



Agenda Item #: 2

Project Title: 701 Gardener Road - Comprehensive Design Review of Signage (CDR) Located in Urban Design District (UDD) No. 6. 11th Ald. Dist.

Legistar File ID #: 70848

Members Present: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Shane Bernau, Jessica Klehr, Christian Harper, Rafeeq Asad and Russell Knudson.

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Summary

At its meeting of June 29, 2022, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a Comprehensive Design Review located at 701 Gardener Road in UDD No. 6. Registered and speaking in support were Sean Roberts, representing Summit Smith Development; and Mary Beth Growney Selene, representing Ryan Signs, Inc. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Shawn Zimny, representing Gilbane Development Co.

Matt Tucker, Building Inspection Director summarized the request and staff concerns, noting that large scale projects' signage needs are different and unique, and that this request should also consider the Urban Design District 6 and Planned Development requirements. The development consists of two lots with two unique situations. Staff has concerns with the size of the proposed signs and after giving consideration for how the signs are viewed for the intended audience, feel the code compliant sign is adequate. Staff does not feel the case has been made for the larger signs. Staff questions whether the proposed ground signs are appropriate for this as place making, or if this is considered a multi-tenant shopping center type establishment. The 'EO' apartment sign has an interesting barrel or turret type canopy design, which needs an exception for the height of the letters and to project beyond the face of the canopy. The ground signs are proposed with branding and multiple tenant panels; staff finds them heavy, more open and airy without tenant panels. The proposed branding of 12-14 banners on light poles is not permissible in the sign code. They can be approved through the CDR; staff recommends allowing banners without the branding or logo to beautify the area. The Secretary noted that the UDD guidelines and requirements for signage require that it be appropriate in scale for the type of signage and should not be imposing; consideration should be given to what it is advertising and the clientele it is intended to serve. Consideration should also be given to a cohesive design for all monument signs within the development.

Growney Selene summarized the sign package for Block 2:

- The north elevation of the apartment building shows internally illuminated letters mounted to the brick façade (facing north) that are code compliant. The above canopy letters are very architecturally pleasing in a deep canopy. They are requesting approval for those letters to project beyond the canopy face, not to exceed six inches. This adds additional interest to the sign.
- The north and west elevation signs for Whole Foods are requested to be 145 square feet rather than 120 square feet, due to the speed limit and the scale of the building. The letters are on longer building elevations and will be the only identification signs on this side of the building. The signs add interest to the elevations and act as place-making for vehicular traffic, with the north elevation occupying 24% of the signable area, and the west elevation occupying 26% of the signable area. The south elevation sign is requested to be 180 square feet rather than 120 square feet. It would be the only identification sign on this elevation and provides a sense of place to

those internal to the site. This is appropriate to the elevation and the letters here occupy 30% of the signable area.

- The proposed parking lot identification signage and projecting signs for the Whole Foods entrances to the parking lot adjacent to the parking letters will not exceed 12 square feet and none extend beyond the lot line.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Agree with staff in the fact that the Whole Foods signs on the north elevation and west elevation, all three elevations are too large. Don't think they make much difference in how the public will perceive them because of your proximity. Even driving on University Avenue you're not that far away. The architecture provided is actually looks nicer to have a slightly smaller sign.
- Don't have any issues with the EO signage or the parking signage. OK with the slight projection of the EO.
- If I had no knowledge as to what is compliant and what is proposed, I'd say the smaller version is better looking in every case. The larger ones look squished into the available space. Having a little room to breathe, the proportions, space and balance of the font with the surrounding surfaces works better. Slight projection of the EO signage is not an issue. The parking lot signage seems perfectly adequate and just fine as it is.
- The EO sign is a sculptural element, the larger one is not problematic. Because it's unique I would say OK on that one. I agree with what's been said about the Whole Foods signs.

Action

On a motion by Asad, seconded by Klehr, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0).

The motion noted the following:

- Approval of the 'EO' sign.
- The Whole Foods wall signage shall be reduced in size to comply with a sign size up to but not exceeding what is permitted under the Sign Code.
- Approval of the parking garage entry wall signs, projecting signs, and loading area wall sign.