

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> February 21, 2007
TITLE: 702 North Midvale Boulevard (Hilldale Redevelopment, The North Face) – PUD- SIP, Minor Exterior Façade Approval and Signage Package. 11 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (05670)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: February 21, 2007	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Lisa Geer, Robert March, Bruce Woods, Todd Barnett, Ald. Noel Radomski and Michael Barrett.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of February 21, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a modified proposal for a minor exterior façade approval located at 702 North Midvale Boulevard (The North Face, Hilldale Mall). Appearing on behalf of the project were Scott McLamore and Dominic Lanni of Joseph Freed & Associates. Prior to the presentation, staff noted to the Commission that the exterior façade and signage package under consideration for a specified tenant space was a result of staff's issue with its deviation from prototypical façade treatments for individual tenant spaces provided with the original approval of the project. It allowed staff flexibility for approval of minor deviations including consideration by the Commission for extensive modifications from the prototypical designs. Staff noted that the flexibility for both staff and/or Commission approval applies to proposed signage. Issues with numerous signable areas on specific facades as well as a "non-pertinent" tenant signage were at issue, requiring consideration by the Commission. Staff noted that a previously approved enclosed vestibule attached to the "North Face" tenant space had also been constructed without its glass enclosure, (a vestibule); thus providing that the structure was no longer integral to the tenant space creating problems with its use for a signage. McLamore and Lanni then presented details of the proposed signage package and building exterior façade details to the Commission. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Concern with precedent with the application of the proposed signage on the tower element comparable to that of the "Diamond Center" appeal.
- Consider removing EIFS panels and signs from canopy structure and limit signage only on opposing 90% orientated walls.
- The removal of the enclosed vestibule is a loss of protection for pedestrians. The three tower signs are redundant. An orange red band would be sufficient to replace signage.
- Structure too much of a billboard with 3 sign areas. Remove panels and create a round sign in between the columns to fill the vacant void.
- The PUD standards looks for exemplary design; sign as proposed doesn't. A drum sign probably could be exemplary.
- Suggest the replication of the red band (vertical) on both facades adjacent to storefront windows. In addition, utilize vertical metal siding on the canopy in replacement of EIFS panels and signage.

## **ACTION:**

On a motion by Woods, seconded by March, the Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of two vertical band signs adjacent to storefront windows on both opposing facades with all signage removed from the canopy with the option that further consideration of signage on the canopy could come back for further consideration to provide other signage options for the tower and/or building façade that provide for more exemplary design as required. The motion passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0). A previous motion by Barnett, seconded by March, allowing for a vertical sign on each side of the building façade adjacent to storefront windows with no signage on the pavilion. That motion was amended by Barnett, seconded by Woods, to require that the building skin be consistent with the tenant space; therefore, metal not precast, failed on a vote of (2-5) with Wagner, Geer, Barrett, Radomski, and Woods voting no.

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, 5, 5, 5 and 7.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 702 North Midvale Boulevard**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	5
	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	5
	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	5
	-	6	-	-	5	-	5	5
	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-

General Comments:

- Application doesn't seem worthy of precedent.
- Don't see the need for the small sign separate on the building if the sign is dominantly displayed at the tower. Or completely eliminate the tower signage.
- Reuse signage per our recommendations.