

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: June 8, 2011

TITLE: Creating Sec. 31.04(3)(j) to Allow Approval of Historic Legacy Signs by the Urban Design Commission and Creating Criteria for Such Approval, Amending Sec. 31.03(2) to Create a Definition of Legacy Signs, Amending Sec. 31.043(4)(b)2. Regarding Additional Sign Code Approvals and Comprehensive Design Review, Repealing and Recreating Sec. 31.045(3)(e) and Amending Sec. 31.07(1) of the Madison General Ordinances Regarding Signs Posted to or Affixed Directly to a Wall. (22501)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: June 8, 2011

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 8, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL** of the Historic Legacy Signs Ordinance. Registered in support of the project was Mary Beth Growney Selene. According to Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator he was approached by a party with a desire to place a certain type of signage that wasn’t allowed; he was asked that Zoning, through working with Ald. Verveer and neighborhood people, find a way to do this. This ordinance is going to allow for the replacement of the historical, non-typical business/commercial type signs that effectively don’t show up in historic districts, which are the ones that actually allow them to be replaced. Possible areas where this ordinance could apply include the industrial corridor around Beld Street and South Park Street, Monroe Street, Atwood Avenue, those sites that do not have the benefit of being in a historic district. The intent is to allow for the replacement of old signs that were once on the building to tell the story historically that the building tells. The ordinance allows for the applicant to work with the Urban Design Commission to get approvals for putting these types of signs back on the buildings and recognizes that some of these signs have been obliterated over the years. It also allows the flexibility for dictating where on the building the sign would be located and different types of materials would be used, thus allowing for the replication of a sign in a fashion that someone can erect but have it appear as though it’s the traditional sign that is there. Rummel asked how the prior to 1940 qualifier date was decided; Tucker replied that this is a period of time where they started to track the age of housing and they wanted to pick a date that had some logical relevance. Rummel thought there could easily be building signage post-1940 that could be replaced. Tucker said the people that approached Zoning were interested in the older industrial type of signage. Wagner thought the date would be at what point the signage would change, such as the

introduction of the automobile. Lufler stated that since the Urban Design Commission allows variances for all kinds of signs that this should be approved. Smith sees a danger in promoting neo-historic wall paintings of what we used to have. Wagner stated that unless they were willing to reopen the entire Sign Code the Commission was getting off task. Lufler sees this as an opportunity to start with something that is reasonable and regulate it right at the beginning.

ACTION:

On a motion by O’Kroley, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (9-0).

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, 7.5 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: Historic Legacy Signs

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

General Comments:

- 1940-45?
- I like the idea but is it a “slippery slope?”
- Would support later date...circa 1960.
- Interesting addition to sign code.