

ARC – September 8, 2025 Reviews

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

Untable 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. Mr. Funk noted that the applicant has revised their drawings slightly from last month. They are now proposing three “Raising Cane’s” wall signs that are internally eliminated. They are eight foot by three foot 10 inches, or 25.5 square feet. These three signs are on the front and on the sides of the building. They modified the large sign on the front to be just a mural without advertising so it will not count in the sign regulations. The applicant requires variances to exceed the number, location, and overall area for wall signs; the proposed monument sign meets the Zoning Resolution.

Ms. Carly Detar, of OLIO Development Group, presented the revised sign package for Rasing Cane’s. She stated that they did take the conversation back from last month to the client. The sign with the dog that was facing the parking lot façade was removed as well as the “One Love” canopy sign. Ms. Detar stated that in place of that, the client does want to prioritize the wall signs. Therefore, they have used same wall sign that you see on that front facade, on the drive through facade, and then as well on the parking lot side. These three signs combined put them at a 19% variance that we would need to look for, and then also a variance for the number of signs as well. Ms. Detar presented an additional Brand Book, as requested by the Board last month, which is a fully conforming to the code package as well. Then for the front facade artwork we removed any sort of sculpture, and we’re just going to collaborate with a local artist. She brought some examples to show the Commission. Ms. Detar provided them to the members as stated that they are from around the country. The idea is to show local flavor and say “Bath Township” on the mural and it will be totally painted directly onto the brick. They would work with a local artist, do some research and find one, and then try to add some Bath Township flavor.

Discussion ensued by the Commission and Mr. Ackerman asked about the set of conforming signs. Ms. Detar walked the Commission through that via her exhibits on screen. In that package they would have kept the “One Love” canopy sign facing the parking lot. But Ms. Detar explained that, the brand would prefer to have wall signs over the “One Love” canopy sign. Mrs. Smith thanked the applicant for taking it back and working with us on what our Township’s regulations are. Ms. Detar shared that they are very excited about this project. We think it’ll do really well here.

The Commission members were good with the revised sign package and the conforming monument sign.

Motion approved the application with the revised signage package as presented, by Mr. Boltz; seconded by Mrs. Smith. Roll Call: Mr. Ackerman, Mr. Boltz, Mrs. Smith and Mr. Smock. Vote: 4-0 to approve.

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

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 applicant has slightly modified the north facing sign and it is now 2' 8' x 13' – 34.7 sq. ft. and the proposed south facing wall sign remains at 2' 1" x 10' – 20.8 sq. ft. Both signs are non-illuminated. The signs do require variances to exceed the number of, location, and overall area for wall signs. Mr. Funk reminded the Commission that the one sign that is facing the south is not actually facing a public street. For wall signs, they are required to face a public street. This building does have three sides that do face, and then this would be the side that does not face, but it is their main entrance.

Mr. Tom Giltner presented to the Commission his apologies for not being at the first meeting but is happy to be here this evening and answer any questions. Mr. Giltner believed the primary comments last time were about the size of one of the signs, which has now been modified. Mr. Boltz asked Mr. Giltner to go through what sign the materials are, again, and how they are being mounted, and any additional input you can give us on the signs themselves. Mr. Giltner responded that the material is a thick, high density urethane, single sided panel with sandblasted background, raised text and raised border. It is not lit, the colors, were thoughtful to basically match and complement the building. The Monterey Taupe is the background of each sign, and then the print is in dark bronze which matches the trim of the building. Mr. Giltner presented that as far as mounting goes, if you're looking at the south facing side, we have the eave as you walk in. There's a solid wood beam that goes across the front, and it would be affixed to that just below it. Then on the north facing side, we will put it on the outside of the railing of the landing of the deck. It was a little tricky to find the right spot. If you look at the back the north side of the building, there's a lot of windows, and if we put it anywhere up above it will be blocking windows. This was the most thoughtful place to put it, where it faces the street, and similarly, it would just be affixed to the floor of that deck on the outside of the railing, just a couple of inches above the floor.

