

ARC – October 6, 2025 Reviews

MEMEBERS PRESENT: Chair Melanie Baker, Vice Chair Jason Boltz, Curt Smock, Bill Weber and Michael Ackermann.

ARC-25-20 – Brian Becker of Becker Signs, for Arcadian Detailing Supply, 1864 N. Cleveland-Massillon Road, sign review, B-5.

Zoning Comments: Property is located on the west side of N. Cleveland Massillon Road, approximately 950' south of the N. Cleveland Massillon Road and Ira Road intersection in the Hammonds Corner Hamlet. i of the Needle is located to the north, and single-family residences are located to the east, south and west. The site currently has two commercial buildings; the northern building is i of the Needle and Arcadian Detailing Supply is in the southern building. The signs require a variance to permit an additional monument sign for the parcel. There is a monument sign for i of the Needle on the same parcel as the proposed new monument sign.

Mr. Brian Becker presented to the Commission a proposal to install a 60" x 33" – 13.75 sq. ft. monument sign that is 4' in total height and 12' from the edge of road pavement, for Arcadian Detailing Supply. Mr. Becker stated that this is a little unique situation because there is two totally separate and distinct businesses, unrelated, on the property. Hence, they need a variance to allow the second sign. The proposed sign is to be put where the original sign was way back when. Using his exhibits on screen Mr. Becker pointed out that the sign has a white vinyl frame, and is a digital print, matte laminated put on six millimeter ACM. Then the frame totally encapsulates the sign so it won't blow out or anything like that. Regarding the landscaping, he explained that what is there has three shrubs in it and they would take out the center shrub and have the tenant plant some low growing creeping Juniper or Myrtle or something like that to replace it.

Discussion ensued by the Commission and Mr. Weber asked Mr. Funk about the I of the Needle building and Mr. Funk shared that there was an existing structure there that they used for basically a storage building for a long period of time. Then they did add an addition to that building. So, the addition would be the part to the north. Mr. Weber stated what he was looking for was the precedent if there were two businesses on site before. His next question was, does this sort of business example exist where we have two monument signs on one site. Mr. Funk stated there is one example at the property with Aqua pools and the home healthcare business that received a variance for something similar to this. There is actually three buildings on that property, with two of them having a monument sign. Mr. Becker commented to say the total of the two signs will still be under the 20 square foot allowance for the property. Mr. Weber had no problem with the sign design itself and the fact that it is still under the allowable area. Mrs. Baker asked about the address that was on the application as "1864" and the sign rendering says "1854". Mr. Becker stated that the address will probably be changed to 1864 as there seems to be some confusion whether there was a separate building address or not. Mr. Funk stated it would be worth the client talking to the County Planning Department who does the addressing. Maybe have a conversation with the business owner if they do want separate addresses for each building, to get those assigned through the county and possibly clarifying.

The Commission members were good with the monument sign but did encourage replacing some of the plantings that will be removed with the low growth as you move forward. Mr. Becker agreed and stated that is the plan; when they take out the center shrub, they will put in some low growing Myrtle or creeping Juniper.

Motion approved the application as presented, pending the zoning variance approval by Mr. Smock; seconded by Mr. Weber. Roll Call: Mr. Smock, Mr. Ackerman, Mr. Boltz and Mr. Weber. Vote: 4-0 to approve. Madam Chair asked the applicant to look over the landscaping and send the plan to Bill for a final review.

ARC-25-21 – Mike Bizjak of CESCO Imaging, for Hyde Park Prime Steakhouse, 4073 Medina Road, Sign review, B-2.

Zoning Comments: Property is located on the north side of Medina Road, roughly 300' west of the Springside Drive and Medina Road intersection. The property also has road frontage on Springside Drive. To the north there are hotels, to the east are Huntington Bank, Barnes & Nobles and the True North gas station, to the south is commercial property in Copley Township and to the west is I-77. The site currently is used as the Holiday Inn and, soon again, Hyde Park. The signs require a variance to permit an additional wall sign and to exceed the area of wall signage facing Medina Road. The applicant is permitted one 40 sq. ft. wall sign facing a thoroughfare and they are seeking 64.4 sq. ft. of wall signage facing Medina Road, which is 61% over the regulation.

