



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, December 7, 2017

4:30 PM

City Hall, Room 307

Call To Order

PRESENT: 6 - Amy Connolly, Michael Rosiensi, John Monefeldt, Micah Waters, Ryan Rudie and Richard Christensen
EXCUSED: 1 - Jeff Coe

Approval of Minutes for the November 2nd, 2017 Meeting

Chairman Christensen noted a typo on page 2 of the minutes.

A motion was made by Connolly, seconded by Monefeldt, to approve the minutes of the October 5th meeting, subject to one typo correction. The motion PASSED by a voice vote.

[1170-17](#)

Subject: (Direct Referral) A request from Ron Christensen for review and approval of a White Box Program Grant for the property at 328 Main Street.

Attachments: [328 Main Street WB](#)

The applicant, Ron Christensen, stated he is requesting a White Box grant for most of the building at 328 Main Street to remodel the building for a proposed bakery, which will need a Facade Renovation Grant at a later time.

Chief Building Inspector, Ken Plaski, stated the maximum grant amount that Mr. Christensen is eligible for is \$20,000.00.

A motion was made by Rudie, seconded by Monefeldt, to approve the request for a White Box Grant for up to \$20,000.00 at 328 Main Street. The motion PASSED by a voice vote.

[1171-17](#)

Subject: (Direct Referral) A request from Tom Bain for review and approval of additional bids for a White Box Program Grant for the property at 411 Main Street. (1059-17)

Attachments: [411 Main Street WB Estimates - Updated 11.27.17](#)
[411 Main Street - Additional Submissions](#)

Mr. Plaski stated the applicant was not present but this item is additions to original item 1059-17. He stated the maximum grant amount approved at the last meeting was \$16,408.80 and that with the new bids the maximum grant amount is \$20,000.00.

Mr. Waters clarified that this is a follow-up submittal from the last meeting.

A motion was made by Monefeldt, seconded by Waters, to approve the request for a White Box Grant for up to \$20,000.00 at 411 Main Street. The motion PASSED by a voice vote.

[1172-17](#)

Subject: (Direct Referral) A request from James Wasley and Pamela Schermer for review and approval of a White Box Program Grant for the property at 613 Sixth Street.

Attachments: [\(1172-17\) 613 Sixth Street WB Submittal](#)

Connolly and Christensen reminded Sadowski that the applicants asked for a deferral to the January meeting.

A motion was made by Waters, seconded by Monefeldt, to defer 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](#)
[\(0961-16 & 0962-16\) 403 Sixth Street Review & Recommendations](#)

Mr. Sadowski stated the applicant wants to defer the item. Waters asks why they wish to defer the request, as they have deferred many times. Sadowski states they need to get material samples and bids, but the present documents show proposal of facade with dimensions.

Waters asked if they would be painting the brick. Sadowski confirmed they would be painting the brick on the upper level to match the first level.

Christensen asked if it would be thin brick. Sadowski confirmed it would be. Monefeldt asked if we accept thin brick, Sadowski confirmed it is accepted.

Monefeldt asked about polystyrene materials being used. Sadowski states we have approved it before at heights not susceptible to damage from the public.

Waters confirmed that the applicants have been advised by Sadowski to submit a paint color.

A motion was made by Monefeldt, seconded by Waters, to defer the design review request. 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](#)
[\(0961-16 & 0962-16\) 403 Sixth Street Review & Recommendations](#)

See discussion for item# 0961-16.

A motion was made by Monfeldt, seconded by Waters, to defer the request for a facade grant. The motion PASSED by a voice vote.

[1176-17](#)

Subject: (Direct Referral) Reconsideration of File 989-17 being a review of plans submitted by Paul Patterson, representing Wisconsin Lutheran School, for signage at 718 Grand Avenue / 719 Washington Avenue. (DC-17)

Attachments: [\(1176-17\) 718 Grand Avenue - 719 Washington Avenue Design Review](#)

Applicant, Paul Patterson of Wisconsin Lutheran School, stated he would like the commission to reconsider the October 5th decision because the last meeting was scheduled when he had a prior obligation. He felt that there wasn't a compelling reason for their disapproval. He stated that in 2012, Wisconsin Lutheran School wanted to expand so they remodeled this location. They acquired the correct zoning, which was a six month process.

Patterson stated their elementary school had old signs, the gym signs were delaminating, and they had become spread across town. These factors caused them to unify the signage, so everyone will understand that they are one entity.

Patterson stated the sign company put up all of the signs without review because they were replacing old signs and were not informed that their new building was in an area that required design review. In April and May, no one told them about design requirements. He stated when they submitted signs for review in August they were given permission for the four signs on the other buildings. He stated they didn't know about the incomplete submission until September. He sought feedback on October 6th, to be informed the signs were not approved.

Patterson stated that he couldn't find anything online about why the signs shouldn't be approved. He stated his frustrations with getting design requirements after his design was denied. He stated he struggles to understand why the building is limited to 120 sq. ft. of signage. Therefore, he would like the committee to consider approving the installation of the last two signs. He stated it shouldn't take six months to put up a sign, and that the commission should have a packet and/or submittal checklist to streamline the process in the future.

