

ARC – August 4, 2025 Reviews

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

ARC-25-15 – Carly Detar, of OLIO Development Group, for Raising Cane’s, 3921 Medina Road, sign review, B-2.

Zoning Comments: Property is located on the north side of Medina Road, roughly 950’ west of the Medina Road and N. Cleveland Massillon Road intersection. To the north is West Market Plaza and Acme, to the west is the Acme West Wing Plaza, to the south is Copley Township and to the east is Red Lobster. The applicant requires variances to exceed the number of, location, and overall area for wall signs; the proposed monument sign meets the Zoning Resolution. The maximum wall signs for the B-2 District is 40 square feet and they exceed that.

Ms. Carly Detar, with OLIO Development Group, spoke on behalf of Raising Cane’s. Ms. Detar stated that they are the preferred developers for Raising Cane’s here in Ohio. She presented to the Commission the proposal for Raising Cane’s signage. The wall signs include an internally illuminated “Raising Cane’s” sign that is 8’ x 3’ 10” – 25.5 sq. ft., and a non-illuminated 12’ 4” x 9’ mural on the front south elevation. There is also an internally illuminated “Raising Cane’s” sign that is 8’ x 3’ 10” – 25.5 sq. ft. on the drive thru west elevation and a “Cane 1” sign that is a non-illuminated 48” x 96” – 32 sq. ft. on the side entry east elevation. The applicant is also requesting a monument sign that is 4’ x 6’ and internally illuminated. The total sign area for the monument sign is 16 sq. ft. and the total height is 4’. Ms. Detar explained that Cane’s is very heavy on their branding; they ask for a lot of signs, but they did cut their typical brand package that they like to see on all of their restaurants. We cut that signage down more than half to present what we have submitted to you all. She shared that after talking with Mr. Funk, the front facing, facing the right of way, the Cane sign and the canopy “One Love” sign is allowed by code, and we are asking for the mural sign and then the other same size as the one facing the right of way sign on the drive through side, as well as the “Cane” dog facing the parking lot. Ms. Detar walked the Commission through the sign elevations via her exhibits on screen.

Ms. Detar noted the front elevation, facing Medina road. We have the “One Love” sign on the canopy, the “Cane’s” internally illuminated sign and then the mural. There are two options for that mural. We do have an option to install it directly to the brick or have a red acrylic substrate for the base for the heart sculpture. Ms. Detar said that with every Cane’s location we like to have the township or the city name that we are building in. So that is where we are proposing to put “Bath Township.” Mr. Boltz inquired if this is then two or three signs. Mr. Funk clarified that these are two signs facing the street per his discussion with Mr. Konstand. Mrs. Baker asked, that in that elevation you’ll notice a large “1”, could Ms. Detar describe what that tall number “1” material is because that is not really a sign as much as it is an architecture feature. Mrs. Detar stated that it is framed at the same time as part of the building, so they frame it with the building and then a sheet-metal like material goes on it.

Discussion ensued by the Commission and Madam Chair clarified with Mr. Funk that we have the “Cane’s” above the door and then the mural being the two signs that we’re specifically looking at. Mr. Funk stated, for that front elevation that is correct. Then there’s the two signs on the side, one facing the drive through

sign, and then the other side, which is the “Cane 1” sign facing the parking lot. Mr. Funk stated they have a total four wall signs where they are permitted one wall sign. Regarding the “One Love” sign, he stated that since it is not advertising anything, Mr. Konstand and he decided it is more of a graphic than an advertisement. The “Cane 1” dog sign, is Raising Cane’s dog, is sort of a logo. We also felt the mural on the front kind of fit that same logo type of thing.

Ms. Detar commented to say that they do also have an option for the dog sign that would be facing the parking lot. They could remove the word “Cane” from that entire mural where it would just be the dog. So, you would remove the bandana that says Cane. You would remove where it says Cane 1. Then up at the top of that mural, where it says Cane, we have an option to remove that as well; just leave the dog. Mr. Boltz inquired as to what, if the number of signs were not an issue, would their standard package look like. Ms. Detar responded to say they would actually have another one of the Cane’s logos that’s the same size as the one on the drive through and the one facing on that side. And they also would have another “One Love,” kind of like what you see on the front facing facade. That’s it on that elevation. So, two other signs would be on that elevation typically. Additionally, there will be one on the rear elevation and multiple on the drive through. The Commission held discussion on the total square footage being too much, expressed concern about the number of signs and the locations, and questioned the mural size on the front elevation.

