

ZONING DIVISION STAFF REPORT

May 8, 2019



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

Project Address: 4916 East Broadway
Project Name: Facility Gateway Corporation
Application Type: Approval for a Comprehensive Design Plan
Legistar File ID # [55296](#)
Prepared By: Chrissy Thiele, Zoning Inspector
Reviewed By: Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator

The applicant is requesting Comprehensive Design Review INITIAL/FINAL APPROVAL. The property is located in the Industrial Limited (IL) district, is also located in Urban Design District No. 1, and abuts the Beltline (6 lanes, 55 mph). This site originally came before the UDC June 19, 2013 for reconstruction of a vacant hotel building and reconfiguring the lot.

Pursuant to Section 31.043(4)(b), MGO, the UDC shall apply the following criteria upon review of an application for a Comprehensive Sign Plan:

1. *The Sign Plan shall create visual harmony between the signs, building(s), and building site through unique and exceptional use of materials, design, color, any lighting, and other design elements; and shall result in signs of appropriate scale and character to the uses and building(s) on the zoning lot as well as adjacent buildings, structures and uses.*
2. *Each element of the Sign Plan shall be found to be necessary due to unique or unusual design aspects in the architecture or limitations in the building site or surrounding environment; except that when a request for an Additional Sign Code Approval under Sec. 31.043(3) is included in the Comprehensive Design Review, the sign(s) eligible for approval under Sec. 31.043(3) shall meet the applicable criteria of Sec. 31.043(3), except that sign approvals that come to Comprehensive Design Review from MXC and EC districts pursuant to 31.13(3) and (7) need not meet the criteria of this paragraph.*
3. *The Sign Plan shall not violate any of the stated purposes described in Sec. 31.02(1) and 33.24(2).*
4. *All signs must meet minimum construction requirements under Sec. 31.04(5).*
5. *The Sign Plan shall not approve Advertising beyond the restrictions in Sec. 31.11 or Off-Premise Directional Signs beyond the restrictions in Sec. 31.115.*
6. *The Sign Plan shall not be approved if any element of the plan:*
 - a. *presents a hazard to vehicular or pedestrian traffic on public or private property,*
 - b. *obstructs views at points of ingress and egress of adjoining properties,*
 - c. *obstructs or impedes the visibility of existing lawful signs on adjacent property, or*
 - d. *negatively impacts the visual quality of public or private open space.*

7. *The Sign Plan may only encompass signs on private property of the zoning lot or building site in question, and shall not approve any signs in the right of way or on public property.*

Section 33.24(8)(c)4., Signage Criteria for Urban Design District No. 1, indicates the Urban Design Commission shall consider in each case those of the following guidelines and requirements as may be appropriate to signage:

Signs. Signs in the district shall meet the following requirements and conform as much as possible to the following guidelines.

a. Requirements.

- i. Signs, if located on or adjacent to buildings, shall be integrated with the architectural design of the buildings.
- ii. Signs shall be located and designed only to inform the intended clientele.
- iii. Signs shall be used only as identification of the establishment, and shall have no more than a total of eight (8) symbols and/or words.
- iv. No portion of an illuminated sign shall have luminance greater than two hundred (200) foot-lamberts for any portion of the sign within a circle of two (2) feet in diameter. No sign or part of any sign shall change its level of illumination more than once every one (1) hour.
- v. Electronic changeable copy signs, if permitted in the District, shall comply with [31.046\(1\)](#) which requires that electronic changeable copy signs in Urban Design Districts shall not alternate, change, fade in, fade out, or otherwise change more frequently than once every one (1) hour.
- vi. A minimum setback of five (5) feet from the public right-of-way is required of all ground signs. A minimum setback of ten (10) feet from the public right-of-way is required for signs exceeding ten (10) square feet in net area. A minimum setback of twenty (20) feet is required for all signs exceeding twenty (20) square feet in net area.
- vii. The height of a ground or wall sign shall not exceed ten (10) feet along John Nolen Drive or eighteen (18) feet elsewhere in the district unless a higher sign is specifically approved by the Urban Design Commission based on the following criteria:
 - A. An exception from the height limitation is necessary for a sign located on the site of an establishment to be identifiable and legible from the nearest roadway at prevailing speeds; and
 - B. An exception from the height limitation will result in a sign more in scale with the building and site and will result in a superior overall design.
- viii. The net area of a ground or wall sign shall not exceed forty (40) square feet along John Nolen Drive or seventy-two (72) square feet elsewhere in the district unless a larger sign is specifically approved by the Urban Design Commission based upon the following criteria:
 - A. An exception from the size limitation is necessary for a sign located on the site of an establishment to be identifiable and legible from the nearest roadway at prevailing speeds; and
 - B. An exception from the size limitation will result in a sign more in scale with the building and site and will result in a superior overall design. (Sec. 33.24(8)(c)4.a. Am. by ORD-09-00091, 8-1-09)

