

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: September 26, 2018

TITLE: 2164 West Beltline Highway –
Comprehensive Design Review for
Steinhafel’s. 14th Ald. Dist. (52900)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: September 26, 2018

ID NUMBER:

Members present: Richard Wagner, Chair; Cliff Goodhart, Lois Braun-Oddo, Rafeeq Asad, Tom DeChant and Christian Harper.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 26, 2018, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a Comprehensive Design Review located at 2164 West Beltline Highway to their meeting of October 3, 2018. Registered in support of the project were Alan Theobald and Chad Dorn, both representing Steinhafel’s. The cornice at the top of the parapet will be shorter for a cleaner design. The signage would be smaller than existing prior to the roof repairs. Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator talked about the staff report, and the challenge of not having the benefit of reviewing the façade with the signage as these two pieces work together but were not presented together. Zoning has a number of concerns with representations and inaccuracies about what is a signable area, the purpose of signage, which is a change to the policy and in direct conflict with our Sign Code that was designed to bring façades down to scale. (It was staff’s suggestion to bring them forward separately.) Zoning’s recommendation is that the Commission look at other signs in the area, which have 30% of the signable area. The applicant is also welcome to come back with something that meets code. The applicant responded that he has percentages for all signs in the center: the proposed Steinhafel’s sign is 21% of signable area, Pet World is at 65%, Sky Zone is 20% and Northern Tools is 22%. Tucker remarked that is an incorrect calculation of the signable area; signable areas are rectangles, not irregularly shaped in any way and are free of doors, windows or any architectural elements. Because of this Zoning came up with different calculations. Pet World is the most out of scale. The Commission’s options are to approve as submitted, do a reduction or refer due to concerns as to how it all fits with the façade. The signable area per the code is the red dashed line up to four-feet above; the code typically would allow the roofline and up to 4-feet above. If this moves forward it should be consistent with the 30%.

Discussion was as follows:

- One option is to take this enormous façade and lower it.
- We’ve already approved the façade redesign.
- Now the question is can we negotiate the smaller façade with signage that still might be larger than what is approvable but not so large as this larger façade would now suggest?

(Applicant) The third option is to not touch the signage and leave it as is. The sign stays high and large, which are two things this Commission doesn't like. We've lowered the façade from existing and lowered the sign and made it smaller, all things you want. Look at the scale of this development and the distance from the road. There's a foot bridge and a Culver's that blocks east-west visibility.

(Chair) You're arguing your particular site, Mr. Tucker brings the view of the City overall and its sign policy, and that's where the clash occurs.

Discussion continued:

- You could make adjustment to the overall façade area so the signage could be brought into scale.
- We could approve the signage you have presented before us or deny it. If we move to reconsider we can see the signage and the façade together again.
- We could allow it to go above the 4-feet.
 - Are you saying I can't include this dark band in the signable area? We'll get rid of it and make it all the same color.
- That's a change to the facade which is another matter. To answer the question, if there was not a color change we would consider it a contiguous signable area.
- But we approved it with the color change, which means reconsideration of the façade matter as well.
- (Tucker) You could grant their request or turn it down so they can do something compliant, or reconsider the façade matter with the signage to come back.

ACTION:

On a motion by Asad, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item to the October 3, 2018 meeting. The motion passed on a vote of (5-0).

The motion **RECONSIDERED** the approval of the façade.