Regarding the materials Madam Chair asked the applicant to share what the materials would be, and specifically how the wall signs could either be painted or a different material. Ms. Detar stated it is a metal sculpture that can be installed directly to painted brick. What you see in red would be painted, and then the sculpture is a metal sculpture heart, and it can either be installed directly to the brick or it can be installed to a substrate base. Mr. Boltz asked if that could be construed to say that the heart portion is the only part of the sign, if we were to paint it on there? Mr. Funk stated that would be true. Mr. Boltz said, personally, he would rather see that painted and that the sign could possibly be reduced by 50 percent. Madam Chair asked for comments on the sign on the side entry/east elevation with the dog. Mr. Boltz shared that is the one he struggled with. It is very long and seems like it is either too little or too much. It either needs to go away or have more signs with it or something. It just does not do it for me. Maybe if you just added color. If you do the dog, and you take away the “Cane’s” and just let it be a graphic of a dog, Ms. Detar stated that the dog is more a metal canvas like piece of artwork that would be installed, not painted. Several recommendations were made to tamp signage down and move or remove signs as the total signage is close to 200 square feet.

Ms. Jen Krack, OLIO Development Group, 1062 Ridge Street, Columbus, Development Manager stated she works closely with Cane’s sign design directly. Regarding the recommendations, she wanted to jump in to explain that a push to change their prototype, by adding red bands on the elevation, would be a very hard sell for Cane’s. They are very locked into their prototype and their design and getting them to approve something like that would be a very hard. Mrs. Krack stated that is why we are trying to propose moving the sign from the drive through side where we did confirm today, you are not going to see it. You cannot see it. She felt the impact of that sign on the side elevation, which faces Red Lobster, would be much more impactful for capturing that traffic. They would love to keep the dog sign because they love the dog. The dog is who the restaurant is named after, so they do like to have him represented. After much discussion ensued again on signage reduction options, Madam Chair asked if we treat today as a Work Session for the Applicant(s) to take what the Commission shared back to Cane’s and take a second look at this; maybe taking the dog off and moving that sign over. Mr. Funk stated it depends on the Applicant, whether they really need to move this forward quickly, or if it is something they could table for this month and come back next month; and we would obviously end up tabling BZA to next month as well. Mrs. Krack stated that

they are in the process right now and have submitted to Summit County for building permits. Cane's does like to have everything wrapped up around the time that we begin construction, but we may not be slated to start here until mid-September. She thought they would be able to table and tried take a lot of notes, just to make sure we're on the same page. Madam Chair stated she did not want to speak for everybody, but collectively, we are suggesting that the total square footage amount that's been submitted is too much. We're asking you to go back and take another look, both at the mural size in the front, as well as the dog sign and the Cane sign on the opposite side by the drive through. And combine them, either onto one wall or making them smaller so that we would gain back some of that square footage which would be most appreciated. The suggestion was maybe to get rid of the dog. So, we would probably ask you to consider that heavily and utilize maybe just the Cane sign on the other side. Madam Chair stated that there are no concerns with the ground monument sign as submitted, but we ask you to bring that back so we can do the package as a whole. Mr. Ackerman asked if they could bring a design that conforms to our standards as it would be nice to know what that would look like.

Applicant agreed to table the sign package for further revisions and review. Raising Cane's will submit a revised signage package with reduced overall signage, particularly the mural sign and the dog sign on the side elevation.

Motion to table the application for ARC-25-15 as presented, and that the applicant study reducing the signage package overall and also present a compliant package by Mr. Smock; seconded by Mr. Boltz. Roll Call: Mr. Smock, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Boltz and Mr. Ackermann. Vote: 4-0 to approve.

ARC-25-16 – Tom Giltner & Jamy Bolling – Township Tasting Room LLC, dba Corner Provisions, 1070 Ghent Road, sign review, B-1.

For the record, Michael Ackermann asked to be recused from the case because the applicant is a client of his.