Mr. Mike Bizjak presented to the Commission that he and the owner, Joe Saccone are here to propose new signage for Hyde Park Prime. This includes the following: a 15' 2.75" x 31" – 39.4 sq. ft. internally illuminated wall sign for Hyde Park Prime Steakhouse facing Medina Road, an 87" x 32.5" – 19.5 sq. ft. internally illuminated wall sign over the main entrance facing Springside Drive, and a 5' x 5' – 25 sq. ft. wall sign facing Medina Road. Mr. Bizjak distributed a set of renderings to the Commission members and walked them through the site demonstrating the previous signs, noting that they have been removed, along with the awnings, because they have started painting. The main building's (south side) proposed sign will be halo lit channel letters. Then there is a duplicate sign over the entry on the east side of the building. Mr. Bizjak then showed views of the awnings. He noted that part of the footprint will change as a part of that elevation was the Holiday Inn. With the change to "Spark" part of the wall there will be part of Hyde Park. The Holiday Inn sign has been removed and they are proposing an "HP" monogram sign because there is another entity ultimately going to be in the building. This is part of the Hyde Park frontage at this point. The Holiday Inn sign on the 77 side of the building, the west side, has also been removed again for the painting. Mr. Bizjak pointed out the monument signs on Medina Road and on Springside. Regarding the main identification sign, he stated that they are individual channel letters, reverse channel fabricated aluminum, halo light so the nighttime view is shown on the gray, which is how those letters will look at night, versus the facelift white, that is viewed during the day. Mr. Bizjak demonstrated the new awnings will be recovered, matching the renderings that that were provided. Next was a smaller side wall sign over the main entry. This is a cabinet sign, routed metal face, dimensional copy reading Hyde Park Prime Steakhouse. He shared that the nighttime view would basically be exactly the same as a daytime view. What is black is black. What's white, will light white. Lastly, he shared that the "HP" monogram sign is kind of the secondary ID to the overall High Park entity. This would be on that feature wall. This would be ground lit with existing lighting on the ground and be redirected to that wall. Mr. Bizjak presented that the awnings would have gold frames, with black canvas and white stripes. This will be consistent all the way around.

Discussion ensued by the Commission and Mr. Weber asked for clarification on what signage is exceeding and Mr. Funk explained that the way we look at it is there are two wall signs facing route 18. They can have one wall sign facing route 18, that's 40 square feet. So, it's either the HP sign that's 25 square feet, or the Hyde Park main sign that is at 39.4 square feet. So, the one requiring a variance is the 25 square foot "HP" monogram sign. Mr. Bizjak noted, regarding the variance, that this signage package is a slight reduction in the overall signage if you count all the "HP" monograms that were on the old version of the monogram on the awnings. The Commission felt that signage, and the monogram regardless of the variance, looked very nice and was tastefully done. Madam Chair felt the sign size was good, too, based on the street that it is facing.

Motion to approve the signage application and the variance as presented by Mr. Boltz; seconded by Mr. Smock. Roll Call: Mr. Weber, Mr. Boltz, Mr. Ackerman and Mr. Smock. Vote: 4-0 to approve.

ARC-25-22 – Erick Allen of Alber & Rice, for Albrecht Inc., 3979 Medina Road, site plan review, B-2.

Zoning Comments: Property is located on the north side of Route 18, roughly 2000' from the I-77 and Route 18 intersection. Springside Athletic Club is located to the north, Temple Israel and Barnes & Nobles is located to the west, West Market Plaza is located to the east and Copley Township is located to the south across Route 18. The proposal meets the requirements of the Zoning Resolution and requires site plan approval from the Appearance Review Commission.