b. Guidelines.

- i. A sign should identify the activity without imposing upon the view of residents, businesses or activities of the district.
- ii. A sign should be appropriate to the type and activity and clientele at which its message is aimed.
- iii. Signs should be designed so as to be legible to the intended viewer in relation to the surrounding circumstances.
- iv. Signs should avoid covering or impinging upon landscape features or significant structures.
- v. Illuminated signs should be lit internally or from the ground, not with fixtures projecting from the sign.
- vi. Internally illuminated signs displaying illuminated copy shall be designed in such a way so that when illuminated, the sign appears to have light-colored copy on a dark or non-illuminated background. (Am. by ORD-09-00091, 8-1-09)
- vii. The Urban Design Commission shall, in addition, evaluate proposed signs in the district based upon the requirements of [Chapter 31](#) in the Madison General Ordinances.

Ground Signs Permitted by Sign Ordinance: This zoning lot is allowed up to two ground signs with a combined net area of 288 sq. ft., and a maximum height of 13' for monument style signs, based off of the prevailing speeds and number of traffic lanes.

Proposed Ground Signage: The applicant proposes one monument style ground sign with a total height of 27', and a total net of 150.67 sq. ft. The main portion of the sign will be no taller than 13', and the remainder of the height is for the salvaged and restored historic clock structure, placed on the top of the sign.

Staff Comments: The ground sign could be described having two parts. The bottom portion of the sign is the main part of the sign, which would have the names of the tenants located in the building. This part of the sign would be of complaint size and height as required by the sign ordinance, but would exceed the allowed net area for this urban design district (viii). The tenant panels would be uniform in size and backer panel color, giving the signs a uniform look. The materials used to construct this part of the sign are made with the same material that can be found on the facade of the building. The top part of the sign exceeds the overall height allowed for a ground sign, as well as the height requirement for UDD #1 (vii), but would only include a refurbished historic McClintock Clock, and would not be counted as part of the net of the sign. This crowning piece to the ground sign adds to the uniqueness of the sign, and gives an overall appearance of high quality and high design.

As this will be the primary signage for tenants located in the building, the number of characters or words on this sign will most likely exceed eight as required by this Urban Design District (iii). The location of the sign would also be closer than the required 20 feet (vi). Yet, if the ground sign were to be placed further back in the lot, the sign would interfere with the parking lot drive aisles, as well as make the site feel cramped, as it would be located closer to the second proposed sign. **Staff has no objection to the CDR request and recommends the UDC find the standards for CDR review have been met.**

Canopy Signs Permitted per Sign Ordinance: Summarizing Section 31.071, the signable area for a canopy fascia sign shall not project beyond the limits of the canopy in any direction, and shall be no wider than the width of the canopy. Any canopy fascia sign shall be in lieu of an above-canopy or below-canopy signage.

Proposed Signage: The canopy has been designed with no fascia area for mounting a sign. The sign will be incorporated as part of the structure itself, with the business name placed within the I-beam structure, and the address of the business suspended below.

Staff Comments: The proposed canopy sign is uniquely designed to fit with the architecture of the building. Some of the structure of the sign uses part of the pre-existing canopy from the old hotel. Other parts of the sign incorporate steel I-beams to frame the sign. The sign has been integrated with the architecture of the canopy itself, making this a high design, high quality material sign. **Staff has no objection to the CDR request and recommends the UDC find the standards for CDR review have been met.**

Notes:

- The provided site plan shows the parking lot modified to install the ground sign. This will require site plan review before the ground sign is issued.
- Art renderings will include lighting details in the final CDR.
- Any additional ground or wall signage would require a new review from the Urban Design Commission.