

**City of Oconomowoc
Architectural Commission Meeting Minutes
November 15, 2010**

Chairman Day called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm.

Members Present: Michael Day, Paul Schultz, Kent Johnson and Chad Vande Zande (4:16 pm)
Members Absent: Jeremy Flint
Staff Present: Jason Gallo, Bob Duffy and Chris Dehnert
Others Present: Aids. Slattery and Hall, and Bill Chapman

2. Pabst Farms Town Centre – Discussion of signage plans for Phase I of the development to be located at the NE corner of I-94 and Summit Avenue: The following individuals were present: Peter Paul Bell, Dan Warren, Bill Niemann and Scott Lesser from Pabst Farms; Chris Erb from Developers Diversified Realty (DDR); Stephen Perry Smith of Stephen Perry Smith Architects, acting as an in-house architect for Pabst Farms; and C.J. Lindburgh of Dorsky, Hodgson, Parrish & Yue, architect on behalf of DDR. Gallo distributed and explained talking points on what will be discussed during this workshop of the Architectural Commission. He then began with a power point presentation, a copy of which is part of the record, and focused on the primary monument sign. He showed photos of similar signs located near Oconomowoc and explained what the US Sign Council's recommendation is and what other locations have for height, square footage and number of tenants. Day then opened the meeting up for comments from individuals in the audience, and the following persons spoke:

Harry Evans, 1849 Spring Park Court - He is opposed to the 60' height, noting other malls in the area do not have 60' signs and they appear to be doing well without one. He concluded a sign with this height would be a big negative to the proposed mall and doesn't feel it is needed.

Ald. Cathleen Slattery, 3rd District – She said she has received a lot of emails from people who live in the area of the proposed mall. She summarized they don't understand the need for such a large sign when people will clearly be able to see the buildings. She also questioned how the tenants can have such control over signage.

No other comments were received. Erb then gave a presentation on their request for a 60' tall monument sign for the Pabst Farms Town Centre. He reviewed what they felt the architectural members wanted to see from them based on their last meeting, noting they have come up with 4 concepts which include different architectural features described as follows:

Concept A - 51' tall monument sign consisting of 2 brick pilasters on a stone base, with 4-5'x20' and 4-4'x20' tenant panels with a stone pier on one side which includes the Pabst Farms logo and an open cornice piece on the top.

Concept B - 50' tall monument sign consisting of 2 brick pilasters on a stone base, with 8-5'x20' tenant panels with the Pabst Farms logo on both sides and a stone cap on the top.

Concept C - 50' tall monument sign consisting of a stone base with the Pabst Farms logo, with 4-5'x20' and 4-4'x20' tenant panels; brick and stone pier asymmetrical on the side with the Centre's name and a stone cap on the top.

Concept D - 51' tall monument sign on a stone base with 1 stone pilaster on one side which includes the Pabst Farms logo and on the other side a half brick / half stone pilaster with a light element and identifying logo, with 4-5'x20' and 4-4'x20' tenant panels and an open cornice piece on the top (total height 55'8").

Erb showed a picture of the entry monuments which they have reduced to an 8'4" height, and updated pictures of their signage photo-imposed into the current landscape to show what the actual signage will look. He agreed the

opaque background for the tenant panels as shown in Gallo's presentation looked good and thinks this won't be an issue for tenants. As for height, he noted it comes down to being a visibility thing and they want to have a shopper see a tenant's signage with little to no effort. Erb stated 60' tall signs are not uncommon, and it comes down to what they are able to do to draw tenants to the shopping center. He believes the sign can be the centerpiece of the project.

Day believes there will be more signage going up on the I-94 corridor as Pabst Farms develops the area. Bell explained the property west of the woods may be developed into office space with box stores east of the woods and a potential development area across I-94 by Aurora. Day said based on this there could be up to 3 – 40' to 50' signs within an 8000 lf area. He added tenant signage should all be the same color background and font. Erb felt it would be a better tool for them if the tenant could have their own color choice for the background. Bell said there are a lot of new concepts available for signage such as that used in the Pick 'N Save sign which has black letters by day and white lettering at night. He believes they can work with the sign company to give the sign an elegant look which is welcoming to the shopper and reflects a quality shopping center. Schultz liked the architecture shown in the new concepts for the sign but still felt that Jason's examples of 40' tall signs are still very tall. Day questioned why a tenant has to have signage on the back of a building if they already have signage on the monument sign. Smith noted some times if the signage on the back of buildings is done very well, it can actually add to the building. Schultz was concerned if the back of every building contains signage, it will look like one large billboard. Warren noted the current sign ordinance doesn't take into consideration a large project like the mall. He added the recommendation from the USSC really makes sense to them because he feels it is a subjective opinion. Day concluded a 50' height is acceptable and the focus now needs to be on the color and font of the tenant panels. Gallo gave the Planning Department's recommendation to reduce the height of the primary monument sign to a maximum 40' tall.

