



CITY of MEDINA

Board of Zoning Appeals

Regular Meeting Minutes

August 14, 2025

Meeting Date: August 14, 2025

Meeting Time: 7:00 PM

Present: Kyle Funk, Bert Humpal, Paul Roszak, Mark Williams, Andrew Dutton (Community Development Director), and Sarah Tome (Administrative Assistant)

Absent: Logan Johnson

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Funk made a motion to approve the minutes from July 10, 2025, as submitted.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Roszak.

Vote:

| | | | |
|----------|------------|----------|----------|
| Funk | <u>Y</u> | Humpal | <u>Y</u> |
| Rozsak | <u>Y</u> | Williams | <u>Y</u> |
| Approved | <u>4-0</u> | | |

The Court Reporter swore in all attendees.

Applications

1. Z25-19 Sarah Mheisen 427 North Court Street VAR

Mr. Dutton stated that the existing Sunoco gas station site contained a ground sign in the northeast corner and two wall signs. Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was proposing two new wall signs on the north and south faces of the canopy. He noted that the proposed signs were permitted as they faced a right-of-way. He added that the applicant was also proposing signs on the gas pumps, posts, and poles.

Mr. Dutton stated that the first variance before the Board was to Section 1147.10, for a rooftop sign. He noted that the arrow of the Sunoco logo sign on the canopy projected above the top of the canopy, designating it a rooftop sign. He added that Section 1147.13(c) required properties in the M-U district to have either a ground sign or wall signs.

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant had submitted two options for the ground sign. He noted that the first option was a face replacement for the existing sign. Mr. Dutton added that the existing sign was located adjacent to the right-of-way and projected west towards the

property's parking lot. Mr. Dutton stated that the first option would be allowed as a face replacement of the existing sign and would only require the aforementioned variances.

Mr. Dutton noted that the second ground sign option was for a new pole sign of approximately the same size as the existing sign. He added that the second sign option was shown projecting into the right-of-way, which was not permitted. Mr. Dutton continued that if the second sign option was approved, it would need to project to the west, similar to the existing sign. Mr. Dutton noted that the second sign option would also require variances to the following sections:

- 1147.07(a) – A ground sign within the required 5 ft. setback from the right-of-way
- 1147.07(b)(4) – An internally illuminated sign prohibited in the M-U zoning district
- 1147.07(j) – An electronic message center sign prohibited in the M-U zoning district
- 1147.10(d) – A prohibited pole sign
- 1147.13(b) – A ground sign exceeding the maximum height

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was also proposing:

- A 9 sq. ft. wall sign on the south side of the canopy
- A 23.3 sq. ft. sign on the north side of the canopy
- Four 4.5 sq. ft. signs on canopy posts
- Signs on the gas pumps

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant had indicated the following regarding the Standards for Variances and Appeals:

- The proposed signs did not adversely impact the character or appearance of the lot or neighborhood.
- The variance sought was the minimum necessary to allow the station to be brought to its new image standards.

Mr. Dutton noted that staff had also provided an alternate option to remove the existing pole sign and install two electronic message center signs on the northeast and southeast sides of the canopy.

Present for the case was Kam Sarai, representing the owners of 427 North Court Street. Mr. Sarai stated that the current pole sign only had a clearance of 8.8 ft., causing it to be hit by box trucks approximately once a month. He added that the sign was \$15,000 per replacement, which resulted in increased insurance premiums or large out of pocket expenses for the business owner. Mr. Sarai stated that the proposal was to raise the sign to 14.5 ft. of clearance and center-mount it for structural stability and safety.

Mr. Roszak noted that the staff report stated that a center-mounted sign would not be allowed. Mr. Dutton stated that a center-mounted pole sign would hang into the City's right-of-way, which was not allowed.

Mr. Sarai stated that, as a center-mounted pole sign would not be allowed, he preferred the flag mounted sign, as the owners had already ordered a replacement sign.

Mr. Humpal opened the public hearing. There were no questions or comments from the public.

Mr. Williams made a motion to grant the variances for the second pole sign option in a flag style configuration. He stated that a conforming sign would block the sight of motorists and a sign that exceeded the allowable height would be more appropriate for the location and the property.

Mr. Roszak seconded the motion.

Vote:

| | | | |
|--------|----------|--------|----------|
| Humpal | <u>Y</u> | Rozsak | <u>Y</u> |
|--------|----------|--------|----------|

| | | | |
|----------|----------|------|----------|
| Williams | <u>Y</u> | Funk | <u>Y</u> |
|----------|----------|------|----------|

| | |
|----------|------------|
| Approved | <u>4-0</u> |
|----------|------------|

The Board then discussed the proposed wall signs. Mr. Sarai stated that the gas pump and column mounted signs could be removed or modified if the Board preferred. He noted that the Sunoco letters and the yellow arrow would be illuminated. After discussion on the gas pump signage, the Board expressed that the column mounted signs should be removed. Mr. Roszak stated that he felt the Sunoco “shield logo” should be reduced so as to fit within the canopy.