Mr. Erick Allen, with Alber and Rice Consulting Engineers representing Albrecht, presented to the Commission a proposal to replace the existing salt domes on the site and consolidate them to one area located to the west of the Acme Building. Currently, there is a salt dome located to the northeast and one to the northwest of the building that both need repairing. Using his exhibits Mr. Allen explained what Acme and Albrecht are looking to do is to replace their two aging and failing salt domes that are behind the building on the corners. He referred to the aerials and stated if you look closely, you can see those two domes. If anyone has been over there you can see they are both in pretty rough shape. Mr. Allen stated what was proposed to them, from an engineering standpoint, was they wanted to consolidate the two locations, obviously, because it's been a hassle dealing with the two spread apart across the site like that. We felt this was a good location to put them, as it is basically the maneuvering and turnaround area for the trucks now for Acme. Mr. Allen referred to the drawings in the package he recently submitted showing the image of the single unit. He said that in the previous drawing, there were two domes next to each other in that engineering plan. Then as time went on, it made more sense just to get one singular dome. He presented a picture he got from a manufacturer and stated that he was not sure if Albrecht would go with that particular manufacturer, but that it is the one they're looking at right now. One thing you have the notes on there is, and he wanted to say for the record, that that image, please take note that image is up on wood posts. He pointed it out on his exhibits. This particular dome would be similar in size to that, except that base piece would be the large concrete blocks that you normally see and what they're actually using now on the two existing salt domes. That image is longer and he thought that was 40 feet long and this other structure will be the same width, but only 32 feet long and 19 feet in height on the canvas itself. Mr. Allen stated that Acme is not sure if they want to go with three blocks or two blocks, meaning their blocks are two feet high, so either four feet or six feet. They are still debating on that. He realized that makes a difference tonight because this was submitted as a 15 foot structure on four foot of blocks, which would be 19 total. If they want to go to the six that obviously would raise it up to 21 but for now, we're going to stick with the 19. Regarding the newer engineering plan, Mr. Allen said that his engineer was able to move the salt structure a little bit for the north and the overall width would be a little less because this

would be a more efficient use of space without having the two walls in between. There will be little bit of grading in an area to the west of beyond that, the goal here is to replace the aging structures they have behind the building with one singular structure. He added that the surface is currently gravel back there and it will remain gravel.

Discussion ensued by the Commission and there was questions regarding the concrete pads and how they would be seeded. Mr. Allen stated, first the area would be graded and leveled out, and then the large concrete blocks would be arranged, 32 feet long x 38 feet wide. There will be a wall across the back, obviously open to the front. Once that's installed, a concrete floor would be poured in between, just within the concrete block square and directly in front of that would be gravel. It was confirmed that the plans meet the required setbacks. Mr. Allen shared that this building would hold a little more salt than the previous buildings and Mr. Dan McCall, with Albrecht, added that it is for salt distribution for at least two of the Acmes. Mr. Ackerman inquired about the runoff from the salt and Mr. Allen stated they decided to put a berm around it. He pointed out on the drawings a two foot berm that went all the way around the structure. So, anything, obviously, is supposed to be protected from the elements, but if anything would happen, the concrete pad, as we talked about earlier, is sloped. Anything that went around would run to the gravel and be contained in that area. The Commission inquired how trucks would be dumping salt within and Mr. Allen said, optimally, what they'd like to do is to be able to bring their dumps in and lift that, but it could be tight. And even though they thought we were allowed to go to 35', Albrecht did not want to go anything any higher because of wind issues. The goal would be to be able to back a truck in as much as they can off of that. And then if they do have to bring the bed down so it doesn't hit the structure, they could maneuver and do what they have to do. They obviously have loaders and things at that point where they could push the salt to the back. Ultimately, it will come down to the contractor that Albrecht uses. The Commission was good with the white roof structure and understood its reason for being white. They also felt that it would be pretty well hidden back in the site.

Motion to approve the application as presented by Mr. Weber; seconded by Mr. Ackerman. Roll Call: Mr. Boltz, Mr. Ackerman, Mr. Smock and Mr. Weber. Vote: 4-0 to approve.

ARC-25-23 – Peninsula Architects, for Bath Township, 4400 Everett Road, site plan review, R-2.

