

AGENDA # 9

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: August 8, 2012

TITLE: 610 Junction Road – PUD(GDP-SIP),
Retail/Office Development, Amendment to
Sign Package. 9th Ald. Dist. (27146)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: August 8, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, Tom DeChant, Henry Lufler, Melissa Huggins, John Harrington and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 8, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of an amendment to a sign package (first floor signage only) located at 610 Junction Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Dan Yoder and Ray Balfarz. At the request of the Commission, Yoder presented more site context photos and surrounding signage. The current proposal reverted back to ask for the potential to have all of their signable areas (7). Portofino Place across the street has face-illuminated signage in all possible signable areas. Old Sauk Row to the northwest has signable in every possible area as well. The current signage at 610 exists for Capriotti’s, Pho Nam Noodle, Salad Creations and Hu Hot. Balfarz continued, explaining why they are asking for the potential to put signage in for possible 7 tenants, he noted that the only known for the second floor is common area with restrooms; the tenant layouts may change. Dragonfly Yoga and a hair salon, in addition to two more tenants for each side of the hallway would occupy the second floor. The Secretary explained that when the project came through, two buildings were supposed to be built, but only one was completed. At the time of the approval, the architect designated signable areas that were actually non-functional because they were too small and only on the first floor. When signable areas were designated they did not specify what would go in them in terms of what size, color or font. Tenancy was so immediate that staff was asked to allow signage. Each tenant was allowed one signable area per façade where their tenancy is located. Even though every sign was approved for these first floor tenants, they were not satisfied, nor were these arrangements ever recorded; permits were issued on an arrangement that needed to be put in the PUD but never was. Now they are asking for second floor signage without recording the administrative-based floor signage or second floor signage being approved. The turret feature represents a unique approach to provide for a sign on it that is different than what the code allows. Normally the code allows two opposing faces with another element that connects them; the angle has to be just right to provide signable on all three faces. The Secretary also noted that tenants on the backside of the building without a thru-face would not be allowed signage on Junction Road. The applicant is also requesting more than the allotted signage square footage based on a 40% signable maximum versus a 30% limitation currently allowed by code for a building this size. Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Have you looked at a monument sign?
 - There is simply not enough space for that.
- What about a hierarchy of signage for tenants? When you look at this, it's overwhelming the number of signs. If the first floor gets one for every business, how do you step that down for the second floor?
- We don't have signage on the second floor typically. The whole building would be a billboard.
- Is there a precedent for two-story retail signage like this?
 - We have one other building by Menard's, it's a Planned Development with two-stories. It's a combination of lower level retail, offices above and some residences. He created a secondary sign band that was subservient to the first floor sign band and matched architecturally, and it was limited to only one or two. There is a tier of signage but it's very uniform.
- Not far from this where the dentistry place in that same parking lot as the Johnson Bank, that's the same kind of thing.
- Staff recommended to stick to the rule that if you're on that side of the building you're entitled to use one of those signable areas consistent with your premise. At the same time, it should be akin to 30% like current ordinance rules and limit those non-premise signs.
- I don't like any of the second floor signs.
 - It's hard to lease space if the tenant isn't allowed any signage on the second floor.
- We have a sign code for the City that doesn't provide that. You're trying to do something that the City doesn't allow.
- When I drive down the street I don't typically look up, I look at the first band of signs. Is there a way to incorporate two bands at that first floor with the upper band representing what's up above? I'd argue that to look up while driving down the street, I may not even be able to see that through my car window.
 - The Dragonfly Yoga sign is in compliance at 30%. I drive down that road and back ¼ mile it's almost right at eye level. Same driving up turning off Old Sauk.
- You've got an extremely wide entry drive. What about an entry sign that would break up those lanes of traffic coming in?
 - We have a left-turn and a right-turn.
- Can you do something in the parking lot?
- Blade signs at the entrances for the second floor?
- What about blade signs for all the tenants? They allow people to have their signs over their doors where people actually come in.
 - That's not going to keep their doors open.
- I get that everybody needs a sign and I see the dilemma, but this is too much. This is a complete mess.
- To me there is a precedent on the second floor. It's going to cheapen the building. It's going to work against you.
 - Our intent is not to use the maximum amount.
- Conceivably you could allow second floor tenants in that first floor band.
- If we were to designate fewer sign bands, would future tenants come in for an amendment?
 - If that's the case.
- Staff noted that the original package was based on the first floor signage package only. As an option, if the Commission has an issue with approving second floor signage, as long as signage is code compliant and meets the 30% rule and the signs are all on the first floor we can approve it.

ACTION:

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Huggins, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the first floor signage only, the details of which are to be coordinated and approved by staff; if there are any issues of dispute with elements of the signage package it shall return for formal consideration by the Commission. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0).

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 3, 5 and 6`.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 610 Junction Road

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	3
	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	5

General Comments:

- May be OK with revision.
- Hope we found a way forward to help your tenants in the awkwardly designed building with no setback from the street.
- Improved plan from first submittal. Acknowledge applicant’s difficult position.