

**City of Oconomowoc  
Architectural Commission Meeting Minutes  
December 20, 2010**

Chairman Day called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

**Members Present:** Michael Day, Paul Schultz, Chad Vande Zande, Kent Johnson and Jeremy Flint  
**Staff Present:** Jason Gallo, Diane Gard, Bob Duffy and Chris Dehnert  
**Others Present:** Aids. Hall and Miller, and Bill Chapman

**2. Approve Minutes for December 8, 2010:** Motion by Vande Zande to approve the December 8, 2010 minutes; second by Johnson. Motion carried 5-0.

**Old Business:**

**3. Pabst Farms Town Centre - Consider / approve special exception for signage height, location, number and type of signs for development to be located at the NE corner of I-94 and Summit Avenue:** The following individuals were present: Peter Paul Bell, Bill Niemann and Scott Lesser from Pabst Farms; Chris Erb from Developers Diversified Realty (DDR); and C.J. Lindburgh of Dorsky, Hodgson, Parrish & Yue, architect on behalf of DDR. Day referred to Gallo's background from the packet, noting all issues with the special exception had been previously discussed at a work session held November 15, 2010. Due to the scope and size of the project, the members did not have an issue with approving the exceptions.

Motion by Vande Zande to approve the special exceptions as requested for the Pabst Farms Town Centre to be located at the NE corner of I-94 and Summit Avenue; second by Johnson. Motion carried 5-0.

**4. Pabst Farms Town Centre - Consider / approve signage plans for Phase I of the development to be located at the NE corner of I-94 and Summit Avenue as follows:** Day explained each sign request would be addressed first by staff and then Pabst Farms representatives, followed by formal action on each.

**a. Primary Monument Sign:** Gallo explained the applicant has decreased the height of the primary monument sign from their original request of 59'2" to 51'4". Gallo's recommendation had been for a 40' tall monument sign, and he feels what is now proposed is acceptable as the tallest advertising portion is 38'8". The architectural feature located on top is now more of an open air feature, not big and bulky, and adds approximately 12' on top of the signage cabinet. The design of the sign has changed from what the applicant had originally requested, and now consists of EIFS cornice and metal coping with a non-illuminated panel which contains the Pabst Farms logo and Town Centre identification. The stone located on both sides of the tenant panels has been upgraded from cultured to split-face fieldstone. The signage cabinet will have 8 tenant panels for a total of 693.33 sf which has been reduced from 800 sf. Gallo noted the individual sign panels will not be approved tonight, but he has been told that they will be no less than 42" in height with opaque backgrounds and illuminated letters. He feels there should be some flexibility given to the applicant on the other choices they make on the panels. The site plan shows the precise location of the sign which meets all zoning requirements. Gallo has no concerns and is recommending approval.

Erb clarified the opaque panels in the signage cabinet will have internally illuminated letters. He also would like the flexibility to illuminate the letters on the arch similar to the existing Pabst Farms arch which is lit with halo lighting. Bell noted the stone on the sign will be the same as used on the Pick 'n Save building, and the logo and fonts will match that used on signage throughout the development. Overall the members liked the changes the applicant has made to the sign. Flint questioned the elevation of the sign base in comparison to the elevation of I-94 which was unknown, though Day felt the road elevation was higher. Day also referred to how the process worked well throughout due to the work session held between the members and the applicant. He also encouraged the use of the same color font

throughout the sign to help keep the campus feel of the development. Flint thought the logo could be bigger. Schultz appreciated the change made to the sign's height from the applicant's original request.

Motion by Johnson to approve the primary monument sign as presented; second by Schultz. Motion carried 5-0.

**b. Secondary Monument Signs:** Gallo stated he had just been informed tonight that the applicant has decided to have only one secondary sign instead of three they had previously requested. It was originally going to be 36'10" tall, and has been reduced to 24'. The top of the sign cabinet is 20' and will contain 8 equally sized tenant panels for a total of 192 sf of advertising space. The architectural feature located on the top of the sign will be similar to the primary monument sign. The site plan identifies the sign to be 25' from the roadway edge which will have to be met as the development moves along and the sign is installed. Gallo is recommending approval of the secondary monument sign as proposed.

