

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> October 29, 2008
TITLE: 1021 Spaight Street – Street Graphics Variance. 3 <sup>rd</sup> Ald. Dist. (12209)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: October 29, 2008	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Chair; Ron Luskin, Jay Ferm, Marsha Rummel, Bruce Woods, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Todd Barnett and Dawn Weber.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of October 30, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a Street Graphics Variance located at 1021 Spaight Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Don Busch and Gene Herber, both representing Immanuel Lutheran Church. Appearing in opposition to the project were Dennis Bergren and William Shaffer. Prior to the presentation staff noted that the proposed ground sign for the “Immanuel Lutheran Church” is located on a lot within both a residential and landmark district. The existing sign’s replacement with a larger sign at 24 square feet in size requires a 22-foot setback from the property line based on a provision of the Street Graphics Ordinance for a “street graphics...shall not exceed twelve (12) square feet in area nor be closer than ten (10) feet to any lot line except such street graphic may be increased in area by one (1) square foot for each additional foot that the street graphic is set back more twelve (12) feet from the street lot line.” Under this provision the ground sign as proposed to be located at the existing 10-foot setback as the existing sign requires a variance. Prior to the presentation, staff noted a handout from Kitty Rankin, Preservation Planner in objection to the proposed Comprehensive Design Review variance. Rankin noted the new sign over prominence in a residential historic district (Third Lake Ridge Historic District) as a distraction from its character. She further noted her preference for the sign to be consistent with code requirements. Busch provided an overview of the ground sign details noting that the additional square footage allows for the incorporation of the cross element as found with the interior of the church. Berger and Shaffer spoke in opposition noting the following:

- The new sign is a foot taller as well as significantly larger.
- The larger/big sign disrupts the setting of church and residential neighborhood as is and will block views. What is there is perfectly adequate.
- Opposed, not beautiful, disruptive to setting around church, doesn’t fit.

Discussion by the Commission was as follows:

- Don’t support, agree with Rankin memo. The existing sign is more in keeping with building architecture, much more contemporary with church.

- Ald. Rummel as area's representative received emails in opposition, also noting that the sign was not in scale with church's setting.
- Don't mind look of sign but need to scale down. Recognize need to have a more visible sign but scale down and keep in same place. It doesn't suit the need of church, needs to work with being in a residential area and be brought down to existing size.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this project. The motion was passed on a vote of (9-0). The motion to refer required that the green background of "Immanuel" which blocks views be eliminated in favor of a more transparent aluminum detail that ties into the glass walled appearance of the church's ascending form to be done in a frame not board to allow visibility and transparency with a tie back to materials of the building and more integration.

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 3, 4, 4, 4 and 4.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1021 Spaight Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	4
	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	4
	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	4
	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	4
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3

General Comments:

- Concur with Kitty Rankin comment if near street comply with size requirements.
- Oversized and out of context with neighborhood.
- Sign is less in keeping with architecture.
- Smaller sign will achieve church goals of being closer to sidewalk.
- Sign needs to be smaller.
- Sign is too large for neighborhood context.
- Sign is too big. Needs to get smaller and more integrated with the handsome building architecture.