

City of Madison, Wisconsin

**REPORT OF:** URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** February 26, 2020

**TITLE:** 666 North Midvale Boulevard –  
Amendment to a Comprehensive Design  
Review for Evereve in UDD No. 6. 11<sup>th</sup>  
Ald. Dist. (59269)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Janine Glaeser, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** February 26, 2020

**ID NUMBER:** 59269

Members present were: Cliff Goodhart,\* Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Christian Harper, Rafeeq Asad, Shane Bernau, Jessica Klehr and Tom DeChant.

\*Goodhart recused himself on this item; Weisensel acted as Chair.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of February 26, 2020, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of front lit sign without the gooseneck fixtures located at 666 N. Midvale Boulevard for Evereve. Registered in support was Chad Schultz, representing Innovative Signs. Schultz reviewed the proposed design, noting that the gooseneck fixtures provide odd shadowing of the letters, which can't be moved. The letters cannot be moved due to the parapet; the applicant would prefer the light to be in front and above the letters.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Did the Evereve sign come in after the gooseneck lights from a previous tenant?
  - I don't know that answer. In this retail complex most of the tenants have gooseneck lights, none are illuminated internally.
- The staff comments seem to suggest it's one or the other – removing the goosenecks and having internally lit characters, or essentially keeping it the way it is.
  - The client would go with front lit letters vs. the gooseneck if that's what this commission prefers.
- Have they attempted any other type of bulb in the gooseneck fixtures?
  - I don't know the answer to that.
- I don't think having it lit from both above and within the signs is necessary, but I don't find it problematic if we approve it specifically for this tenant.
- I'm struggling with the necessity and precedence of this. It's slow vehicle traffic but a lot of pedestrian traffic. I'm not having trouble reading the sign from the photograph, and not seeing that there's a necessity proven here.
- From the photo it is somewhat difficult to read, it casts a shadow. You have to pick which one you want to keep it harmony with the rest of the complex.
  - When the shadow comes down it doesn't stand out. The client is looking for a front lit letter.
- (Secretary) If they do decide to go with a front lit sign, they would not need a Comprehensive Design Review.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Asad, seconded by Bernau, the Urban Design Commission **GRANT FINAL APPROVAL** of the front lit sign without the gooseneck fixtures. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0).