

CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS – CITY HALL  
MONDAY, JANUARY 06, 2020  
17:30 (05:30 PM)

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Steve Lichtenfeld at 17:30.

ROLL CALL

Chairman Steve Lichtenfeld, Interim City Manager Janet Watson, Aldermanic Representative Richard Lintz, Carolyn Gaidis, Robert Denlow, and George Hettich answered roll call.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE

Stephanie Karr, City Attorney  
Scott Dedert, Planner

CHAIRMAN REQUESTS

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked that all cell phones be turned off and that conversations take place outside the meeting room.

Chairman Lichtenfeld also asks that anyone who speaks please spell out their last name.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

RICHARD LINTZ – MOVE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS SUBMITTED.

GEORGE HETTICH – SECOND

BOARD UNANIMOUSLY APPROVES DECEMBER 02, 2019, MEETING MINUTES.

NOTES

8144 KINGSBURY BOULEVARD – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD – SOLAR – TABLED

NEW BUSINESS

444 SOUTH BRENTWOOD BOULEVARD – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SIGNAGE

Scott Dedert summarizes the following staff report: “The subject property is located at the northeast corner of South Brentwood Boulevard and Roseline Drive. The property has a zoning designation of C-1 Neighborhood Commercial District. The applicant has expanded their business and is requesting additional signage above the awning on the southwest corner of the building.

The proposed wall sign is 17.05 square feet in area and will be internally illuminated. The proposed sign will be made of aluminum and vinyl with the advertising being blue, black, and white.

Because the subject property is located on a corner lot, an additional wall sign is allowed on the secondary street of Roseline Drive. Instead of placing the sign on the side of the building facing Roseline Drive, the applicant would like to place the additional wall sign facing the Roseline Drive/Brentwood Boulevard intersection on the southwest corner of the building, where it is angled. The wall area at the proposed location is 9 feet 9 inches wide. For signs located on side streets, the code requires a 4-foot setback from the corner of the building. Given the proposed location and size, there is not enough space for a 4-foot separation from each corner of the building, therefore the applicant is requesting a modification to allow the sign in the corner location, as proposed.

Section 425.040 of the City’s Sign Regulations address wall sign as follows:

*One (1) wall sign fifteen (15) square feet or five percent (5%) of the front wall area up to a maximum area of fifty (50) square feet shall be permitted as follows:*

*Corner lots. Buildings and stores as described above on corner lots with a display window and/or a separate street entrance may have a sign on the side street side of the building conforming to the above requirements. Such signs shall be centrally proportioned on each facade or located above display windows but in no event shall such signs be located within four (4) feet of the corner of the building.*

The staff also prefers the location of the secondary sign at the southwest corner of the building above the awning, because the sign will be illuminated and at that location, it will be further from view by the nearby residents. Staff is of the opinion that the proposed material, location and sign color is compatible with the building and surrounding character.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO APPROVE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITION:

1. THE ILLUMINATION SHALL NOT BE GREATER THAN 75 WATTS.”
- 

GENE NORBER (GN) – ARCHITECT

GN – Thanks the Board for it’s time and Staff for their description. This sign wattage is 14.4 watts. It will allow Medical West to show there is new activity in the building and the expansion of the business.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – I think the staff report and where it’s going makes sense. I have no issue with the sign.

RICHARD LINTZ – Has staff figured out the new LED wattage and what that is comparable to in the old lighting?

SCOTT DEDERT – No.

CAROLYN GAIDIS – MOTION TO APPROVE WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE ILLUMINATION SHALL NOT BE GREATER THAN 14.4 LED WATTS.

ROBERT DENLOW – SECOND

BOARD UNANIMOUSLY APPROVES

---

8136 STRATFORD DRIVE – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – EXTERIOR ALTERATION

Scott Dedert summarizes the following staff report: “The 5,000 square foot site is located on the south side of Stratford Drive and has a zoning designation of R-2 Single-Family Dwelling District and is within the Clayton Gardens Urban Design District (UDD). The project has been completed and consisted of removing a 24 square foot balcony, that had 2 foot +/- bump-out with two vinyl windows and siding. The applicant reused the two windows, placed them in the approximate location as before, matched the existing vinyl siding, and kept a roof overhang above the windows.

The Clayton Gardens UDD allows for specific use of building materials within the code, vinyl is not one; however, the vinyl siding and windows were existing prior to the construction of this project.

The project is not in conformance with the requirements of the R-2 Single Family Dwelling District or the Clayton Gardens UDD with the use of vinyl windows and siding. However, the use of vinyl siding and windows along Stratford Drive does exist. Staff is of the opinion that the design and materials are compatible with the home and street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED.”

---

JASON SHUPP (JS) – FERGUSON ROOFING

ROBERT MURTHA (RM) - HOMEOWNER

JS – The narrative says everything I would have said. This is one of those ask for forgiveness situations, I apologize we didn’t realize it would be something that requires a meeting. Cosmetically what we took off created minimal change to the home and if anything declutters it. What do we need to do to be in compliance and if any modifications need to be done, we will work with the homeowner to make them happen.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – It looks much more cleaned up now, however, on the after photo what is the turquoise color?

JS – I think that is my printer malfunctioning.

RM – That is rainwater deflection, it is not blue though, it is copper.

JS – I need to change the toner in my printer.

RM – If you weren't looking for it you wouldn't notice it.

CAROLYN GAIDIS – Was there a reason to not get rid of this part here on the top and continuing the regular gutter?

JS – There is issues with pitching it and where the downspouts would go.

RM – The roof line would have made it difficult to remove the overhang.

CAROLYN GAIDIS – MOTION TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED.

GEORGE HETTICH - SECOND

BOARD UNANIMOUSLY APPROVES

---

HAVING NO FURTHER BUSINESS BEFORE THE COMMISSION, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 18:06.

---

Recording Secretary