

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: August 28, 2013

TITLE: 610 John Nolen Drive – Construction of a Four-Story, 111-Room Holiday Inn Express in UDD No. 1 (Signage Exceptions from UDD No. 1). 14th Ald. Dist. (30769)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: August 28, 2013

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 28, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a signage package located at 610 John Nolen Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project was Mary Beth Growney Selene, representing Ryan Signs, Inc. Growney Selene noted that there are fourteen (14) guidelines for UDD No. 1 and the signage proposed complies with all but three of those requirements: square footage, height to the top of the sign and setback on the double faced sign. All the signs are consistent with the other commercial developments on the John Nolen Drive corridor between Olin Park and the Beltline. The request is to approve the monument sign (7.5 square feet larger than allowed) and the setback on that site, because of the property line being an integral part of the site. On the east and west wall signs they are asking for an exception of 26 square feet per sign and a height exception of 31 feet; on the south sign (primary identification sign at the entrance of the building) they are asking for an 86 square foot exception and a 41 foot exception to the height. The scale of these signs is in keeping with the scale of the building. Holiday Inn has updated their identification signage with the “H” remaining the same, but the relationship of the “Holiday Inn Express and Suites” letters is smaller in relationship to the “H.” The new graphic guidelines do not hit the same height as the top of the “H” graphic. All of the signs utilize internally illuminated letters.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Is there a single sign on this corridor that complies with the ordinance?
 - Staff noted that probably the office building next door, as well as several office buildings to the south of the Sheraton.
- We’re only shown what the request is, we aren’t shown what would actually comply.
 - What would comply is a sign that would be below the overhang (canopy) on the front of the building and 1/3 of the size of this sign. One of the things I would observe is that the square footage and the height limitations prescribed for not only this location but the one we just looked at several weeks ago on the Beltline at Schroeder Road, doesn’t really meet with the development that’s allowed in those districts.

Staff remarked that those two are the oldest districts and the thinking at the time was basically to limit signage so it didn't conflict with building architecture and site design.

- It seems if the signs on the end are big enough for the traffic to see, the one on the front is really going to be seen by people standing there, I don't understand why it needs to be bigger than the ones on the ends.
- This is better than the Sheraton's signs.
- I think these signs fit, it seems very balanced.
- Is there any way to tweak that "suites" lettering (monument sign)?
 - We have terrible artwork for that horizontal layout. The monument sign itself will not change, the brick monument, but it absolutely will be more to scale with great white space. And the square footage that we've asked for in our application is smaller than that.
- I think all three signs should be the same size at the top of the building.

ACTION:

A motion was by Huggins, seconded by Cnare, to **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. A motion was made by Goodhart, seconded by Cnare, to amend the motion to include that all three signs are the same size (matching the wall signs proposed on the end elevations). The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0).