

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** July 10, 2013

TITLE: 3550 Anderson Street – Amendment to Existing “Comprehensive Design Review” of Signage for Madison College. 12<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (22901)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: July 10, 2013

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Tom DeChant, Henry Lufler, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Lauren Cnare and Cliff Goodhart.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of July 10, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **FAILED TO GRANT FINAL APPROVAL** of an amendment to an existing Comprehensive Design Review located at 3550 Anderson Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Mary Beth Growney Selene and Fred Brechlin. Growney Selene gave an overview of their previous presentations to the Commission and presented new signage designs that incorporate the Madison College shield and path logo which is part of their corporate identity and matches all the other signage on the property. The partnership with Madison College now exists where it didn't the last two visits to the Commission. The signs have gone from 7.75 square feet to 4.7 square feet and on the credit union from 4 square feet to 3 square feet. There is no presence for either of these signs on Anderson Street; the credit union is located parallel to the entrance to the Gateway building. With regard to the Group Health sign, that is located at the entrance to the Health building which is on Hoffman Street with no access from Anderson Street. The notion that this is advertising should be reconsidered as identification of these partnerships. You do not see the Group Health sign until you are physically inside the parking lot. Both of these businesses are in tremendously competitive markets.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Who uses these services? This is a clinical site for health services?
  - Absolutely. Anybody can use these services.
- What if a restaurant wanted to open near the culinary aspect of the college, would they require a sign too?
  - What's important with regard to these two partners is that they are functioning in their business. It's not just them taking space up and helping with body shops, but they physically have a credit union the same with Group Health Cooperative. You as the Urban Design Commission can limit that. But I don't see a "Subway" or "Doolittle's Grill." I don't anticipate that there will be and I don't think that Madison College does either.
  - We have a John Deere partnership, there are others, we don't foresee what you're talking about.

So why are these different? (Brechlin)

Public entities on this campus. We don't have anything else anticipated right now.

- Did you look at lowering the address?
  - We didn't because it's consistent with the rest of the family of signs, but we certainly can.
- I know you can't predict the future but I think this will be a plethora in the future. The design includes a logo and it shouldn't have anything other than identification. I sympathize with being a partner with the college and a good community partner.
- I come back to the public access message. The public has to find them and use them.

### **ACTION:**

A motion was made by DeChant, seconded by Goodhart, to **GRANT FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion **FAILED** on a vote of (3-4) with DeChant, Goodhart and Slayton voting yes; Lufler, Cnare and Harrington voting no; with Chair Wagner breaking the tie on the failed motion by voting no.

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 are 6 and 7.

**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
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	7	-	7	7
	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	6

General Comments:

- Subtle use of corporate partners.
- Excellent signage...bad policy.
- Public access requires this wayfinding.