Day inquired about backlighting the sign in the same fashion as the primary monument sign. Erb agreed and noted the panels will also be the same as the primary monument sign. He added they decided to eliminate the two signs at this time, and they will re-evaluate the sign originally planned for Hwy 67 at a later date. They plan to come back to the Architectural Commission when they are ready to move forward with it. The members liked the signage as proposed.

Motion by Vande Zande to approve the secondary monument sign as presented and the Town Centre architectural feature may be illuminated as discussed if the applicant desires to do so; second by Flint. Motion carried 5-0.

**c. Entry Monument Signs:** Gallo explained the applicant has reduced the entry signs from 11'4" to 8', which now complies with code. The sign will not contain any advertising, and the applicant should make sure it is located outside of the vision corner. Gallo recommended approval as presented.

Flint inquired about the sign being backlit like the others, and Erb agreed they would like the option to be able to do this.

Motion by Flint to approve the entry monument signs as presented and they may be illuminated as discussed if the applicant desires to do so; second by Johnson. Motion carried 5-0.

**d. Wall Signs:** Gallo explained the applicant's request for wall signage for each different size of tenant store. The anchor store signage complies with the code except they would like to eliminate the maximum size requirement. He agrees with the applicant's request for both the junior and small shop tenant stores after seeing the examples they included in their latest submittal. He feels the applicant's request for wall signage as submitted is appropriate, and he is recommending approval.

Erb noted included in the handout distributed tonight were illustrations on front wall signage at three different sizes: the tenant prototype following code; at 2.0 x and at 1.5 x with no cap of the total front sign area. In addition, they showed illustrations of the signage to be located on the back of the building at 50% of the store prototype; 50% of the total front sf based on 2.0 x; 50% of the total front sf based on 1.5 x; and at 80% of the total front area. Erb did this for all three tenant store sizes and felt the 80% looked more proportionate for each. Schultz was concerned if there was no cap on signage then there could potentially be signage all across the back of the building. Erb noted the back could be either at 50% or 80% of the front, whichever they felt looked better. Lindburgh said there is language included in the agreement with each tenant which provides they are not to exceed the square footage of the store prototype. Day asked if the signage on the back could be limited to only the name/logo of the tenant, which Erb agreed. Day and Johnson agreed with what the applicant is proposing and thought the illustrations really helped them visualize the signage.

Motion by Schultz to approve the wall signs as follows: anchor tenants are allowed 1.5 sf of signage for every 1 foot of linear wall length, with 80% max. of the primary sign on the backside; junior tenants are allowed 2.0 sf of signage for every 1 foot of linear wall length, with 80% max. of the primary sign on the backside; small shop tenants are allowed 2.0 sf of signage for every 1 foot of linear wall length, with 80% max. of the primary sign on the backside; and the rear signs can only contain the tenant's name and logo, and no other signage; second by Johnson. Motion carried 5-0.

Flint inquired about temporary signage for the development. Gallo explained it was included as part of the applicant's request for a special exception; however, Pabst is restricting temporary signs to only one per tenant for a total of 90 days. This was not included on the agenda as they don't know what these signs are going to look like yet. In addition, temporary signs do not come before the Architectural Commission for approval but instead come to the Planning Department for approval. If they comply, they are exempt from getting a sign permit; if they exceed the standard, then they must change and come back. Day commented again that he felt the workshop between the Architectural members and Pabst/DDR really paid off. He thanked them for the work that they did on all of the signage issues.

**5. Reports and comments from the Architectural Commissioners:** Schultz questioned the status of the sign in place for the Taqueria el Indio restaurant which has not been reviewed yet by the commission. Gallo said he will follow through with this and will report at the next architectural meeting.

**6. Reports and comments from the City Planner:** None.

**7. Adjourn:** Motion by Schultz to adjourn at 6:13 pm; second by Johnson. Motion carried 5-0.

---

Chris Dehnert, Deputy City Clerk