



Design Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, October 8, 2020
via tele/videoconference

1. Call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Wesley Brice, Bryan Koester, Larry Pachefsky, Daryl Melzer, Mike Skauge and Mary Wright.

Others present: John Ludwig, Jessica Ludwig, Tony Spolar, John Mahoney and Bart Griepentrog, Planning & Development Director.

2. Approval of September 24, 2020 meeting minutes.

Mr. Pachefsky moved to approve the minutes as drafted; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 7-0.

3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of one projecting sign and at commercial property 4473 N. Oakland Avenue, business owner John Ludwig.

The applicant requested that this item not be considered, as new plans were being prepared for submission. No discussion or action was taken.

4. Consideration by Special Exception of the application and plans on file for the installation of a window sign that exceeds the allowable size at commercial property 4473 N. Oakland Avenue, business owner John Ludwig.

Director Griepentrog referenced the sign memo that was prepared for this item. John Ludwig was present to represent this item during discussion.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if a projecting sign was also going to be installed and was informed that it likely would be, but at a future meeting.

Ms. Wright noted that she believed the proposed neon window sign was too much for Oakland Ave. Mr. Skauge questioned if the sign would occupy the entire window, and Director Griepentrog confirmed that it would occupy approximately 52% of it. Ms. Wright reiterated that she did not like the proposal and thought it was too big. Mr. Koester also confirmed that he thought it was too large.

Mr. Koester noted a desire to be able to see directly through more of the window glass. Mr. Ludwig responded that the back of the sign was proposed to be clear plastic behind the neon

tubes. Chair Kraehnke questioned if the sign back could follow the contour of the sign more closely, and Mr. Ludwig indicated that it needed to be a rectangle to be more sturdy.

Ms. Wright questioned if the dog image would also be on the projecting sign, and it was confirmed that it most likely would.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned why the applicant was not considering a wall sign. Mr. Ludwig indicated that they were hoping to present a similar look to other area businesses, such as Aloha Poke and Snack Boys, who feature glowing “retro” neon signs. Mr. Pachefsky suggested that the neon sign could be installed inside of the tenant space. Ms. Wright noted that she did not wish to see neon from the street. Mr. Skauge agreed.

Mr. Ludwig noted that he appreciated the feedback. Ms. Wright stated that she would like to see the entire sign package together, including the projecting sign. Mr. Ludwig agreed to provide the whole package at a future review. Ms. Wright suggested that Riley Sandwich Company be included on a wall sign to catch the customer eye and leave the window open to see into the store. She suggested that the dog image would work best on the projecting sign. Mr. Skauge once again agreed. Mr. Koester noted that he likes neon, but that the proposal was too large. Chair Kraehnke also noted that he liked neon, but would prefer the back of the sign to be contoured and would like to see a complete proposal.

No action was taken on the application.

5. Consideration by Special Exception of the application and plans on file for the installation of a monument sign that exceeds the allowable height at commercial property 1225 E. Olive Street, property owner Kingo Lutheran Church.

Director Griepentrog referenced the sign memo that was prepared for this item. Tony Spolar presented an overview of the project. He noted that they were mostly proposing to replace the existing monument sign with a sign of the same footprint and size. He stated that the proposal honored the building’s architecture. He detailed that the proposed cross would be made of cedar. He noted that it would be 10 ft. in total height, but that 2’ 6” would be underground. He questioned if the height should be measured from the sidewalk or the top of the steps.

Ms. Wright questioned if the cross would light up, and Mr. Spolar suggested that it might eventually be up-lit from the bottom, but that it currently was not proposed. He noted that if it was lit that the viewer would not be able to see the light source. He noted that the sign’s canopy was also designed to hide the light source while allowing the sign to be washed in light.

Ms. Wright stated that the sign would be a huge improvement. Mr. Melzer agreed and stated that he loved the design. Mr. Spolar noted that they were referencing the past with the design. He believed that it looked timeless and fit the architecture of the building. He noted that the old sign was “tired.”

Mr. Melzer noted that he was in favor of granting the exception. Mr. Spolar noted that otherwise they would need to scale everything down. Director Griepentrog requested that if the Board was willing to consider the exception that they should reference which sections of the code they thought it qualified under. Chair Kraehnke suggested that the uniquely sloping nature of the site would help it qualify, noting that the sign was built into a hill.

Mr. Skauge moved to approve the plans via Special Exception, noting conditions 2 (type of sign), 3 (proposed materials), 4 (type of construction), 5 (appearance), 6 (location of building), 7 (size in relation to building) and 8 (effect on the appearance or character of the property) of the code; seconded by Mr. Melzer.

Mr. Koester noted that there were a lot of favorable factors. Mr. Pachefsky questioned if the brick pillar of the sign was original, since it appeared to match the brick pillars of the church. He questioned why that needed to be torn down. Mr. Spolar noted that the pillar was structurally tired and required maintenance. John Mahoney from Kingo Lutheran Church noted that the pillar was not original, but was added in the 1990s. He confirmed that it was not in good shape and noted that the cap on top of the pillar was too small and did not actually match that of the church.

The motioned passed 7-0.

6. Adjournment

Mr. Pachefsky moved to adjourn the meeting at 5:45 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 7-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director