



**CITY OF TALLMADGE
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 2023
7:00 p.m.

COUNCIL CHAMBERS

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Patrick Larson called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

Commission Members present: Patrick Larson
Julie Oliver
Stephen Ryder
Kevin Heilmeier
Bob Kostko

Administration present: Megan Raber, Law Director
Helene Hussing, Planning and Zoning Manager

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

A motion to adopt the May 4, 2023 minutes was made by Mr. Heilmeier and seconded by Mrs. Oliver.

All members voted in favor. (5-0)

AGENDA ADDITIONS

None

CORRESPONDENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS

Memo from City Engineer dated May 2, 2023.

AGENDA ITEMS

FILING - none

CASES

Case PZ 23-06-01

Site Plan Review: Modification to Sign Code

For Review and Determination

Address: 505 South Ave
Applicant: Matt VerBeck, Archer Sign Corporation
Owner: Tallmadge Properties

Mrs. Hussing gave a summary of the case.

The representative for the case, Matt VerBeck gave more information on the case according to the submitted plans.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Larson: Do you have a representation of what the sign is supposed to look like? Because what I'm seeing still has a yellow background.

Mr. VerBeck: The background was not painted when we superimposed that on there. That was recently done within the last week; so, I don't have that signage on that background right now. I can get that though, within a matter of days. He's got a picture of what the wall looks like now.

Mr. Blakeslee approached the podium.

Mr. Blakeslee presented a photo of the actual background as it is right now.

Mrs. Oliver: What is the reasoning behind making this change? Is it that corporate changed the way this logo goes?

Mr. VerBeck: Yes, corporate made the decision to change a few things about the layout of the signage. A big part that they did was, they changed their trim cap to an all-white trim cap in order to make the letters stand out a little bit, for a cleaner look up front. They did that across the board at all locations and then they changed part of the layout of their logo as well.

Mr. Larson: The original submission on April 28th, 127 sf showed the Planet Fitness letters with the logo on the side. The new one that you're submitting now has Planet Fitness on 2 lines and the logo is actually larger. Are either one of those acceptable to Planet Fitness?

Mr. VerBeck: Yes, both of those are acceptable. So, they actually have 4 options to choose from.

Mr. VerBeck described each option available.

Mr. Larson: I personally like the original submission. I'm not sure why you went back and increased it. If the 137 sf was too large, I'm not sure why you came back with a 240 sf as an option instead of just taking the 137 and asking for an exception.

Mr. VerBeck: The reason for that is, at the time, we hadn't done a proper survey of the building and I didn't realize it was that far set back from the road. Once I realized it was that far set back from the road, compared with the size of the original signage, that's where the decision was made to try and increase that. That, combined with the fact that the landlord was not going to be giving them any tenant signage at the road for identification.

Mr. Kostko: Is there a corporate standard for their signage and their logo or is it strictly off of different buildings?

Mr. VerBeck: They have a very specific layout as far as where Planet and Fitness fall in. If it's the stacked version, how far that logo is off of the P and the F. Now, the size of that layout depends on the situation that you're dealing with. So if the sign band on a building is a certain amount of feet, you have to be able to fit within band. That's basically where their stipulation gives you a little flexibility. But as far as the spacing in-between each word and from logo to each word, that's set-in stone. You can't mess with that.

Mr. Kostko: On the building itself right now, is there additional work that has to be done behind the sign, on the face of the building?

Mr. VerBeck: No. It's been painted. The last part for that part of the building would be us coming to install the sign itself.

Mr. Heilmeier: Mr. Chair, originally I was with you, that I liked the 137-sf sign, but I'm beginning to wonder now, if the day comes and there's an outbuilding put in there, depending on the height and everything, is that going to be a problem down the road? Are they going to be back in front of us? And the sign originally was 240 and you're at 225 now. It's not like they're asking for a bigger sign. I could live with either one of them but I think in the long

term, if there's potential for no signage on the street from the landlord and a potential of buildings being in front of them, I wouldn't be opposed to the bigger sign.

Mrs. Oliver: Seeing the photograph that you showed us gives us an idea of the color. I'm pleased to see that. That to me improves things significantly but I also believe that that is going to take away from the visibility to some degree because the yellow attracted a lot of attention and the gray won't attract as much. I agree with Mr. Heilmeier that with that setback and the potential for some further development out there, I don't have an issue with the larger sign.

Mr. VerBeck: I apologize for the first submission. I was not aware.. usually you don't have it set that far off the road and usually they do allow for tenant signage. If it makes any difference, I'm sure Planet Fitness would probably be comfortable agreeing to not applying for any further signage at this location if they're allowed for this variance. It is a considerable variance, but that is something we can certainly discuss with them as well.

Mr. Ryder: Looking at both options, I don't have a problem with either one. I think the stacked version looks a little more appealing and probably a little more visible from the road at that distance and it seems to fit more aesthetically with the gable front of that building.

Commission discussed the Variance Applicable Factors.

Factor A – The strict application of the provisions of this Zoning Code would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship inconsistent with the general purpose and intent of this Zoning Code.

All commission members agreed.

Factor B – There are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the property involved or to the intended use or development of the property that do not apply generally to other properties or uses in the same zoning district or neighborhood.

All commission members agreed.

Factor C – The granting of such variance will not be of substantial detriment to the public interest or to property or improvements in such district in which the variance is sought and will not materially impair the purpose of this Zoning Code.

All commission members agreed.

The following motion was made by Mrs. Oliver and seconded by Mr. Heilmeier:

I move to approve the Site Plan Review Application, Case #PZ 23-06-01 for a site modification to signage, applicant Matt VerBeck, Archer Sign Corporation, owner Tallmadge Properties LLC at 505 South Ave, based upon the application & plans submitted May 18 & 22, 2023, to the Planning & Zoning Department subject to the following conditions, modifications and/or amendments based on the evidence presented: That a modification from the sign code is not granted for a 135.6 square foot sign area variance from Sections 1108.05 B (7) and 1108.11 E (2) to allow 225.6 square feet of sign area;

- 1. That the illumination of all signs complies with the standards as listed in Section 1108.05 F Sign Illumination;**
- 2. That all installations are met and approved by the Summit County Department of Building Standards; (and)**
- 3. That any temporary signage comply with the City of Tallmadge Sign Regulations in the Zoning Code;**

All members present voted in favor. (5-0)

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Heilmeier and seconded by Mrs. Oliver.

All members present voted in favor. (5-0)

Meeting adjourned at 7:27 pm

Respectfully submitted,



Kelli Funk, Secretary



Patrick Larson, Chairman

Full audio recording of meeting is hereby incorporated as part of meeting record.