

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: September 16, 2009
TITLE: 2202-2300 South Park Street – Amendment to the “Comprehensive Design Review” Sign Plan for the Villager Mall in Urban Design District No. 7. 14 th Ald. Dist. (10903)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: September 16, 2009	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 16, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of an amendment to the Comprehensive Design Review sign plan located at 2202-2300 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Mark Olinger, Director of the Department of Planning and Community and Economic Development; Steve Harms, representing Tri-North Builders; and Mary Beth Growney Selene, representing Ryan Signs. Prior to the presentation staff noted that the signage package under consideration is an amendment to the originally approved Comprehensive Design Review sign plan (CDR) approved by the Commission for The Villager Mall in July 2007. Growney Selene provided an overview of the existing signage on the site detailing the extent of directional signage, the main ground sign and wall signage previously approved under the original CDR. Growney Selene supplemented this information with additional directional signage as proposed with the current amended sign plan, as well as signage for the recently approved façade of the “Atrium” portion of the site, as well as that of the “Urban League/Madison Public Library” building. Staff noted that elements of the signage package such as the sign bands for the Atrium were approved as part of the Atrium’s architecture in December of 2008. Olinger provided collaboration on building façade/sign issues associated with the original approvals of the Atrium Mall façade, as well as that with the Urban League/Public Library building. Growney Selene further noted that tenant signage on the Atrium building is located primarily on the perforated aluminum sign band approved with the Atrium’s façade where individual letters in the tenant’s style and color, mounted flush and facelit with external fixtures on the building as part of the original building lighting plan as approved were proposed. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- The commercial signs on the Atrium building overpower the more institutional signs such as the Dane County Human Services sign. Commercial signs appear oversized and over-scale. Problem with detail of the size where scaling down in size of commercial sign needs to be examined.
- Provide for consistency of location of signage in relationship to the panel’s bottom with the Atrium signage. In addition, standardized letter size on all.
- Relevant to the directive signage for The Villager Mall, keep the existing directional sign at the entry east of the tree at the drive entry.

- On the Urban League/Urban Design building's east elevation the blade sign should be pushed to the left to be asymmetrical, not in the middle. On the north elevation signage needs to be better integrated with window spacings the same for the signage on the south elevation.
- On the north elevation, since there is no entrance the sign should be smaller based on hierarchy.
- Move the Urban League sign and make smaller to fit over windows, more to the left on the north elevation. On the south elevation move to the right.
- Consider removing north elevation signage for ground sign due to visibility issues.
- Consider placing a ground sign on the east at the plaza walk.
- Sign design should portray how to get into building and where major entrances exist. The sign package does not identify major tenants.
- Provide pedestrian-oriented signage.
- The Urban League signage is OK, look at relocating signage on the north elevation on a ground sign.
- Use east elevation to identify library; the remainder of the library signage package is OK.
- Explain value of entry and exit signs (directionals) as proposed.

ACTION:

On a motion by Wagner, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0-1) with Luskin abstaining. The motion to refer requires address of the above stated comments with further consideration of the project.

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, 4, 4, 5, 5 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2202-2300 South Park Street

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

General Comments:

- Canopy signage should be consistent. Consistency in construction with more variety in tenant signage image brings energy with construction standards. Building identification should be strongest.
- Greater consistency of font size (canopy signs) and text placement (panel sign) needed.
- Unresolved signage package.
- Very poorly thought out signage package. It seems applicants did not consider architecture and signage in a coordinated fashion.
- Clarify signs on Urban League building. Look at ground sign and separation of mesh signs. Please make sure sign renderings are accurate.