Zoning Comments: The 77.6 acre property is located on the south side of Everett Road, roughly 3,700' west of the N. Cleveland Massillon Road and Everett Road intersection. Single family residences are located to the north, east and south, the Firestone Trace treatment facility and the Bath Baseball Park are located to the west. The current site contains the North Fork Preserve Park and the proposal does not impact the environmental protection area per the Zoning Resolution. The proposal does require conditional use approval and a variance to impact the 100' minimum setback for structures. The barn is setback 75' from the eastern property line.

Mr. Matt Schwarz, of Peninsula Architects, presented to the Commission a proposal to renovate the existing barn, making improvements to the parking and adding a standalone restroom to the south of the barn on the property. Mr. Schwarz shared that this barn was brought to the site many years ago. He stated that the intention is to convert it into a wedding venue. So, the barn is going to be lifted up off some foundation that is woefully inadequate for our frost depth and the foundation will be replaced. Then they will drop the existing barn frame onto the new foundation and reside everything with insulated panels and add little awning side additions to the north and south of the building. The whole thing will be sided in Hardy vertical board and batten. It will have a standing seam metal roof, of which the color has not

been determined, but so far, it's always been shown in a silver, gray, black color. Mr. Schwarz noted the "Trailhead restroom" on the plan and stated that this restroom building will serve not only the new wedding barn, but also the trail that's adjacent to that on the property. It will have similar finishes to the barn, being Hardy board and a standing seam metal roof. The barn, actually, as it stands, is already within our 100 foot setback. So, adding the wings on to the north and the south, the south one comes a little closer to the setback than the barn sits right now; but we're already well within that 100 foot set back where the barn is located. Mr. Schwarz stated that it is about 1,000 feet back from Everett Road, so it's quite a distance. There is a lot of tree cover and a pretty long winding road that goes back into the site that they are going to improve. Parking will be added, with a lot of gravel parking to the west and to the north of the barn. Applicant shared that they built the whole thing in a series of 3D renderings to give the Commission a conceptual view of what it looks like coming in from the street and into the parking lot, and then across from that there is an existing house, which at one point was planned to become a new community center. However, that has been put on hold due to budgetary concerns.

Discussion ensued by the Commission and Mr. Boltz asked if any consideration was given, when you're lifting the barn and redoing the foundation, to move it to get out of the setback issue. He also wondered, if this is for a wedding venue, is there going to be a breakout space or something like that. Is there any exterior space being developed or connectivity to the house? Mr. Schwarz responded to say he believed that Bath at one point did talk about using that green space between the two buildings to maybe do a tent for some open air for something between the two buildings. But at this time, there's nothing being done with the house. He could not say for sure what the future is for that kind of space. Regarding moving it, they did not consider that just as far as circulation and parking, to bring that thing another 22 feet in, it's going to cut that whole drive in half, and we'd have to bring all of that parking a lot closer to the existing house. So, if they did want to use that space in between, it would be reduced considerably. Mr. Boltz asked if the parking count is adequate for a fully occupied building and Mr. Schwarz stated that it is.

Mr. Schwarz walked the Commission through the floor plans and stated that it's pretty open. On the side that faces west towards the existing house, it will open with a large sliding barn door. There is an entry door, and then as you open it up, we've got some kind of green room space for a bride and groom, storage space, mechanical/electrical room, and then the rest is wide open for seating. The intention being that the ceremony would focus at the front. We've given the Township a couple of different layouts for table setups for receptions within that space. The idea is you could open up these barn doors and have kind of indoor and outdoor kind of flow through. Mr. Ackerman inquired on how many square feet the barn is currently and how many square feet will be added and Mr. Schwarz did not have that exact information but stated that it is being increased by a about 30% to manage an occupancy of about 80 people. It is a small footprint that has no kitchen or food prep, no running water, only electric and gas. Mr. Boltz asked why they wouldn't stub some utilities in in the event this becomes a major success. Mr. Schwarz referred back to his statement that the original plan included the house across the green. There was additional restrooms, meeting space and full kitchen in there. The idea was that when you rented one space you would get that whole area. Mr. Weber asked if the restroom is dedicated to this building or is it for overall use and Mr. Schwarz informed them it is for park use and the building. The restroom will have a men's and a woman's and will have a little mechanical janitors closet. The restroom will be fully heated with piped water and electricity and open year-round. They did have a brand-new commercial septic system that was approved and installed; they just need to make the connections. Mr. Schwarz shared that the plan is to preserve as much of the barn as possible. It has been patched together, but the frame, for the most part is remaining intact. They will take out a couple of the main posts toward the front so there is a better view of the of the event space, but all the exterior siding we're going to try and keep that on the