Gallo continued with his presentation on Pabst Farm's request for 3-36' tall secondary monument signs. He is recommending 2-20' tall secondary monument signs with up to 6 tenant panels for a total of 200 sf. Ald. Slattery commented this signage will be able to be seen from the backyards of nearby residential properties, and sign height is a great concern for neighbors. She also doesn't agree with tenants having different colors on the sign. Erb continued with his presentation stating they want to mimic the large monument sign only in a scaled down version. He previously talked to Gallo about removing the secondary monument sign located in the middle of the development until the lifestyle area is developed. Thus there would only be 2 signs, one located off Hwy 67 and one off Sawyer Road. Lindburgh noted the secondary signs will be included as part of the entry wall of the Town Centre. Day stated he didn't have a problem with a 20' tall sign with the height of the architectural feature added to it.

Gallo continued with his presentation on Pabst Farm's request for 3-8.4' tall entry monument signs which are to be placed in the boulevard. He believes they are a nice gateway feature, and it is his recommendation that they be no taller than 8' and include landscaping. Warren asked if they have to be included in an island or if they can be included as part of the side wall. He noted sometimes special criteria can apply to signs located in an island so they would like the flexibility to add them to the wall. Day recommended these be brought down to 8' and asked about the font to be used, as he would like to see the same font that Pabst Farms has used everywhere else.

Gallo continued with his presentation on wall signage as proposed for the stores located in the Town Centre. He reviewed the sign ordinance requirements and noted Pabst Farms is requesting a special exception to increase the maximum amount allowed for primary wall signage up to 300 sf. They also are requesting larger retailers be allowed up to 600 sf for overall signage. Ald. Jimi Hall, 1st District, commented he thinks the wall signage has to be increased as the current ordinance doesn't cover this type of a development. He believes they need to set an appropriate amount per store within reason. He added as to the secondary monument sign proposed a 36' tall sign in a residential area is not going to make the people very happy who live around the Town Centre.

Erb referred to a specific retailer and its minimum signage requirements. They are proposing a cap of 300 sf for large tenants, noting signage would be proportionate for the size of the tenant. He added the smaller stores located off I-94 need signage for visibility as do the tenants who face in toward the mall as their name will not be located on any other signage other than on their building. Gallo pointed out per ordinance the signage on the back of a building should be

half the square footage of what is located on the front. Day did not believe they need 100% of the same square footage on the back as that on the front. The members agreed with 1.5 sf of signage per linear foot of building on the front and half the square footage on the back of the building. Gallo suggested a drawing showing tenant signage to exact dimensions would be most helpful for the December meeting. Bell added he understands the members don't want sign pollution. He said they will refer back to the Pabst Farms master sign plan in order to make this all work.

Gallo then finished his presentation and explained what Pabst Farms is requesting for the rest of their special exception request. Planning staff finds the temporary signage request is acceptable; they need more clarification on the banner and future business signage; and limits put on construction type signage. He added the exception request on Sales/Special Announcement type signs is more restrictive than City Code, and he cannot enforce these issues. Gallo concluded with the City approval process for their signage requests. Erb explained banner signs will only be used for special events at the mall and may include a graphic along with the Centre's logo. He noted they will not be used for sales events at the stores and may only include a tenant logo if they are sponsoring a special event at the Centre. Erb also clarified their position on Sales/Special Announcement type signs noting they have a tendency to make a storefront look cluttered. This is not what they are looking for and they want to have control directly over this with their tenants. The members agreed that construction type signage should be a 12 sf maximum. Erb noted typically whatever is approved as part of the sign plan is provided directly to tenants as a part of their lease package. Gallo questioned who will be in charge of controlling signage, and Erb said it would be a joint venture between Pabst Farms and DDR.

Erb acknowledged they have more work to do, and they greatly appreciated this work session with the architectural members. Gallo questioned the members if they felt they had a consensus on the monument's height. Day felt it should be no taller than 50' which includes the architectural feature; the secondary monument should be 20' tall with the height of the architectural feature added on top of it; tenant wall signage set at 1.5 sf of signage per linear foot of a building on the front and half the square footage on the back of the building. Johnson liked both Concept A and D the best while Day preferred Concept A. Vande Zande was in agreement on all of this while Schultz disagreed with the height and amount of signage proposed.

3. Adjourn: Motion by Johnson to adjourn at 6:17 pm; second by Vande Zande. Motion carried 4-0.

Chris Dehnert, Deputy City Clerk