



Agenda Item #: 3

Project Title: 4710 East Towne Boulevard - Comprehensive Design Review for Signage.
(District 17)

Legistar File ID #: 92995

Members Present: Shane Bernau, Chair; Jessica Klehr, Davy Mayer, Anina Mbilyni, David McLean

Staff Present: Matt Tucker, Building Inspection Division Director

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

*Commissioner Hellrood arrived late, mid-item and abstained from voting.

Summary

At its meeting of April 15, 2026, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a Comprehensive Design Review for Signage (CDR) located at 4710 East Towne Boulevard. Registered and speaking in support was Tom Vavra. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Valerie Thodde.

Summary of Commission Discussion and Questions:

The Commission inquired about the awnings, and what is considered signage. Staff clarified that yes, the graphics on the awnings are considered awning signs, but staff does not believe they were ever permitted. The Commission inquired as to whether the apple graphic is a sign. Staff clarified that it is considered signage.

The Commission discussed when an awning is merely decorative and artistic versus a sign about a business. Staff clarified that graphics that relate to what is going on inside the building or that are related to logos are considered signage.

The Commission inquired about the dual branding and interior layout. The applicant replied that the interior is split with the dual brands. The Commission asked if the applicant has had push back or comment in other jurisdictions related to the amount of signage proposed as a result of the dual brands. The applicant noted that most municipalities have received them well.

The Commission inquired about the pick-up door and whether both pick-up activities happen in the same location. The applicant clarified that there is one location for both tenants' pick-up in this location.

The Commission inquired about a different design not being considered signage. Tucker responded it depends; this is an apple and for the purpose of what is in front of us today it is considered signage.

The Commission inquired about the size of the medallions and whether the elevation or the renderings are correct. The applicant noted that they could reduce the size to whatever the Commission wants.

Staff note that there are alternatives for the pick-up medallions. The Sign Code allows parking regulation signs to identify stalls for pick-up as a by-right sign that is highly visible. The applicant is also allowed window signage by right without permit.

The Commission noted that there are options for code compliant signage. The awnings could be the brand color without signage. Red canopies with an apple applique on the window would meet code. The “welcome back” and date copy on the iHop side of the building are unnecessary. The “feel good” messaging is sometimes seen inside the building versus outside. The “Neighborhood Bar & Grill” is part of the brand and could be allowed.

Action

On a motion by McLean, seconded by Mayer, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item to allow the applicant to explore alternatives that result in a sign package that is more consistent across the sign package, including sign types, and that reflects the necessary signage for business identification to meet CDR Criteria No. 2. Overall, the package should strive to be closer to compliant with the Sign Ordinance.

The motion was passed on a vote of (4-1-1) with McLean, Mayer, Mbilinyi, and Klehr voting yes; Hellrood abstaining, and Bernau non-voting.