

ZONING STAFF REPORT

November 3, 2017



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

Project Address: 1965 Atwood Avenue
Project Name: Monona State Bank (Monona Bank)
Application Type: Final Approval for a modification to a CDR
Legistar File ID # [49154](#)
Prepared By: Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator

The applicant is requesting final approval for a major amendment to an approved Comprehensive Design Review for signage. This property is located in the Traditional Shopping Street (TSS) district. This property abuts Atwood Avenue to the north and Winnebago Street to the south, and faces Schenk's corners.

This request involves the changing of the signage for the major tenant of the building, Monona State Bank, to Monona Bank. In the process of reviewing the permit request, staff discovered that the previously-approved CDR allowed for a sign crossing an architectural detail at the front of the building, which was not noted when the CDR was originally approved. The request is for the new sign to replace the existing sign, in a similar size, but with the new copy.

Pursuant to Section 31.043(4)(b), MGO, the UDC shall apply the following criteria upon review of an application for a Comprehensive Sign Plan:

1. *The Sign Plan shall create visual harmony between the signs, building(s), and building site through unique and exceptional use of materials, design, color, any lighting, and other design elements; and shall result in signs of appropriate scale and character to the uses and building(s) on the zoning lot as well as adjacent buildings, structures and uses.*
2. *Each element of the Sign Plan shall be found to be necessary due to unique or unusual design aspects in the architecture or limitations in the building site or surrounding environment; except that when a request for an Additional Sign Code Approval under Sec. 31.043(3) is included in the Comprehensive Design Review, the sign(s) eligible for approval under Sec. 31.043(3) shall meet the applicable criteria of Sec. 31.043(3), except that sign approvals that come to Comprehensive Design Review from MXC and EC districts pursuant to 31.13(3) and (7) need not meet the criteria of this paragraph.*
3. *The Sign Plan shall not violate any of the stated purposes described in Sec. 31.02(1) and 33.24(2).*
4. *All signs must meet minimum construction requirements under Sec. 31.04(5).*
5. *The Sign Plan shall not approve Advertising beyond the restrictions in Sec. 31.11 or Off-Premise Directional Signs beyond the restrictions in Sec. 31.115.*
6. *The Sign Plan shall not be approved if any element of the plan:*
 - a. *presents a hazard to vehicular or pedestrian traffic on public or private property,*
 - b. *obstructs views at points of ingress and egress of adjoining properties,*
 - c. *obstructs or impedes the visibility of existing lawful signs on adjacent property, or*
 - d. *negatively impacts the visual quality of public or private open space.*
7. *The Sign Plan may only encompass signs on private property of the zoning lot or building site in question, and shall not approve any signs in the right of way or on public property.*

Wall Signs Permitted per Sign Ordinance: Summarizing Section 31.07, there shall be one signable area for each façade facing a street or parking lot 33 feet in width or greater. For buildings with more than one tenant, each tenant is allowed a signable area as reasonably close to its tenant space as possible. Standard net area allows for 40% of the signable area, or two square feet of signage for each lineal foot of building frontage not to exceed 100% of the signable area. In no case shall the sign exceed 80 sq. ft. in net area. For tenant spaces exceeding 25,000 sq. ft. of floor area, the maximum wall sign shall not exceed 30% of the signable area and 120 sq. ft. Monona State Bank occupies over 25,000 sq. ft. of the building.

Proposed Signage: This request pertains to changing two signs: First, as noted above, the applicant wishes to replace the existing sign at the front of the bank with a new sign of similar size, crossing architectural detail. The applicant also wishes to replace the existing sign at the rear of the building (facing west) that was approved by the UDC under Sec. 31.043(3(d)), *Additional Sign Code Approvals, Permit the use of wall signs on building facades not adjacent to off-street parking areas where, due to a variation of building setbacks, a signable area exists, provided the area of the sign shall not exceed the area of the wall sign permitted on the front of the building.*

Staff Comments: The discovery of the existing sign crossing architectural detail is troubling. It appears as though the crossing of the architectural detail dates back to when the agents for Chase Bank applied for sign permits in 2003. Had this been shown, no permit would have been issued. The crossing of architectural detail should have been presented when the original CDR was approved, as covering an architectural detail on the front of this significantly articulated building should have been shared with the UDC when the Monona State Bank sign was approved. The submission shows the original sign etched into the facade of the building, and this is the appropriate design and placement for signage for this particular façade. In consideration of these comments, **staff does not support the CDR request to cross architectural detail, and recommends the applicant reconsider the location and design for this tenants' wall sign.** Should an otherwise compliant sign location be determined this CDR would not be necessary.

For the change to the wall sign facing west, as noted above, a signage approval pre-exists for this sign. **Staff has no objection to this change.**