

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: December 1, 2010

TITLE: 2101, 2109, 2115 East Springs Drive – Comprehensive Design Review of Signage Package for a Conditional Use/Planned Commercial Site; 99,000 Square Foot Retail Building, Steinhafel’s. 17th Ald. Dist. (12240)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: December 1, 2010

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner, Jay Handy and Henry Lufler, Jr.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 1, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a Comprehensive Design Review of signage located at 2101, 2109, 2115 East Springs Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Gary Steinhafel and Juliette Wegner, representing Steinhafel’s; and Ronald Rogahn, representing Poblocki Sign Co., LLC. Rogahn presented details of the wall sign component of the package with channel letters and LED lighting effect, in addition they use 3/16 inch thick material so you don’t see the light fixture but a soft glow. The north elevation and west elevation will be the name “Steinhafel’s Furniture Super Store” placed on the EIFS material with low voltage wiring and no raceway. They also propose accessory signs to read “Clearance Center” and “Mattress Express.” The challenge of the site makes it difficult to see from the Interstate, so without some sort of pole sign potential customers would go right by it. Getting their name out on the Interstate, even for exiting purposes is very important. The pole sign would be aluminum with a coating to look like stucco and give it definition. Aluminum decorative pieces would wrap around the pole. The sign cabinet background is aluminum and the letters are cut out of the background. Below would be an LED electronic display board for advertising, or public service messages, controlled from inside the building. They are proposing a monument sign for the outlot and those future tenants. Rogahn reiterated that Steinhafel’s puts a lot of attention to detail and landscaping and is very proud of how nice their signs and properties look and are maintained. Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator spoke about the code requirements and how these proposed signs don’t meet the code. He noted that the multi-colored electronic display is not allowed even under the provisions for Comprehensive Design Review, the excessive height of the pylon sign, excessive total square footage of all ground signs including parking, directional and regulation and wall signage.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- On wayfinding/directional signs, the large base and height; shorten-up height-wise, look at matching the building’s treatments, materials and other design elements, the signs have curved tops, no curved elements on building; introduce materials from building and design. Also look at reducing top by a foot with alternate roof form but not gabled.

- The LED display board is not allowed by code.
- Digital image signs are prohibited.
- Where is the height of the pole sign relative to other signs?
 - It would be lower because of the topography.
- If we approve this it's reasonable to assume other businesses in this area will request ground signs based on this request and limited existing use in area.
- It might be nice to use the u-shaped sign to screen the transformer, if it can be done. Split sign to screen transformer with single faced signs, acknowledge setback and clearance requirements.
- Concern that the main building signage squashes the gable feature.
- The pylon pole sign seems too tall to me; need another approach than pylon as proposed.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion provided for approval of the wall signage on the building as proposed, with everything else to come back to the Commission.

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 5, 5, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2101, 2109, 2115 East Springs Drive

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

General Comments:

- Good start.
- Nice overall signage package. The full color changeable screen sign is not allowed.