

## AGENDA #9

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

|  |   |
|--|---|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION   | <b>PRESENTED:</b> June 16, 2010                                 |
| TITLE: 2 South Bedford Street – PUD(GDP-SIP),<br>Mixed-Use Development, Signage<br>Package. 4 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (13295) | <b>REFERRED:</b><br><b>REREFERRED:</b><br><b>REPORTED BACK:</b> |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary  | <b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>                                     |
| DATED: June 16, 2010   | <b>ID NUMBER:</b>   |

---

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, Ron Luskin, R. Richard Wagner, Mark Smith and Jay Ferm.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of June 16, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 2 South Bedford Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were J. Randy Bruce, representing Depot Development; and Doug Merritt, representing CVS Pharmacy. Merritt presented the revised details, including elimination of the sign on Building No. 1 and relocated it to the group mount, elimination of the electronic message board and reduction of the vertical height of the backer panel for the CVS trade name on West Washington Avenue. Signage specific to The Depot project has not changed. Alternate locations have been chosen, however. The panels are not illuminated but the individual letters are. The backer panel is critical to the daytime hours. The signage specific to directional and informational nature is unchanged. Three color options were provided that will tie the signage in to the architectural elements of the building. Comments from the Commission were as follows:

- Blade sign looks good. Don't like the white background.
- Both the blade sign and all wall signs should be beige as well as the front of the building, all backer panels should be beige.
- Agree with Option #2; the texture is closest to the stone and in keeping with the look of the building.
- Support the signage package as presented as long as the blade sign and the CVS sign on West Washington both use the same backer panel.
- Metal with paint on it and no lights would be more authentic and match the building.
- Having a sign that is lit up at night, in competition with the Capitol is something to think about.
- Blade sign should not go beyond heads of adjacent windows.
- Depot signage preferred as contained in the application packet.
- I think the blade sign itself is a great idea. It could be just CVS, without the "pharmacy." Merritt responded that the corporate headquarters would not separate the trade names.
- I think the blade sign is too big. I don't think about the competition from the Capitol as much as if I lived in one of the corner elevations there would be glowing signs; it's a quality of life issue. It might affect the rentability of these units.
- If we are going to agree to an oversized sign, that is another good reason to say "not lit."

## **ACTION:**

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Smith, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-2) with Luskin and Rummel voting no. The motion provided that:

- The CVS Pharmacy backer blade sign shall not project into the right-of-way more than 24-inches.
- The size of the blade sign as approved is based on location in context with the building architecture and shall be as thin as possible.
- The blade sign shall be non-illuminated with no white background on metal panel, with the final design to come back for Commission approval.
- Depot signage as contained within the application packet was approved.

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 6, 6.5, 7 and 8.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2 South Bedford Street**

|                       | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <b>Member Ratings</b> | -         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | -             | 6              |
|                       | -         | -            | -              | -                              | 6     | -                                   | 6.5           | 6.5            |
|                       | -         | -            | -              | -                              | 7     | -                                   | -             | 7              |
|                       | -         | -            | -              | -                              | 8     | -                                   | -             | 8              |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |

General Comments:

- Improved and well done.
- Overall, attractive sign package. Blade sign too big, bad precedent.