

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: April 17, 2013

TITLE: 3550 Anderson Street – Amendment to Existing “Comprehensive Design Review” of Signage for Madison College. 17th Ald. Dist. (22901)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Jay Wendt, Acting Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: April 17, 2013

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lauren Cnare, Tom DeChant, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 17, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of an amendment to an existing Comprehensive Design Review of Signage for Madison College located at 3550 Anderson Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Bridget Growney and Mary Beth Growney Selene, both representing Ryan Signs, Inc. Growney listed four minor alterations to the original Comprehensive Design Plan which include relocation of an approved location due to underground power lines, omission of an original campus entrance sign which was replaced with signage without message centers. The current request is for UW Credit Union and Group Health Cooperative signage, and increased letter size and color change for the Protective Services signage that will tie in with the rest of the campus. They would also like to move the Health Education sign to make room for the GHC signage.

Staff did express concern as to whether or not these changes are outside the “family” of the overall signage package. The issue is one of outside entities on the campus needing signage that doesn’t match the Madison College signage package. Growney Selene stated that currently GHC is a partner on campus. She sees this as developing a standard for non-college partners. The Chair replied by asking how many partners Madison College has and does every partner then deserve a sign? This is multiplicity of signage that is not directly related to the zoning purposes of an institution; this is not a retail site. Growney Selene responded that GHC currently provides clinical services but they are also a partner from an educational standpoint. The clinic and the credit union are both open to the public with their main focus being students and faculty. Harrington noted that tax dollars paid for this site but it is now being used for commercial purposes. Harrington noted that Union South has a credit union but their signage is very small. O’Kroley noted the approved kiosks near entrances could be used for the requested signage; Growney Selene replied that they are dissuading them from putting anything other than directional signage on the kiosks because those faces are routed and a change would require changing the entire face. Wagner and Harrington both questioned if this was in the Commission’s purview to approve commercial signage within an institutional zoning district. Staff remarked that Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator did not raise any issues with zoning; Tucker’s issue is one of setting a precedent with the current

application, not use. Cnare suggested referring this back to staff for an opinion that specifically explores the fact that this is becoming sort of a mixed message.

ACTION:

On a motion by Cnare, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** the amendment, and **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the “Protective Services” portion of the signage. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0).

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project is 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 3550 Anderson Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	6

General Comments:

- Appropriateness of sign.