Zoning Comments: Property is located south of the N. Cleveland Massillon Road and Ghent Road intersection. To the north, east and west is single family residential, and to the south is Wilson's Garage and Dr. Slenn's Veterinary Clinic. The signs require variances to exceed the number of, location, and overall area for wall signs. Mr. Funk explained that, technically they are permitted signs on each wall, facing road frontage. However, the main entry does not face a road frontage, it is actually facing to the south, but they do want to sign there, and then they want a sign facing to the north. They also require a variance for overall size. They are permitted 20 sq. ft. per tenant, again, per road frontage, and they're asking for basically 65 sq. overall.

Mr. James Deastlov, General Manager of Corner Provisions, presented to the Commission a proposal to install wall signage for Corner Provisions. The owner was unfortunately not able to attend so he is here to answer any questions. Mr. Deastlov stated they are seeking approval of the proposed north facing wall sign at 3' x 14.5' – 43.5 sq. ft. and the proposed south facing wall sign at 2' 1" x 10' – 20.8 sq. ft. Both signs are non-illuminated. He explained that the reason for the size is basically because they need to allow guests to identify the restaurant. There really is no signage on the building and people may drive by wondering what the building is. They would like to have signage to make it clear to the public. Mr. Deastlov stated that the aesthetic was thoughtfully designed to match and complement the building. And, the placement on the parking lot side is an obvious choice to identify the building. Placement on the pond side is also the best option for facing northbound as well to really help identify the building.

Discussion ensued by the Commission and Mr. Boltz asked to look at the white, photoshopped elevation sign and the actual sign rendering. He inquired on the true sign color as it looks like a white sign. Mr. Deastlov stated that the color will actually match the color of the siding which is a taupe color. Mr. Boltz inquired on the material of the sign on the stair railing. Mr. Deastlove said it is going to be a thick, aluminum faced, single sided panels. The panels are to be butted up against each other and screw mounted to the two and a half inch wide, vertical metal railings. Mr. Boltz felt that the sign, although size wise, is probably nice and readable, it feels like it is oversized for what it is being mounted to. The one on the parking lot side feels comfortable, and he liked the way that it was hung below the wood beam and kind of fills the void. However, that sign facing the north seems like it is not proportional to what it's being mounted on. Mr. Smock agreed with Mr. Boltz's statements. Mr. Deastlove stated that sign is 36" x 175". Mr. Funk spoke to say that we allow 20 square feet per tenant. So, the one sign complies essentially and the other one is a little over double the allowable square footage.

Mr. Boltz stated he would be in favor of making that more like 30" high so it feels like it fits better on the rail system. But that is for the applicant to decide if it is legible enough and meets any of their other requirements. Mr. Deastlove confirmed to say 30" instead of the 36". Mr. Boltz suggested something to just snug it down just enough to make it look like it fits within the backdrop of the railing more. It was also noted that the proposed 9.2" lettering of "Corner Provisions" can be seen for quite a ways. The Commission did not have issue with the variance but just recommended reducing the sign to fit on the railing to look good but remain legible.

Madam Chair inquired if this would be the only tenant on the sign or will others want a location out there as well. Mr. Deastlov believed that this would be the only tenant on the sign. The Commission was good with the colors and the materials. Madam Chair stated that because the size of your letters are going to be really important to you no matter how we size this down, we should revisit the request. She stated 6" at 60 miles an hour on the interstate, that's what you read. So, six" letters can be readable as well. She would hate to say, let's just go 32" by whatever percentage that is, and take those letters down to 8", because you may not get the same proportional look that you have here. Madam Chair recommend the applicant table the case and make this a Work Session. That gives the opportunity to relook at it and make sure we are good with the size and the proportion of everything. She asked the applicant to have someone do a little better job superimposing the sign on exhibit as that would really help. Mr. Funk felt it would also be helpful if they showed the entire building, not just a zoomed in shot. He thought it would enable the Commission to see that sign in relation to the entire building, not just that part of the deck; because that's throwing us off as well. Mr. Deastlove accepted the option to table the case.

Motion to table the application for ARC-25-14, with the recommendation that the south facing parking lot sign is accepted as presented and we ask that the north facing sign on the railing be reduced in size to make it more proportional to the railing that it's mounted on, and that the font size remain legible, by Mr. Boltz; seconded by Mrs. Smith. Roll Call: Mrs. Smith, Mr. Smock and Mr. Boltz. Vote: 3-0 to approve.

Meeting adjourned.