



City of Racine

City Hall
730 Washington Ave.
Racine, WI 53403
www.cityofracine.org

Meeting Minutes - Final

Downtown Area Design Review

Amy Connolly
Alderman Jeff Coe
Michael Rosiensi
John Monefeldt
Micah Waters
Ryan Rudie
Richard Christensen

Thursday, April 5, 2018

4:30 PM

City Hall, Room 307

Call To Order

Chairman Christensen called the meeting to order at 4:44 p.m.

PRESENT: 5 - Amy Connolly, Michael Rosiensi, Micah Waters, Ryan Rudie and Richard Christensen

EXCUSED: 2 - Jeff Coe and John Monefeldt

Approval of Minutes for the March 1, 2018 Meeting

A motion was made by Connolly, seconded by Rudie, to approve the minutes of the March 1st meeting. The motion PASSED by a Voice Vote.

[0332-18](#)

Subject: (Direct Referral) A request from Paul Maheras for review and approval of a White Box Program Grant for the property at 220 Sixth Street.

Attachments: [\(0332-18\) 220 Sixth Street WB Application](#)

Chief Building Inspector Ken Plaski introduced the item. He stated the request the applicant, Paul Maheras, is looking for a white box grant to help with plumbing and electrical work to put a restaurant in the space. He stated the project would be eligible for a maximum grant of \$10,425.00.

Maheras explained there was not a bar in the property previously so most of the electrical and plumbing work will be for the installation of the bar. He stated the main dining area previously had a drop ceiling that was taken down to the tin ceiling and that new lighting will be installed. The water line in the kitchen was closed and a new floor and wall coverings were put in; plumbing needs to be reinstalled.

A motion was made by Waters, seconded by Connolly to approve the request. The motion PASSED by a Voice Vote.

[0961-16](#)

Subject: (Direct Referral) A review of a façade remodeling project at 403 Sixth Street. (DC-16)

Attachments: [\(0961-16 & 0962-16\) 403 Sixth Street Facade & Grant Application 03.23.2018](#)

Todd Letven represented the owners of the property. He explained that they were looking to improve the façade of the building which has sense been removed. He stated the lower portion of the building will be replaced with cream city brick and the upper portion will be painted to match. He stated the application has been presented to the Commission before.

In response to Connolly, Letven stated the window trim will stay white and the doors will stay the same.

Waters asked for clarification regarding whether or not the window grates will be removed as they are not shown in the rendering.

Letven stated the grates will stay and can be painted white to match the windows.

Waters asked if the windows and grates will be white and everything else painted out.

Letven stated that is correct.

Rudie asked for clarification regarding the window color as it looks brown in the rendering provided by the applicant.

Letven stated the doors could be painted to match the brick and the horizontal bands will be a greyish bronze color.

Rudie stated it was hard to approve something when what is being asked to be approved is unclear and does not match the rendering presented.

Sadowski stated the Commission can approve the request contingent on receiving an accurate rendering. He stated he was more focused on receiving a design that matched what they wanted to do to the building rather than the colors.

The owner of the property stated they plan on painting the doors.

In response to Connolly, Waters stated polystyrene is a plastic coated interior material and that it has been approved for use before.

A motion was made by Waters, seconded by Connolly, to approve the request with the base of building receiving the doors and the doors being painted, the upper portion of the building being painted to match with windows and the grates remaining white and a new rendering to be submitted to the city for an accurate representation and a color chip to match the brick submitted to the city for approval. The motion PASSED by a Voice Vote.

[0962-16](#)

Subject: (Direct Referral) A review of a façade grant request for a façade remodeling project at 403 Sixth Street. (DC-16)

Attachments: [\(0961-16 & 0962-16\) 403 Sixth Street Facade & Grant Application 03.23.2018](#)

Sadowski stated signage was not part of this request.

The owner stated he would be able to cover the cost of the door.

Sadowski stated that half of the total cost of the project, according to the bids submitted, would be around \$11,800.00. The applicant would be eligible for a façade grant in the amount of \$5,900.00.

A motion was made by Waters, seconded by Rudie, to approve the request for façade grant in the amount of \$5,900.00. The motion PASSED by a Voice Vote.

[0334-18](#)

Subject: (Direct Referral) A review of plans for signage at 308 Sixth Street. (DC-18)

Attachments: [\(0334-18\) 308 Sixth Street Signage Application](#)

Craig Schaub from Dig-It-All signs showed samples of the lettering for the signage and the colors to be used. He explained that the sign band would be a stained white oak walnut hickory blend. Colors for the façade are also included in this approval.

Waters and Sadowski confirmed that there was already a façade grant used for the property so there may not one available for the property.

Christensen stated the lower portion of the façade was not original to the building. He stated the verticals do not relate to anything above and that the sign placement would feel better if it related more to the building. He asked if the wording and logo could be stretched out.

Shaub stated it was possible to stretch the wording so that the sign band related more to the upper portion of the building or the transom. Shaub stated there was an external agency compiling signage produced based on those opinions. Christensen asked that the applicant consider lowering the sign.

In response to Connolly, Sadowski stated spreading out the sign would be an option. He stated they are at 20 square feet with their current proposal and they have 40 square feet available. He stated door graphics are not counted towards the signage allotment.

Shaub stated the anodized aluminum used would be silver in color.

A motion was made by Rudie, seconded by Waters, to approve the signage in the paint colors with a revised drawing submitted that shows the paint colors to coordinate with the samples received. Christensen made a friendly amendment to the motion to include consideration given to the comments made regarding the sign relating to the transom. The motion PASSED by a Voice Vote.

[0335-18](#)

Subject: (Direct Referral) A review of plans for signage at 512 Main Street. (DC-18)

Attachments: [\(0335-18\) 512 Main Street Signage Application](#)

Jason Roetz from Fast Signs explained the request. He stated the applicant is proposing some graphic updates with their logo in white vinyl on the front doors and using the same graphics on the back door. He stated perforated vinyl for privacy will be along the back walls and extend four feet. He stated the sign panel will be updated and the previous vinyl removed and replaced with vinyl with a black background and a white logo. Roetz stated they were coming to the commission after the fact as most of the signage is already installed, everything except for the logo on the sign band. He stated the graphics on the transom from the previous tenant will remain.

In response to Connolly, Roetz stated banner signs will be done in the future.

Sadowski explained the window signage ordinance allows 50 percent of the windows to be covered. He stated permanent signage on windows are counted towards the signage allotment.

Hintz stated the transom signage would more than likely put them over the sign square footage limit.

Sadowski stated the transom and banner signage were part of a previous approval and made sense for that business.

Rudie suggested not having the signage at the bottom or removing the signage from the top.

Roetz stated that, at some point, the transom signage will be removed.

A motion was made by Waters, seconded by Rudie, to approve the signage request with the use of vinyl as submitted with the removal of the existing upper transom vinyl letters on East and West side of the building. The projecting banner brackets may remain if a signage is received in three months. If not, the brackets are to be removed. Any painting of the building will need to be submitted for review and approval of the DADRC. The motion PASSED by a Voice Vote.

It was clarified that they cannot put up the new sign without the existing transom graphics coming down as that will put them over the signage allowance.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:44 p.m.