Discussion ensued by the Commission and Mr. Smock stated that proportionately the north facing sign would look fine and he was okay with it. Mr. Boltz felt the size of the north facing needs to exceed our requirements just so it's legible. And south facing one is essentially 20 square feet. He did not think we needed to beat them up for .8 square foot. Mr. Boltz thought the south facing one needs to be there in support of their variance for the location of the south facing one. He was in favor of both signs. The Commission had no more comments or questions. Madam Chair thanked the applicants for taking into consideration the comments of the Commission and making the adjustments.

Motion to approve the revised size signage application as presented by Mr. Boltz; seconded by Mr. Smock. Roll Call: Mrs. Smith, Mr. Smock and Mr. Boltz. Vote: 3-0 to approve.

ARC-25-17 – Lindsey Gartman & Amy Ford, with Woven Words Bookshop, 843 N. Cleveland-Massillon Road, Suite DN5, sign review, B-5.

Zoning Comments: Property is located on the east side of N. Cleveland Massillon Road approximately 675' north of the N. Cleveland Massillon Road and Yellow Creek Road intersection in the Ghent Hamlet. To the north are offices, to the east there are single family residences, to the south is office, and to the west is

Vehicle Information Systems. The site contains a multi-tenant, retail and office use building known as Ghent Square. The signs conform to the Zoning Resolution and previous approvals.

Ms. Lindsey Gartman introduced herself and stated that her sister and she were opening a bookstore at Ghent Square. Ms. Gartman presented to the Commission a proposal to install new wall sign for The Woven Word Bookshop. The signage is approximately 10' x 2' – 20 sq. ft. She also proposed a hanging sign that is 2' x 2.75' – 5 sq. ft. and a panel on the existing multi-tenant monument sign. Ms. Gartman stated that the sign company has proposed a half inch PVC, with printed vinyl overlay for the largest sign that goes over the window, facing into the store. It will have half inch acrylic letters and a logo. There will be some 3d elements to it with a little bit of an overlay. Regarding the hanging sign, it will be a routed PVC with printed vinyl overlay, which is completely flat, and it will be two-sided so you can see it from both sides as it hangs over the door. Ms. Gartman explained that since this used to be two units, they wanted to designate which side is the entrance because there's technically two doors. That is why they choose to have the hanging sign to the right. Lastly, the monument sign is the tenant panel that the landlord provided and it will be vinyl.

Madam Chair asked if there were any questions and the members felt it was pretty straight forward.

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

ARC-25-18 – Tom Stenger for the Iradale Allotment, corner of Ira and Kemery Roads, sign review, R-2.

Zoning Comments: Property is located on the south side of Ira Road at the intersection of Ira Road and Kemery Road in the Iradale Subdivision. The sign site is located in the triangle at the Ira Road and Kemery Road intersection at one of the entrances to the Subdivision. The property is surrounded by single family residences. The sign is replacing the previous entrance sign and is non-illuminated.

Mr. Tom Stenger presented to the Commission a proposal to construct a new monument sign for the subdivision entrance. The proposed sign is a metal, two-sided non-reflective at 48" x 36" – 12 sq. ft. and 4' in total height. Using his exhibits he explained where the sign would be installed. Mr. Stenger thanked Mr. Funk for explaining what they are trying to do. He felt that he may actually have more questions than the Commission because this is a DIY project. Mr. Stenger stated they are looking for adjustments so that they can work from off the road. There is a very large rock that currently sits right in the middle of where they want to put the sign. He shared that someone in the Township is going to help them move that, which is great. But we want to move it to the north side of the island. He needed to know how far they could push it off. It was explained that the rock is closer to Ira now and they want to move it toward the point, toward the bottom of the "Y," southward. Mr. Stenger stated there is plaque on it for the guy who originally founded the neighborhood so they want to keep it.

