

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: May 23, 2018
TITLE: 7902 Watts Road – Comprehensive Design Review for “The Reserve at High Point.” 9 th Ald. Dist. (51383)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: May 23, 2018	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Cliff Goodhart, Dawn O’Kroley, Tom DeChant, Christian Harper, Michael Rosenblum, Rafeeq Asad and Amanda Hall.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 23, 2018, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a Comprehensive Design Review for “The Reserve at High Point” located at 7902 Watts Road. Registered in support of the project were Michael Morey and Mark Kurensky, representing Oakbrook Corporation.

The applicant presentation described a single lot site with a private road that bifurcates the site with curb and gutter, street trees and sidewalks that looks like a public street. There’s no parking on Watts Road or High Point Road so their front doors face this small private roadway. As a result they have two front doors facing each other. Planning staff wanted pedestrian access off of Watts Road; there is an awning and two architectural brick walls approximately 25-feet in length to accent the entrance (Site Wall A and Site Wall B). The two other day-to-day entrances have architectural site walls that house the leasing office and wayfinding for drop-off with backlit halo effect letters. The last one actually acts as a screen wall because there is a patio behind it with tables, a fire pit and a gas grill. The most important sign they need is on the east building that faces the private road, to direct people into the building (Site Wall Sign D).

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Do the properties have a Watts Road address?
 - Yes.
- Is there a street sign for that drive?
 - I don’t believe so, there’s an easement over the land to get you into the club.
- If you’re driving on Watts Road looking for buildings, you’re going to look for the name. But the numbers are on the private drive?
 - Every building has the numbers above the doors.
- Maybe you could increase the contrast on those.

- I agree that the name of the building by the leasing office is important, but I don't see the other signs as important for wayfinding. You're looking for a street address, a house number. I see those prominently displayed on these entrances.
- The address isn't until you're on the inside of that street though.
- Aren't they permitted one ground sign at the entrance of the development too? But the issue is they're looking for two signs on Watts Road.
 - We need that one at the lobby and think it would be nice to have at least one ground sign on Watts Road.
- I could see a monument sign near that intersection. They suggested one on South High Point as well.
 - Ironically we had a blade sign on the building along High Point and in deliberations with staff they thought it was too commercial. So we started with signage on High Point and pulled it. I don't want to add another freestanding wall on Watts.
- To me it's a lot of branding and less wayfinding. I agree with the leasing office, and maybe somewhere along Watts. If they're offering it, put one at High Point on one of the walls there.
- You're agreeing with A?
- A or B and something along Watts Road, A or B.
- B and A renderings show them somewhat concealed. How is someone driving on Watts going to see that, or would it be better to have a monument sign further out into the intersection to draw people into the development?
 - The signage we are trying to do is very low key. We're trying to direct people to the corner of High Point and Watts, it's almost a verification. They turn and know they're at the right spot. We didn't want a big commercial sign. And we do need signage up near the front. And it's part of the architectural wall.

ACTION:

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Hall, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of Options "B" and "D." The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0)