Sadowski stated that design guidelines are located on the Department of City Developments web page, which explains the difficulty Patterson had in finding them. Sadowski also stated that the design standards are not so prescriptive as to direct an applicant exactly how a design and placement should be, which is where the expertise of a sign company can help. He stated that Patterson's building allowed 60 sq.ft. of signage per street frontage, up to two frontages, which can be combined for 120 sq.ft. He stated his first interaction with Patterson was on October 11th when he, in response to a phone discussion with Patterson, emailed Patterson the checklist showing why his signage was denied and also provided a web link to the Downtown Design documents. Sadowski indicated that October 11th was his first instance of interaction with Mr. Patterson regarding this signage matter and that prior to that date

he had been communicating and meeting with the sign company at all other times.

Discussion about the placement, size, and design/construction of the sign ensued. Christensen stated the sign placement seems arbitrary and distracts from the building, suggested placement between windows. Patterson stated that you don't see the windows at grade. Waters felt it was a legitimate argument and Christensen then agreed to original placement.

In response to Monefeldt, Sadowski confirmed that in relation to the basic design standards, the sign does comply: artistic embellishments are included, all-weather materials are being used, and it is not interally illuminated.

A motion was made by Rudie, seconded by Waters, to approve placement of the signs as proposed above up-light and that by owner's choice, one of the signs be reduced in size so that total signage on the site not exceed 120 sq. ft.; to comply with the ordinance. The motion PASSED by a voice vote.

[1177-17](#)

Subject: (Direct Referral) A review of plans submitted by Carl Kump for a Facade Renovation Grant project at 420 Main Street. (DC-17)

Attachments: [\(1177-17 & 1178-17\) 420 Main Street Facade Grant Application](#)

The applicant, Carl Kump, stated his plans for a facade renovation grant at 420 Main Street. Kump proposed replacing the door, five windows, and the sign all in the storefront area. He stated he would be reconditioning the existing metal edge, and adding three gooseneck lighting fixtures above the sign area; and they will be maintaining the granite base around the building. He stated the glass will be clear and not tempered. He proposed adding air filtration vents in the front of the store because he found it was the best way to filter the air out of the building since it has no operable windows.

Waters asked about the copper band and existing awning. Kump stated they intend to try to straighten the copper band and maintain it. They have no intent of putting a canopy in the awning shroud, and asked if they can paint the existing canopy shroud. Waters confirmed that they can.

In response to Monefeldt, Sadowski stated the site is on the national historic registry list as a contributing property to the Old Main Street Historic District. So the prism glass and sign, and copper should be retained in place or saved, if removed.

Kump stated the current sign is not prism glass, it is a thin plastic. Their intent is to remove it carefully to try to save it and mount it inside.

Monefeldt was concerned about the vents and covering up the Wiegand Brothers sign.

Sadowski stated that the City would like to see the facade preserved in its current condition, but decisions are ultimately up to the owner. However, they are applying for a facade grant, so the commission has some leverage there. He stated leaving the sign in place and covering it up seems to be the best solution.

Monefeldt asked if this was a practical option. Kump stated there is no way to secure the new sign without going through the existing sign.

Sadowski stated that he could see a scenario where the new sign was mounted on a

frame that was then secured to the opening occupied by the original sign, without having to remove the original sign. Micheal's Sign representative, Bill Pfister, acknowledged that building a framework was possible but felt there was nowhere to secure the framework without damaging the original sign.

Monefeldt stated he doesn't like the vents being featured. Pfister stated that the vents will not be featured as the color will be matched to the sign.

A motion was made by Rudie, seconded by Monefeldt, to approve the sign as presented with the original sign being salvaged for preservation and reuse or display in the future, new lettering as presented, goose neck/pendant light fixtures, sign graphics as presented, and clear glass windows with dark bronze frame. The motion PASSED by a voice vote.

[1178-17](#)

Subject: (Direct Referral) A review of plans submitted by Carl Kump for a facade grant for a facade renovation project at at 420 Main Street. (DC-17)

Attachments: [\(1177-17 & 1178-17\) 420 Main Street Facade Grant Application](#)

See discussion for item# 1177-17.

A motion was made by Rudie, seconded by Monefeldt, to approve the facade renovation for up to \$8,200.00 at 420 Main Street. The motion PASSED by a voice vote.

[1180-17](#)

Subject: (Direct Referral) A review of plans submitted by James Powell for window signage installed at 1207 North Main Street. (DC-17)

Attachments: [\(1180-17\) 1207 N Main Street Design Review](#)

Sadowski stated that the signage is already up but the sign company worked with him to ensure compliant placement and proportions to expedite the process before the weather changed.

A motion was made by Waters, seconded by Monefeldt, to approve the design as presented. The motion PASSED by a voice vote.

Administrative Business

Mr. Sadowski stated that the City Development has been developing an inventory of downtown signage to better guide applicants in the future. He would like to review this with the commission at the January meeting.

Connolly stated she would like to promote projecting signs, using guidelines and incentives, through the Commission.

Next Meeting Date is January 4, 2018 at 4:30 PM

Adjournment

A motion was made by Monefeldt, seconded by Waters, to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.