr. Macias stated they are here today to reapply for the two additional signs that go above the sign awning but they would like to show the Board a slightly different version of the sign based on some of the feedback that they got from the last meeting, but keeping in line with the brand that they discussed that Studio Wish has adopted.**
- **Ms. Wales stated the previous discussion wasn't about the location or the size of the signs but the colors and the print on the back and didn't fit in with the other signs in the plaza.**
- **Mr. Macias stated they are asking for two variances. One that will allow them to put up more than one sign and then the second that would allow them to go beyond the square footage allowed. Then there is the sign application/permit for the actual design that would go up.**
- **Ms. Yeager stated that in 2020 when her business was shut down for eight weeks due to Covid, she took that opportunity to rebrand her business and change it from what it looked like before with their logo and with the name of the business. They altered it to Studio Wish Salon Spa. She stated that when they decided to do this there were several things that they changed within their brand which took them to more of a black and white appearance but it also took them to having a splash of color which is why originally the Board saw with the Salon Spa had the orange.**
- **Ms. Yeager stated Mr. Macias mentioned the original proposed sign was way too dark and after she looked at it she agreed and that from the street it's very hard to see and so one of the things that they did was changed it and lightened up the wish on the background so that it's not as dark and then changed the red orange, which she could see being a disconnect from their sign above, and made it white.**
- **Another option that they added was that in the Wish, they have the dot underneath and the dot above.**
- **Mr. Midlik asked Ms. Yeager if her logo is registered nationally. Ms. Yeager stated her logo is registered with the state and she has a copyright on the actual brand logo.**

MOTION #1: Mr. Marcovitz motioned to approve the Variance for Case 23-07-35 as submitted.

Mr. Midlik seconded the Motion.

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

- **Mr. Marcovitz stated there are three options being submitted for the Board to choose from:
 - 1) White lettering
 - 2) White lettering with the dot under the S
 - 3) Red orange lettering**
- **Ms. Yeager stated the white lettering with the dot under the S is not one of her favorites. She stated she prefers the all-white lettering. She believes it ties in better with visibility and readability when you look at it from across the parking lot.**
- **Ms. Wales stated that is a very good point. Ms. Yeager stated with the orange you cannot see that at all.**
- **Mr. Sharma stated that as it's submitted right now, he is not a big fan of any of the options with the black background. He asked if it is possible to use the same white/silver that is used on the existing sign as a background currently. Ms. Yeager stated they tried that and she felt it did not look good.**
- **Ms. Wales stated she likes the idea of a lighter background too that was with dark lettering but maybe the red and the black surround as a border on the signs with the Salon Spa without the background writing on it.**
- **Mr. Khatra stated for him if they had the top one as a black and white then the bottom one could be exact same but to him, the rest of the building's signs are all white.**
- **Mr. Sharma stated his big concern is it takes away the uniformity and also opens everybody else to similar types of signs.**

MOTION #2: Mr. Sharma motioned to approve Case 23-07-35 as submitted for the variation without the dot.

Mr. Khatra seconded the Motion.

No further discussion was presented.

Upon roll call, the Motion was disapproved, 1-4.

Mr. Khatra (No), Mr. Marcovitz (No), Mr. Sharma (No), Ms. Wales (No), Mr. Midlik (Yes).

Approval of Minutes: July 6, 2023

MOTION: Mr. Sharma motioned to approve the Architectural Review Board meeting minutes dated July 6, 2023, as submitted.

Ms. Wales seconded the Motion.

No further discussion presented.

Upon roll call, the Motion passed unanimously.

Additional Discussion:

Excuse Absent Members:

Adjournment:

MOTION: Mr. Marcovitz motioned to adjourn the meeting at 6:47pm.

Mr. Sharma seconded the Motion.

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

David Marcovitz, Chairman

John Midlik, Secretary