

## AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> July 9, 2008
TITLE: 2501 and 2601 West Beltline Highway – Comprehensive Design Review. 14 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (10706)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: July 9, 2008	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Richard Wagner, Bruce Woods, Marsha Rummel, Bonnie Cosgrove, Richard Slayton, John Harrington and Todd Barnett.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of July 9, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a Comprehensive Design Review located at 2501 and 2601 West Beltline Highway. Appearing on behalf of the project were Doug Hursh, Conlynn Goetsch, Brad Hutter and Sean Baxter, all representing Arbor Gate Development; and Mary Beth Growney. Prior to the presentation staff noted that details of the recently modified provisions for “Comprehensive Design Review (CDR)” of the Street Graphics Control Ordinance were provided as part of the packet on this item. Staff referenced that the ordinance amendment provided criteria for review and approval of a proposed comprehensive sign plan where the Commission must make a finding that the criteria for comprehensive design review has been addressed. The presentation detailed an array of signage proposed as part of the sign plan under review. Following the presentation Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator provided a detailed analysis of the Comprehensive sign plan against the existing provisions of the Street Graphics Ordinance, noting no issue with signs primarily above the first floor level of the commercial/office/retail structure, including a non-objection to the array of proposed ground signs and first floor tenant signage. The significant issues according to Tucker are provisions for two upper end elevation signs where no physical space relevant to occupancy adjacent to the sign area was being provided as normally required with the code, including the placement of which is inconsistent with the locale or premise of the tenant being identified. This concept is significant departure from the requirements of the code. Following the presentation Ald. Bruer spoke in support of the signage plan noting the need of signage flexibility for attracting businesses as an alternative to development in outlying communities and municipalities. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- There is visual integration between signage and building, well-conceived. Well-conceived overall relationship between building and signage.
- Applaud no pylons, the secondary wall signs should feature a standards type face to complement quality of project.
- Agree with need for uniformity in height, mass and style and size.
- Need to be uniform on secondary sign plan following the buildings’ West Beltline Highway frontage.
- Consider all upper case versus lower case creating discrepancies.

- Prefer to allow diversity in typography; adequate controls are in place to create uniformity and need to specify minimum distance between signs, also not comfortable with signs located over projecting window boxes which compromises the building's architecture.
- Like the rhythm of patterning as shown on the elevational exhibits relevant to the secondary sign band.
- Like diversity but issue with too many sign types, creates a problem.
- The secondary sign band not allowed previously, sets a precedent. Need to keep simple to maintain elegance of building architecture. Need to keep away from having logos or special type faces.
- Like innovative aspect of the signage package, still too many type of tenant signs especially within the secondary signage band. Need to provide a priority of need to allow for signage.
- The projecting signage on the end elevation is excessive with the amount of wall signage as proposed.
- The primary signs proposed on the first floor level are in sync with the building architecture.
- The "WIPFL" sign is less integrated because of the lack of contiguity with of an adjacent penthouse enclosure as found with the companion sign.
- The "Wisconsin Heart" sign shall not to overlap into the adjacent vertical fin horizontally.
- Signs on the lower first floor level concern with detail on how they connect to the building.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Wagner, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the comprehensive plan under the provisions for Comprehensive Sign Review. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0). The motion noted satisfaction of the criteria required based on the integration between the elements of the comprehensive sign plan and the overall architecture and site design and layout of the "Arbor Gate Development." The motion required the following:

- Instead of 6 front and 2 end signs on the secondary sign band, reduce to 2 end signs and 4 front signs with no signs over projecting window boxes, with the first floor signage approved as proposed except for the deletion of sign type 8-1B. All other first floor signage types approved, including ground signs and directionals.
- The four front and two end signs within the secondary sign band shall come back to the Urban Design Commission for approval of the specific design and layout.
- The reason for approval is because it is a Comprehensive Design Review, where it is felt the merit for this particular architecture deserves this flexibility.
- The projecting signs shall be eliminated with the text added to maintain the alignment of the signage within the secondary sign band depicted on the elevations as contained within the packet.

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 6, 7, 7, 7.5, 8, 8 and 8.5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2501 and 2601 West Beltline Highway**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	8.5	-	-	8.5
	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	8
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	8
	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	6

General Comments:

- Excellent proposal, great project, meets standards of unique, exceptional and innovative design. Appreciate comparison text to describe conformance with code-thank you.
- Excellent sign package.
- Unusually good integration between architecture and signage.
- Very good sign package.
- Overall, a very nice integration of architecture and signage.
- Really nice signs, very well integrated with the architecture and site.