Discussion ensued by the Commission and Mr. Funk felt that for the rock placement question it would be great to meet on site. We would ask our Township Service Director to join us to make sure that it's not going to cause any issues with traffic or snowplows, or anything like that. We can definitely meet out there and find out what Caine would recommend as the best location. Mr. Stenger was in agreement. Mr. Funk explained that the sign itself is basically replacing the existing sign, so long as it is in the same location as the last one that was approved by the Subdivision; it is fine. Mr. Boltz inquired if, from a line of sight standpoint, the sign is back far enough that as your exiting your neighborhood on to Ira you have

enough line of site up and down the road. Mr. Stenger said they did, but there are four road signs that obstruct many views. They are trying to cheat it up just a little bit to position it because when you're coming down Ira the stop sign blocks the view of it. They are trying to eliminate that from happening again. He said by keeping the sign lower and maybe cheating it up about two feet. Mr. Boltz's said that we need to verify what the setback needs to be in words that. Mr. Stenger shared that he measured from the edge of the asphalt and the grass at 22 feet back to where the sign was. Mr. Smock stated we do need to find what the right of way is on Ira and see what the 10 to 15 feet would be. Mr. Boltz stated he felt you would need 20 feet give or take. That is what you'd want from the pavement for line of sight minimum. Mr. Stenger said there's so many signs there that are obstructing it, but we're trying to work with that. After discussion regarding the right of way and the line of site it was decided to make a site visit with the Service Director.

Mr. Funk offered that the applicant could come back after the site visit or, the Commission could approve it conditioned upon certain requirements. Mr. Ackerman felt that we did not have jurisdiction to say where to put the sign, because it's all in the road right of way. As Bill said, it was put there before as part of the development. He did not see that the Commission had any reason to say anything about where it went. The members were in agreement on the sign, as the sign materials and size were appropriate and in compliance. Madam Chair asked the members if they would entertain approving the sign as submitted, with the recommendation that the applicant work with the Service Director on location of both the rock and the sign and verify that the line of sight is not an issue.

Motion to approve the application as presented, with the height restriction of being four feet only, accepting the materials of being the aluminum overlay, as well as the metal two sided sign, no exterior illumination, and they will work with the Service Director in order to set the location, as well as the line of sight verification and location of the existing rock, by Mrs. Smith; seconded by Mr. Boltz. Roll Call: Mr. Smock, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Boltz and Mr. Ackerman. Vote: 4-0 to approve.

ARC-25-19 - Jeff Clark, of Easy Sign Group, for Yellow Creek Veterinary Surgery, 799 Wye Road, sign review, B-5. The proposed sign is non-illuminated.

Zoning Comments: Property is located on the east side of Wye Road, roughly 200' north of the Wye Road and Yellow Creek Road intersection in Ghent Hamlet. The Bake Shop is located to the west, Lanning's Restaurant is located to the north, vacant commercial is located to the east, and Keystone Technology is located to the south. The proposed wall sign does meet the requirements of the zoning resolution.

Mr. Jeff Clark, with Easy Sign Group, presented to the Commission a proposal to install a new, non-illuminated wall sign that is 73.5" x 31.75" – 16 sq. ft. on the front of the building. Mr. Clark stated that the sign is a single panel, PVC with a UV coated print on it that simulates the wooden panel. Mr. Clark shared that he visited the area and it is a long ways from what the customer originally wanted of a sans serif typeface, on just a white panel with black type on it. They love it now and he hoped the Commission did too. Mr. Boltz clarified to say that "simulated wood panel," means it's a white panel with a wood grain embossing. Mr. Clark stated yes, everything you see is printed on it. He said that it is not sandblasted, it's not textured; none of those things. His client wanted something less expensive and this gives a relaxed look. One other thing that Mr. Clark felt was that nobody is walking along in front of the building, so nobody's really going to see it up close. It will most likely be seen from the road.

Discussion ensued from the Commission and Mr. Boltz inquired about the monument sign. Mr. Clark stated he did not know what they were doing with that but thought they were marketing two different

businesses as this one is for the veterinarian “surgery” side. Mr. Boltz wasn’t sure about the white in context of the right thing else. Mr. Clark spoke to say that the top of the building is white with a taupe color beneath it. So, the sign will tie in with building. He stated that he looked in the area and said that it is charming. He wanted to do something a little better and so the corners are cut out and the font used is a gray, kind of drop, shadow that simulates a hand-painted sign. The Commission appreciated his efforts.

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