

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: December 14, 2016	
TITLE: 2702 Todd Drive – Amendment to the Approved Comprehensive Design Review of Signage for “United Brick & Tile.” 14 th Ald. Dist. (17847)	REFERRED:	
	REREFERRED:	
	REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED:	POF:
DATED: December 14, 2016	ID NUMBER:	

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Cliff Goodhart, Lois Braun-Oddo, Tom DeChant, Richard Slayton, Rafeeq Asad, Michael Rosenblum and Sheri Carter.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 14, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of an amendment to the approved Comprehensive Design Review of signage for “United Brick & Tile” located at 2702 Todd Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Mary Beth Growney Selene, representing Ryan Signs, Inc.; Margo Goodwin and Michael Sehgal.

The original Comprehensive Design plan for this site was approved in 2010, which approved the removal of a 144 square foot sign leaving the current sign in its place. Also approved was integrating the pipe structure with the architecture of the building, which has never been done. A new sign is now proposed relative to the building at 2710 Todd Drive; this is a unique site as they lost an ingress and egress drive when the new Beltline overpass and on-ramp from Todd Drive was done in 2009-2010. Hardships listed beyond the control of the property owner include limited access due to the Beltline overpass, high voltage lines and a fuse box in the front yard of the business, limited and not highly visible parking, the lack of knowledge of the on-ramp as a non-frontage road. They are asking for approval of an addition sign to go below the existing sign that was approved in 2010, showing two possible designs, which will be 16-feet over the maximum of 144 square feet of allowable space for a roadway like the Beltline. The owner of the property is self-limiting the site to two ground signs, plus a secondary entrance sign of 15 square feet which would be located at the north entry drive coming into the property. The third request is for a reconsideration of the Commission’s 2010 decision to wrap the poles in a stone; they would prefer to paint the pipe the color of the stone that has been added to this building.

The Secretary stated that in talking with the Zoning Administrator, they don’t object to the additional signage on the site, or even the smaller sign. But when the Comprehensive Design Review was approved in 2010, the requirement to wrap the poles in stone to tie in with the building’s architecture was meant to make a non-conforming structure be more attractive, which ties back to the criteria for Comprehensive Design, and that requirement was not met.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Brick or stone would be a nice logical tie-in to go along with the business, some free advertising there.
- (Business owner) The concern is that the sign is very close to our building, and the way it's designed, with the overhangs, if we put stone on those pillars water and snow is going to build up, come down on those pillars and we're going to have problems as far as cracking, and a lot of water sitting there, freezing and thawing.
- We don't have anything showing us where the building is in relation to the signage. The building can't be in relationship to both pillars, can it?
 - It's parallel to the building.
 - The problem is because this roofline is so close, if we put pillars here the water's going to fall and sit on these pillars.
- Unfortunately that relationship existed when it was a non-conforming sign which we allowed to be maintained. That's a relationship that has not changed since the original approval.
 - We're just asking for consideration.
- I understand but I don't think that's the hardship when it was the existing condition you asked us to accept and allow for a non-conforming sign to begin with.
- We were trying to not argue so much for pillars, which are nice, but for something that would take this non-conforming sign and make it more attractive. I'm not sure that paint simply does it. Might you have thought of anything else besides just not doing the brick?
- One of the things I stated before when we looked at this originally was what's your other alternative to tie back to the aesthetic requirement of Comprehensive Design? Putting up different poles or different skin is not the aesthetic requirement.
 - If you look at that building it's all brick. It used to be all block, and if you look around those buildings, the majority of the signs are basically just a solid pole sign, which architecturally...
- Right but they're not before us, because they didn't have to come before us.
 - That's what I'm saying, I understand that. But it's so close to my building that is all stone and brick and nice looking.
- Is there an option to not use this pole and put the sign in between the two buildings, because there is face on this side of the on-ramp.
 - Currently I'm leasing parking on one side of my building, so if I have to do that I might as well shut my doors because I'm going to lose parking spaces. I'm already losing 8 of them because of the Todd Drive access. You're telling me know that I can no longer park on that side of the building. If I go ahead and have to put a sign in between my buildings where are my customers going to park?
- I guess I'm trying to figure out where's the compromise, because right now I feel it has to be your way or the highway.
 - No, but when the pillars crack and I have to continuously have to maintain them...
- One of the things you're not understanding is to offer an alternative we can accept beyond what you're putting on the table. What you're putting on the table does not suffice to replace what you didn't do. In talking to Matt Tucker, what else can you do besides what you're asking us to approve? If you want an alternative that we can approve let's broach that subject. Right now what you have on the table is not there.
- I can understand the argument that the building is so close, but that still doesn't mean that you've looked at other alternatives, and we don't have them here, for what might have been done.
- On your second sign for the parking lot, how do they know the parking lot is behind there? There's really no separation between that and Pella.
 - We can do a faux stone pole cover, which would take care of the decay issue.
- I was thinking of something in the middle that would do something to dress up the poles.

- When you come back bring a photo of the building for context.

ACTION:

On a motion by Carter, seconded by Asad, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the signage component only, with no gap between the sign faces on the main group sign and with issue on the supporting poles requiring further address as noted. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion provided for the following:

- The applicant shall return with examples of a design that reflects some of the options discussed.
- The gap in between the two signs shall be eliminated.

The applicant then decided to go with the original approval to put stone on the pillars. The original motion was amended to accept the owner's acknowledgment to wrap the ground sign's poles with masonry as originally approved by unanimous consent.