The Board considered different options for the canopy signs. After discussion, Mr. Roszak made a motion to approve the variances to allow the wall signs, pole sign, and gas pump signage with the following conditions:

1. The diamond Sunoco logo on the south side of the canopy shall not project above the roof of the canopy.
2. The column mounted signs shall be removed and were not included in the approval.

Mr. Roszak stated that the variance would be consistent with the general spirit and intent of the ordinance.

Mr. Williams seconded the motion.

Vote:

| | | | |
|--------|----------|----------|----------|
| Rozsak | <u>Y</u> | Williams | <u>Y</u> |
|--------|----------|----------|----------|

| | | | |
|------|----------|--------|----------|
| Funk | <u>Y</u> | Humpal | <u>Y</u> |
|------|----------|--------|----------|

| | |
|----------|------------|
| Approved | <u>4-0</u> |
|----------|------------|

Mr. Dutton stated that the Target building contained two wall signs, including the main Target Logo and a smaller “CVS Pharmacy” sign. He noted that the “CVS Pharmacy” sign was permitted by a variance in 1995.

Mr. Dutton stated that, in October of 2022, the Board of Zoning Appeals approved a variance to allow four wall signs on the Target building, totaling 271 sq. ft., though the approval expired in October of 2023. He added that the applicant was proposing four wall signs on the front façade, with a total area of 335 sq. ft.

Mr. Dutton stated that Section 1147.14(d) allowed one permanent building sign on the front façade of the building, not exceeding one square foot in area for each linear foot of primary building frontage, or 300 sq. ft, whichever was less. He noted that the proposal incorporated four wall signs with a total sign area of 335 sq. ft.

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant had indicated the following regarding the Standards for Variances and Appeals:

- A conforming sign would be blocked from the sight of passing motorists as the additional “Drive-Up” and “Order Pickup” signs must be visible to direct customers in the Target parking lot.
- The proposed area increase was appropriate in scale, sized to ensure optimal visibility for customers, and essential for navigating customers on the site.
- The exception would not adversely impact the character of the building or neighborhood as the signs were consistent with Target’s branding and not easily visible from adjacent lots.

Present for the case was Tyler Meeker of Kimley-Horn, 3875 Embassy Parkway #280 in Akron.

Mr. Humpal opened the public hearing. There were no questions or comments from the public.

Mr. Roszak stated that he felt the proposed signage was appropriate for the size and scale of the building. Mr. Humpal stated that he had been in the Target parking lot recently and could see the need for directional signage.

Mr. Funk made a motion to approve four wall signs with a total size of 335 sq. ft., stating that the signage would allow for better traffic flow and safety for vehicles. He added that the approval of the variance would allow for better visibility and readability of the signs and the proposal was within the spirit and intent of the Zoning Code.

Mr. Roszak seconded the motion.

Vote:

| | | | |
|----------|------------|--------|----------|
| Williams | <u>Y</u> | Funk | <u>Y</u> |
| Humpal | <u>Y</u> | Rozsak | <u>Y</u> |
| Approved | <u>4-0</u> | | |

Mr. Dutton stated that the proposal included signs for the hotel, the event center, and the parking lot to the west of the buildings. Mr. Dutton continued that the east side of the hotel featured an internally illuminated “Legacy” sign over the main doors, an awning sign over the coffee shop, and a small “Tribute Portfolio” sign by the door. H

Mr. Dutton noted that the south side of the building featured a vertical, 85 sq. ft. “The Legacy” sign and a “Privato” wall sign next to the entrance of the restaurant, both of which were backlit.

He added that the north side of the building contained a small “La Vista” projecting sign and a “Legacy” directional sign.

Mr. Dutton stated that the event center featured a 95.8 sq. ft., backlit “LL” wall sign on the west side of the building, a “Locale at the Legacy” wall sign on the south side, and a 51.8 sq. ft. “LL” wall sign on the east side of the building.

Mr. Dutton indicated that the parking lot contained a 12 sq. ft., 3 ft. tall main sign, as well as freestanding instructional signs.

Mr. Dutton noted that Section 1147.07(b)(4) stated that internal illumination was prohibited for all signs in the Historic District. He stated that the “Legacy wall sign was internally illuminated. Additionally, he added that the “Legacy wall sign, “Privato” wall sign, and two “LL” wall signs were backlit. Mr. Dutton stated that signs were either non-illuminated, externally illuminated, or internally illuminated. He added that, though backlit signs did not fall into a clear classification, staff had determined that backlit signs were considered internally illuminated, thus requiring a variance.