inside. So, that will be the finish for a lot of the inside. You'll see that original barn siding and then the insulated panels will go up on top of that.

Discussion ensued on the parking and Mr. Boltz confirmed with the applicant that it's gravel parking and asked about what looked like a retention area. Mr. Schwarz said that it was stormwater management designed to slow the water down before it leaves the site. He walked them through the site plan showing the gravel drive and parking. He said they did add an alternative to do a part of the parking in asphalt with concrete for ADA spaces. He shared that they will be disturbing over an acre so they have started the process with EPA with their notice of intent to disturb. Mr. Boltz recommended, for future development as a wedding venue, at least plan for some area for a breakout space off to the northeast. Mr. Schwarz responded to say that right now everything is pretty well uphill. They don't have a considerable amount of flat space behind to take advantage of, and to do anything with that, there would be some considerable regrading in order to make that usable for the wedding. That's why it's nice to be able to come out across that drive with the concrete walkway and walk all the way to the edge of the new parking. There is all this space that you can kind of break out into, rather than behind the barn, keeping that activity away from the neighbor's property line and more in the center of the property. Mr. Schwarz pointed out the adjacent neighbor and it was noted that there was a nice tree line separating the two properties and said there is no plan to disturb it. Regarding the storm water retention and runoff path, Mr. Schwarz stated he believed it will perk away and the idea is to keep it on site. There is an existing swale through the property right now, that all of the neighbors runoff is coming down through this property. We have redirected that to keep it away from the parking lot, but we are not introducing anything more. We have an overflow spillway that picks up some of that water, they don't feel it will see much action.

Madam Chair asked if there were any questions or concerns on the site plan beyond what has already been discussed. Mr. Weber inquired if there were any exterior lighting plans. Mr. Schwarz shared that there are plans for a couple of pole lights for the parking lot and then some small bollard lights along the path. The tall parking lot lighting is confined to the south edge of the parking lot. Additionally, there will be a couple of little barn light fixtures hanging on the side of the barn, but no landscape lighting pointing up at the barn. The lighting will be on a timer and a photo eye that they can use in combination. Mr. Boltz asked how the wedding and reception functions would work timewise, relative to the neighbor on time constraints. Mr. Funk spoke to say there will be some later hours and Bath is in the midst of finalizing that now. The plan is to meet with the neighbor who is directly to the east because that is who they feel will be most impacted. The plan is to meet with them over the next week once the park rules are finalized for the facility. The Township has met with the neighbor on some other issues regarding access and a small pond in the back. A fence has been put in between the properties to keep people off of the neighboring property.

Madam Chair asked if there were any comments on the building structure, materials being used or otherwise. The members felt it was a great plan in making the two buildings work together. Mr. Schwarz stated that they are working on an area for the dumpster pad and screening and they also have the Fire Department on board. Madam Chair asked about landscaping and Mr. Schwarz stated that right now the intent is to disturb as few of the existing trees, even some of the scrub material, as possible, and then just re-seed all of the all the lawn areas. There are no plans right now for any bushes or shrubs.

Motion to approve the application as presented, by Mr. Smock; seconded by Mr. Weber. Roll Call: Mr. Weber, Mr. Boltz, Mr. Smock and Mr. Ackerman. Vote: 4-0 to approve.

Madam Chair noted that it was a good suggestion to stub in some utilities somewhere in the future as well.