



CLEVELAND HEIGHTS

MINUTES OF THE
PUBLIC HEARING RE: ORDINANCE NO. 27-2006 (PD)
OF MONDAY, MAY 1, 2006

The Council of the City of Cleveland Heights met on the above date at 7:24 p.m.

Dennis Wilcox, presiding

Council Members present: Dietrich, Evans, Kelley, Montlack, Tumeo, Wilcox

Council Members absent: Caplan

Council Member Wilcox excused the absence of Council Member Caplan.

Staff present: Czaga, Downey, Gibbon, Malone, Mannarino, Niermann O'Neil, Tomaro,
Wagner, Wong

Council Member Wilcox stated, "I'm going to call the public hearing to order. This is a public hearing in respect to Ordinance No. 27-2006(PD). If you are here for the Council meeting, that will take place immediately after this public hearing. This is a public hearing on such ordinance previously introduced on first reading for Council and this is an Ordinance, amending the Zoning Code, respecting projecting signs and principally modifies the requirement to obtain a commitment from six or more businesses, because that present restriction has the effect of banning projecting signs within the city. I am first going to ask Richard Wong to give the staff report on this proposed change in the Zoning Code."

Mr. Wong proceeded, "Thank you very much. This is essentially a rerun of the January show with one extra slide. What I will go through is the rationale of reasoning why we are introducing this. When we talk about projecting signs, we're talking mainly about things that are as this describes; artistic, things that are done with creativity, done with craftsmanship like the one on the far left is from Salzburg, Austria. These two in the middle are Boston and the one on the right is in Cleveland [displaying various photos of projecting signs]. We think it's time for our city to go beyond requiring everyone to have flat signs, because as this slide shows, you can add dimensional interest. Back in the 20's all the way through the early 1990's, we noticed there were projecting signs all over Cleveland Heights, as these photos from Kara show. What can you say about the 60's, other than there's quite a few projecting signs built but not much was really designed. We are going to get back to basics now, with each person that's proposing a sign. This one, for example, came out after the 1993 code. It was the only projecting sign ever approved by the city since 1993. The reason, as I stated in January, you are supposed to have six contiguous property owners or six businesses all agreeing to this within a one-year time frame. They got a Board of Zoning Appeals variance and as you can see driving down Taylor this fits in pretty well and that was working with the staff and ABR to do some good work. What this will not do is allow plastic-faced-painted signs such as these [pointing to example]. These would be grandfathered, but

what we're trying to do is establish a set of guidelines and regulations to make sure that you get the signs that you want. Based on the sign that was approved at the Taylor Tudor it's about 16 square feet. We think that's about as big as they should come. Some of these are consistent with the Ohio Basic Building Code, no projection above the building except for a single-story building where you could go two feet above the top.

"Like I said before, certain signs would not be permitted and everything would go through ABR. What we should note, back in the late 60's ABR was in existence, but they did not review signs. So what we are proposing is for the staff to actively participate and play a role in making sure that we get well-designed signs. We feel like the city's ready for this level of quality. Basically, what we're talking about is a combination of the staff work with Storefront Program incentives and the hard work of ABR to result in this sort of sign [pointing to sign]. That's all I have, Mr. Chair. I'd be happy to answer questions and anyone that's interested can refer to this handout which talks about the mechanisms and the details on how we change the code into something that allows projecting signs."

Council Member Wilcox added, "This is for a matter of clarification, you might have mentioned it, but the ABR has to approve all of - every sign under this ordinance as in the prior ordinance."

Mr. Wong confirmed that Council Member Wilcox was correct. Mr. Wong continued, "We plan to work with ABR on formulation of all the regulations - the aesthetic guidelines too."

Council Member Wilcox asked, "Are there any questions from members of Council? Any comments?" Being none, Council Member Wilcox continued, "This is a public hearing, so if you are here and you would like to make a comment on the proposed changes in the sign ordinances, this is your opportunity to do so. Seeing no comments, I would just remind everybody that this will be heard at the Planning Commission on the 10th of May and then it will be brought back for Council consideration at our next meeting in two weeks.

There being no comments or business, I will adjourn the meeting at 7:30 p.m."

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Wilcox, Council Member
Planning & Development Committee Chair

Thomas K. Malone
Clerk of Council

/mwc