Mr. Dutton stated that Section 1147.15(c) included numerous regulations for signs in the Historic District. He noted that building signs were only permitted in lieu of a ground sign. he added that both ground and building signs were proposed.

Mr. Dutton stated that building signs were only permitted on primary and secondary frontages. He noted that the south side of Locale at the Legacy building was not considered frontage as it did not have a public entrance or face a street, and was not permitted a wall sign. Additionally, he noted that only one of the “LL” signs on the event center was compliant with size requirements.

Mr. Dutton stated that the Historic Preservation Board had reviewed a Conditional Sign Permit application earlier in the evening and had approved the request with the condition that the applicant provide a sample of sign materials. He added that the applicant’s responses to the Standards for Variances and Appeals had been presented to the Board in their packet for the case.

Present for the case were Lisa Reau of Autonomy Capital, 3991 North Jefferson Street, and Bobby Johnston of AVID Architects, 3660 Embassy Parkway in Fairlawn. Ms. Reau stated that

she felt the signage was appropriate for the size and scale of the property. Mr. Johnston stated that wayfinding was critical for the site.

Mr. Humpal opened the public hearing. There were no questions or comments from the public.

Mr. Funk stated that he had initially felt like the applicant was proposing a lot of signs, but had determined that the signage was needed for hotel visitors.

Mr. Humpal stated that he gave a lot of weight to the Historic Preservation Board's decisions and that he had no issues with the project.

Mr. Funk noted that he felt the vertical "The Legacy" sign would look cleaner without the small "The". Mr. Johnston and Ms. Reau stated that they would look into removing it. There was a discussion as to the temperature and brightness of the illuminated signs.

After discussion, Mr. Funk made a motion to approve the variances, stating that the variances were within the spirit and intent of the ordinance and allowed for wayfinding on the property.

Mr. Roszak seconded the motion.

Vote:

| | | | |
|------|----------|--------|----------|
| Funk | <u>Y</u> | Humpal | <u>Y</u> |
|------|----------|--------|----------|

| | | | |
|--------|----------|----------|----------|
| Roszak | <u>Y</u> | Williams | <u>Y</u> |
|--------|----------|----------|----------|

| | |
|----------|------------|
| Approved | <u>4-0</u> |
|----------|------------|

| | | | | |
|----|--------|---------------|------------------------|-----|
| 4. | Z25-23 | Dave Sterrett | 207 North Court Street | VAR |
|----|--------|---------------|------------------------|-----|

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant had received approval for a 58.7 sq. ft. wall sign on the east façade of the building, facing North Court Street. Additionally, he noted that a 58.7 sq. ft. wall sign was proposed on the south façade of the building, facing West Friendship Street.

Mr. Dutton stated that Section 1147.14(d) allowed building signs in the C-2 District to be 1 sq. ft. per one linear foot of primary building frontage and 1 sq. ft. per 4 ft. of secondary building frontage. He continued that, at 78 ft. of frontage, the south façade was permitted a 19.5 sq. ft. wall sign. Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was proposing a 58.7 sq. ft. wall sign on the south façade, which exceeded the permitted area.

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant had indicated the following regarding the Standards for Variances and Appeals:

- The proposed area increase was appropriate in scale as it would help the building's aesthetics by being symmetrical with the approved sign on the east (front) elevation.

Present for the case was Dave Sterrett, 411 West Smith Road. Mr. Sterrett stated that both building elevations were visible to motorists on North Court Street, and he felt it would look best for the signs to be symmetrical in size. He noted that the signs featured a "shoebox lid" type design and were created with an aluminum box sitting approximately two inches off the wall. Mr. Sterrett noted that the graphics would be raised laser-cut acrylic letters.

Mr. Humpal opened the public hearing. There were no questions or comments from the public.

Mr. Roszak stated that he had no issues with the proposal. Mr. Funk agreed.

Mr. Williams made a motion to approve the variance to Section 1147.14(d) to allow a larger secondary building sign, as presented by the applicant. He stated that the exception would not adversely affect the character or appearance of the building and the variance was consistent with the general spirit and intent of the ordinance.

Mr. Roszak seconded the motion.

Vote:

| | | | |
|--------|----------|--------|----------|
| Humpal | <u>Y</u> | Rozsak | <u>Y</u> |
|--------|----------|--------|----------|

| | | | |
|----------|----------|------|----------|
| Williams | <u>Y</u> | Funk | <u>Y</u> |
|----------|----------|------|----------|

| | |
|----------|------------|
| Approved | <u>4-0</u> |
|----------|------------|

Board Member Recognition

Mr. Dutton thanked Mr. Williams for his 15 years of service on the Board of Zoning Appeals. Mr. Funk, Mr. Humpal, and Mr. Roszak also expressed their appreciation of Mr. Williams's service.

Adjournment

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Tome

Bert Humpal, Chairman