

**July 14, 2011**

City of Madison  
Mr. Al Martin  
Secretary to the City of Madison Urban Design Commission

Re: Comprehensive Sign Design Review HotelRED at Regent and Monroe  
Letter of Intent 31.0.43 para 4 (b)

Mr. Martin and Members of the Urban Design Commission:

It has come to my attention that part of the submittal information for UDC Comprehensive Design Review you are requesting is the applicants responds to the seven items listed in Chapter 31 Section 0.43 Urban Design Commission and Comprehensive Design Review para. 4 sub. (b), “Comprehensive Design Review Criteria”

As stated in my previous letter, signs SD1 Thru SD4 all meet and exceed the code requirements of Chapter 31. The sign of discussion, Sign SD5, meets the requirement of Chapter 31 in size and design, but is questions by Zoning Staff as to its’ code compliance because of the definition of “Projecting Signs”. Projection Signs by definition are to project from a “wall” of a building. Staff questions whether the column holding up the wall of our building where our sign is located is “part” of the building “wall”.

In addition to the previous submitted materials please attach this letter of explanation of the “Comprehensive Design Review Criteria” relating to sign # SD5.

Item #1 – The sign plan shall create visual harmony between signs, building...

RESPONSE: All signs are of the same high quality materials, consistent in graphics and color complimentary to the building materials, colors and architecture, both is scale and design. These signs are of appropriate scale and character of this Hotel and the adjacent buildings. In most cases these signs exceed the quality of adjacent buildings.

Item #2 – Each element of the Site Plan shall be found necessary due to the unique or unusual design aspects in the architecture or limitations in the building site...

RESPONSE: The uncertainty of Staff as to whether our column at the building Northeast corner is a part of the building “wall” demonstrates a unique design aspect in the Architecture. This is clear from the photo of the building showing the sign placement. The unique traffic flow at this intersection and the building entrance placement also create the need for this sign.

Item#3 – The Sign shall not violate any of the stated purpose described in Secs. 31.02(1) 33.24(2)

RESPONSE: Chapter 33.24(2) addresses the intent of the UDC. The basic content of this ordinance section is to encourage, require and promote high quality of design in the City. This Sign Plan we

believe does accomplish that exact goal. Chapter 31.02(1) addresses the Purpose and Scope of the Sign Ordinance. The basic content of this ordinance section is to promote public safety and aesthetic values in sign displays while protecting scenic views and the visual environment along the City streets.

This Sign Plan we believe does accomplish that exact goal and will be among the highest quality signs on Monroe and Regent Street.

Item #4 – All signs must meet construction requirements under Sec 31.04(5)

RESPONSE: Sec 31.04(5) addresses the requirement for incombustible materials, designs to withstand 30psf wind pressures, structural capacity of supporting members including footing to carry the dead load of the sign, and most important to our submittal – “projecting signs not be attached to any part of an unbraced wall above a point of bearing of the roof rafters. This Sign Plan meets and these requirements in that the signs are of noncombustible materials, all structural requirements are met as it is an all concrete building, and the surface to receive this sign is structural concrete.

Item #5 – The Sign Plan shall not approve advertising beyond he restrictions in Sec 31.11 or off premise Directional Signs ...

RESPONSE: We have no off premise signs. We have no advertising signs and outlined in Sec 31.11.

Item #6 – Sing shall not be approved if any element of the plan:

- Present hazard to vehicular or pedestrian traffic on public or private property

- Obstructs view points of ingress and egress of adjoining property

- Obstructs or impedes the visibility of existing lawful signs on adjacent property.

- Negatively impacts the visual quality of public or private open space.

RESPONSE: This sign is 30’ in the air, 14 sq ft, and meets all the requirements detailed above, presenting no hazards, impeding no adjacent property, and adds visual quality to the open space.

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

RESPONSE: All sign are clearly on this zoned parcel and not on public property.

Again, it is my professional opinion as building architect that this sign package is of high quality design and materials and is consistent with the design and colors of the building design and meets the review all criteria for approval set forth in Chapter 31 Section 0.43 Urban Design Commission and Comprehensive Design Review para. 4 sub. (b), “Comprehensive Design Review Criteria”

Thank you for your consideration of this request. We look forward to presenting this material at the UDC meeting in July.

SiegerArcitects Bob Sieger Project Architect