

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION | PRESENTED: September 27, 2017 | |
| TITLE: 6310 Town Center Drive – Comprehensive Design Review. 3 rd Ald. Dist. (48872) | REFERRED: | |
| | REREFERRED: | |
| | REPORTED BACK: | |
| AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary | ADOPTED: | POF: |
| DATED: September 27, 2017 | ID NUMBER: | |

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, John Harrington, Cliff Goodhart, Tom DeChant, Michael Rosenblum and Rafeeq Asad.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 27, 2017, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** for a Comprehensive Design Review located at 6310 Town Center Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Zach Wenger and Joel Zielke, representing Steamfitters Union Local 601.

Zielke described how the facility will be utilized (building/construction trades), as well as how the signage would be beneficial to them. This building is primarily educating the apprentices and the journeymen for certifications. The building was designed to accommodate two signable areas. Wenger presented signage that meets the code, alongside what is being requested. They are seeking approval to allow two signable areas per the north and south elevations to create a balance in symmetry that would not be achievable with one signable area per elevation. The large free-standing sign with message center is located on the north side of the property; they are seeking approval to increase the overall height from 13-feet to 50-feet to put the sign 35-feet above Interstate grade for better visuals. The sign engineer expressed concerns with moving the sign closer, as well as doing a single pole. These concerns included structural integrity and pouring foundation in such a small area. The approved sign would sit 2-feet below Interstate road grade, making it impossible for east and west bound lanes of traffic to see. The proposed monument sign on the southeast corner of the property is also seeking an increase in square footage from 144 square feet to 152 square feet. The larger background gives the text more depth and makes it easier to read.

Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator addressed the Zoning staff report and concerns. The City decided to allow signage as would otherwise be permissible for Planned Developments relative to comparable districts without asking for a Comprehensive Design Review. He noted that some signs were not accurately representing the situation. What is shown as a monument sign adjacent to a highway; most would do a pole sign where the base would be 1/3 or no wider than the width of the sign it is supporting, which is 22-feet in height. This represents something that no one would build; what should be shown is a pole sign at 22-feet in height to see what would otherwise be permissible. The proposed 50-foot sign has dual poles that are wider than 1/3 of the width it supports, which is a design choice. This could be engineered to be a single pole if it were taller, but this is what

they have chosen to do. A sign of this style could only be 13-feet tall but single pole could be up to 22-feet tall. Zoning staff did a calculation of the square footage of the signs per the code and did not feel they needed a CDR for signage exception; they feel they aren't being accurately measured by the client. The sign code allows one signable area per façade. A signage variance may be a better solution for the larger sign request. No signs have been approved, no permits have been issued. Zoning's biggest concern is with the tall sign, the argument made that it's necessary because it's a message center is a choice by the client to use said message center. Those signs are not necessarily high design signs; it's a "super variance." There is some rationale for the need for a taller sign, but the applicant has yet to make that case.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Can we split the logo?
 - You need to approve a Comprehensive Design Review for two signable areas.
- They're also increasing the size of the sign.
 - No, our suggestion is that that comply with the 120 square foot maximum and we think it could be close. The difference is what they can do by right, and what they are requesting by moving the logo to one side and having the signage to the other side.
- I don't mind the logo split, but some of the other stuff is a bit much. I don't think going to a bigger sign does anything. I think it looks better with the logo on the other side.
- Nice job presenting your case. The split sign facing the highway, I wouldn't do a pole sign at all, let your building draw everyone's eye rather than a pole sign.
- I know you can't see the building when you're traveling westbound, the two lanes are at different elevations. Having a pole sign when you can't see the building to me is just like having a billboard. As you drive in your car you're miles away from that sign.
- I like the split logo on both façades. I don't like the 50-foot sign at all. I would like to see a rendering of the permissible 22-foot sign on a single pole as viewed from the highway, see if it makes sense to you. I don't want you to wreck the architecture of that building. I would really test what you need there and show us what's required.
- Because you have neighbors to the south, be aware if the lighting needs to be adjusted or not on after a certain time when your building is closed.

ACTION:

On a motion by O'Kroley, seconded by Asad, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion approved only the separation of the logo signage on the north and south elevations, thus creating two signable areas by action, noting that only the logo can be placed on the second signable area. The motion further approves a monument sign that conforms to code, but no pole sign.