

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: July 31, 2019

TITLE: 3739 E. Washington Avenue – Signage
Exception for Discount Tire. 17th Ald. Dist.
(56309)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: July 31, 2019

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 31, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **FAILED TO GRANT APPROVAL** of a signage exception located at 3739 E. Washington Avenue. Registered in support of the project was Todd Mosher. Registered in opposition was Quentin Sears. The applicant is looking for approval of a sign on the north elevation of the proposed building. There is a provision in the ordinance that states wall signs may be displayed on a façade not facing a street, but allowed facing a parking lot. The front of the building faces E. Washington Avenue. He reviewed the proposed signs and site layout, seeking approval of a wall sign over the customer door facing the parking lot. They do anticipate cross-traffic.

The Commission discussed the following:

- It appears that any traffic coming to that building is coming from the southwest. You would see two signs and the monument sign before you even got to that driveway. It's a single occupancy building, it's not confusing which door you use. You're very well signed, people coming here aren't going to wonder where you are.
 - We will have traffic coming from the north that will have to go around to get to the northbound lanes. When I read the ordinance, it seems as if they're defining a side of a building which faces a parking area at least 33-feet in width (we've got 36), it doesn't mean it's not part of our parking area.
- You also have a pylon sign?
 - Monument style, smaller.
- Two building signs and a pylon sign. The other question about the sign crossing architectural elements, I would suggest on the side sign that if you moved up to the masonry band to approximate the height of the front sign and does not come in front of the red band. You're allowed to go within a few feet of the roof elevation.

- The reason for the location/height is it's in within the sign band on the building. We've made some modifications to this building specific to the neighborhood and Madison. We do have that additional architectural feature on the front of the building.
- It would be more harmonious with the building materials if it were in the sign band just above your sign band.
 - The band is designed as EIFS to allow change if needed. We would consider raising it up if that's a condition of approval.
- This is a signage exception? Can you explain?
 - (Secretary) This is an exception in a UDD, to allow a sign facing a non-parking area and non-street facing area. This is facing a drive and technically not parking, that's the exception. Staff doesn't have an issue with the additional sign but wanted your feedback on where it's located, the aesthetics of it.

Public Comment:

Quentin Sears spoke as a long-time neighborhood resident with concerns for aesthetics of the neighborhood. There are already a lot of tire stores here, Klein's is now a newly remodeled building, some of the signs look cheap. He would be against extraneous signage, especially ones he could see from his apartment balcony.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Goodhart, seconded by DeChant, to grant final approval of the north facing sign with the condition that both the north and south signs are placed in the upper split face CMU band versus the red EIFS band, and perhaps centered over the glass component below on the south side, based on the staff report comments that we review sign locations and make a recommendation for its integration into the architecture.

The motion **FAILED** on a vote of (2-5) with Goodhart and DeChant voting yes; Braun-Oddo, Asad, Bernau, Klehr and Harper voting no.