

AGENDA # 11

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: April 1, 2009
TITLE: 2121 East Springs Drive – Amendment to the Current Sign Package for a Planned Commercial Site, “Bowl-A-Vard Lanes” for an Electronic Changeable Copy Ground Sign. 17 th Ald. Dist. (14173)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: April 1, 2009	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Mark Smith, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Jay Ferm, Dawn Weber, Marshal Rummel, Ron Luskin and Todd Barnett.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 1, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a sign package located at 2121 East Springs Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Eric Marty and Doh Bussan.

Prior to the presentation, staff noted to the Commission that this property is one of several commercially improved lots along this portion of East Springs Drive within the Regional East/Zeier Subdivisions. Development of these lots appear to not support the development of ground signs beyond directionals as contained within the restrictive covenants for the collective properties. Staff noted as the representative for “the City” on the Zeier Architectural Review Committee, it did not support allowance of ground signs where the two other representatives on the Committee voted in favor of allowance of the ground sign as proposed on the site. Staff further noted that the City’s “jurisdiction” extends beyond the enforcement of the restrictive plat covenants based on the property’s status as a “conditional use and planned commercial site” which provides for the Commission’s review of modifications to the previous approved signage package for this development. Under this provision, the development of an electronic changeable copy ground sign has been forwarded to Commission for formal consideration based on the Commission’s policy to require formal consideration of electronic changeable copy graphics. A presentation on the details and location of the sign followed where Eric Marty of Grant Signs noted that the sign does meet the provisions of the Street Graphics Ordinance for property zoned C3L; where the intent of providing for electronic changeable copy is necessary to inform the public of the design of the sign to match the building color. Discussion by the Commission was as follows:

- Concern with distraction of traffic caused by the sign.
- Support sign due to setback from road, but its location is wrong. Needs to be by a driveway and is way too big in size.
- The sign is too large, not comfortable with change and text to announce leagues and bowl times. Use as a changeable billboard, not for business identification.
- Don’t support – too large and unappealing.
- Change of copy is advertising beyond identifying businesses on the premise.
- Bowling is a social activity, mitigating circumstance, a social aspect.

- Concern with its appearance as a billboard or “big television.” Appears to be a big light picture. Want to see what’s already up which is similar in appearance. The lines of text are not an issue, but the big light picture is.
- Doesn’t promote spontaneous activity; it’s a planned activity, not necessary.
- Against conditions for referral too prescriptive and still a problem with changeable text.

ACTION:

A motion by Ferm, seconded by Smith, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED CONSIDERATION** on this item. The motion passed on a vote of (6-3) with Barnett, Harrington and Luskin voting no. The motion for referral required that the applicant come back with a modified proposal featuring one line of changeable copy on a sign with aesthetically pleasing proportion and with its relocation of the sign adjacent to the driveway entrance.

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 4, 5 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2121 East Springs Drive

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings								5
					2			
					4			4
					5			
								6

General Comments:

- Monument signage electronic changeable sign! Will abide by C.O.M. M.G.O. concerning signs.
- Fine but no changeable text.