

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** January 20, 2010

TITLE: 2733 University Avenue – Comprehensive Design Review of signage for Car Care Clinic in UDD No. 6. 5<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (17124)

**REFERRED:**  
**REREFERRED:**  
**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary      **ADOPTED:**      **POF:**

DATED: January 20, 2010      **ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Dawn Weber, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Ron Luskin, Jay Ferm, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner, Richard Slayton and Mark Smith.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of January 20, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a signage package for 2733 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project was Eric Marty. Prior to the presentation staff noted to the Commission that the request for consideration of the Comprehensive Design Review of the signage for the Car Care Clinic located at 2733 University Avenue was primarily based on a request to reface and potentially reconfigure an existing non-conforming ground sign on the site that conforms to the square footage allowance under the sign control ordinance but exceeded the maximum height for ground signage of 16 feet with the existing pole sign at 18 feet in height. Staff noted that consideration of the continued reuse of the sign could be provided as a “variance” which allows for an increase in height not to exceed 25% beyond the threshold allowed under the ordinance. Staff noted that Matt Tucker, the Zoning Administrator, agreed that consideration of the ground sign would not require Comprehensive Design Review. Staff further noted that other elements of the signage package were consistent with both the requirements for Urban Design District No. 6 as well as the Sign Control Ordinance. Staff further noted a correspondence from a concerned neighbor relevant to the operator’s use of non-allowed signage for the business establishment such as portable signs within the public right-of-way for the pennants, banners and flags (attention getting devices) as problematic for the neighborhood. Marty then proceeded with the detailed review of the refaced and restructuring of the proposed ground sign further noting the details of an existing wall sign on the building requiring a change of face to eliminate a portion of the sign currently featuring product advertising as well as an overall of the building’s front elevation signage to eliminate a combination of awning and wall signage in favor of wall signage to be contained on the building’s extensive mansard roof. Staff further noted that outside of the ground sign based on a now limited request for a variance all other signage was consistent with the requirements of the Sign Control Ordinance and the provisions for Urban Design District No. 7. Ald. Shiva Bidas-Sielaff spoke noting concerns with the use of illegal signage on the site assailed neighbors as well as the need to remove any sign extensions on the ground sign.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Luskin, seconded by Smith, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2) with Harrington, and Barnett voting no. The motion required that all

signage shall be code compliant with the removal of all “add-ons” on the ground sign, discontinuance and removal of any illegal signage on the zoning lot (e.g. banners and portable signage in the right-of-way).

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 4.5, 6, 4, 4, 5, 5 and 5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2733 University Avenue**

|                       | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <b>Member Ratings</b> |           |              |                |                                | 5     |                                     |               | 4.5            |
|                       |           |              |                |                                | 6     |                                     |               | 6              |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               | 4              |
|                       |           |              |                |                                | 5     |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                | 4     |                                     |               | 4              |
|                       |           |              |                |                                | 5     |                                     | 5             | 5              |
|                       |           |              |                |                                | 5     |                                     |               | 5              |
|                       |           |              |                |                                | 5     |                                     |               | 5              |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |

General Comments:

- Approvable but not desirable.
- Signage at this location is too extensive.
- Slight improvement, but improvement nonetheless.
- Internal access.