

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: May 8, 2013

TITLE: 3550 Anderson Street – Amendment to Existing “Comprehensive Design Review” of Signage for Madison College. 12th Ald. Dist. (22901)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: May 8, 2013

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Melissa Huggins, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, Henry Lufler, Ald. Lauren Cnare, Tom DeChant and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 8, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **FAILED TO GRANT FINAL APPROVAL** of a Comprehensive Design Review of Signage for Madison College located at 3550 Anderson Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Mary Beth Growney Selene and Bridget Growney, both representing Ryan Signs, Inc.; and Fred Brechlin, representing Madison College.

Jay Wendt, Urban Design Planner stated that in discussions with Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator, it was determined that the use of the signage inside this district is not really what’s in question; what he is looking for from the Urban Design Commission as a body is commenting on the design of the signs, how it fits in the rest of the signage package, the precedent and how that moves forward based on the provisions for “Comprehensive Design Review” according to the Sign Control Ordinance. Tucker compared what goes on inside Camp Randall Stadium as a suggested reference.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Looking at the UW Credit Union one and the Group Health one, was there some reason you chose not to use the same color background?
 - We wanted to differentiate them. The distinct identifying factor.
- My concern is that you’re making part of an institutional site into a commercial one. I understand it’s a permitted use because it supports the institution, but today they’re showing one bank and tomorrow it could be another. It looks like a regular branch of a bank and I don’t think that’s the intent of the comprehensive sign package for an institution. I don’t think the Camp Randall analogy is at all related to this kind of thing. UW-Madison campus has a lot of small little operations on it but they don’t get signage.
 - One of the tasks you charged us with the last time we were here was looking at the University. Please keep in mind that the University does not have a comprehensive sign plan because any property owned by the University is exempt from the Sign Control Ordinance of the City and

required approvals. They self-regulate and they do have signage standards for every building and we found several instances of retail/commercial properties on the University Campus that are integral to the campus that vary, some dramatically some less dramatically from the standard that the University has established. These signs that we're showing are more integrated into the comprehensive sign plan than some of those examples are on the University campus.

I stand by my observations.

- My question is: what is an organization to do? I know that these credit unions service the teachers and students.
- These just seem like advertising rather than directional or wayfinding signage.
- The signs themselves are not unattractive but it's the concept of them being equal in designation as the Health Education building and holding equal prominence.
- The option they might have then is to use their standard sign with just the word "clinic" or "credit union."
 - The question is what is the appropriate use of signage in an institutional setting. And if this is approved the precedent would be, commercial signage on campus.
- If we follow that logic, the examples that you gave us from the UW seem subtle. Having the signs carry the same weight as the institution seems a bit much.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Slayton, seconded by Cnare, to **GRANT FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion **FAILED** on a vote of (3-4) with Slayton, Goodhart and DeChant voting yes; and Huggins, Cnare, Lufler and O'Kroley voting no; therefore the amendment to the previously approved 'Comprehensive Design Review' sign package was not 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 rating for this project is 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 3550 Anderson Street

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

General Comments:

- OK to highlight commercial uses within institutional setting in my mind.
- Advertising versus wayfinding.