AGENDA # <u>1</u>

City of Madison, Wisconsin

AUTHOR: William A. Fruhling, Acting Secretary DATED: March 3, 2010		ADOPTED: ID NUMBER:	POF:	
	PUD(GDP-SIP) and Signage Package Exceptions. 11 th Ald. Dist. (16448)	REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:		
TITLE:	702 North Midvale Boulevard (Target) –	REFERRED: March 3, 20		
REPORT	OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: March 3, 2010		

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 3, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) and Signage Package Exceptions located at 702 North Midvale Boulevard. Jaci Bell, Tom Camreo and Mary Shaffer presented updates to the project. The Commission discussed the screening of the rooftop mechanical equipment, bike lanes on the site and adjoining streets, the configuration of the right turn lane from Hilldale Way onto University Avenue, the front entry sidewalk/ramp, canopy over the loading bays, and adding vision glass to the stairwells along Frey Street. It was noted that sheet C-300 shows the correct location of the bike racks. Jim Ferrell, representing Joseph Freed, stated that his company is supportive of expanding the sidewalk along the Sentry store and that would be implemented through a development agreement. He is agreeable to including curb cuts aligned with the drive aisles, but needs to work with the Sentry owners and City staff to finalize the plans. There was considerable discussion on the graphic in the lobby and whether there should be some limits on the commercial message content given its visibility from outside of the building. Fruhling stated that that component should be considered as part of the architecture of the building and that the rest of the signage should be evaluated as a comprehensive design review.

The project team then reviewed the proposed sign package. They noted that the ground signs near Segoe Road are located on the Target development site, but they are designed to accommodate future development on that portion of the site. The Commission's discussion focused on the appropriateness of those signs, and it was clarified that they would be located outside of the vision clearance triangle. The Commission also discussed the two freestanding directional signs on Hilldale Way and Frey Street, with several members expressing concern about those signs blocking the views for cars exiting the parking structure.

Ald. Chris Schmidt, Ken Saiki, Adam Fink, and Allan Klugman registered in support.

ACTION:

On a motion by Ferm, seconded by Smith, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the project and signage package. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-2-1) with Barnett and Harrington voting no, and Luskin abstaining. The motion was passed with the following conditions:

- 1. The sidewalk along the Sentry store will be expanded with curb cuts that are aligned with the drive aisles.
- 2. The definition of "family" will be removed from the PUD text.
- 3. Access ramps will be added to all bicycle parking areas.
- 4. That the two freestanding directional signs on Hilldale Way and Frey Street will be changed to blade signs mounted on the building or have an open base as approved by staff.
- 5. That the word "Target" is removed from the "Target parking" clearance signs at all entries to the parking structure except for the one on Hilldale Way, which can say "Target parking".
- 6. The two ground signs near Segoe Road are approved, but are subject to review and change as part of the approval of any future development on that portion of the site.

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 5, 6, 6 and 7.

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	6	6	-	5	3-4	5	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	7
	5	6	6	6	6	5	6	6

General Comments:

- Development is noted but still resistance to: bike lane, loading dock canopy, vision glass at stair wells, Frey view, display windows. Wish signage motion was separated from building/site motion.
- Well thought out project. Target brought a lot of energy and flexibility to the process. Thank you Target!