

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> April 9, 2008
TITLE: 34 Schroeder Court – Comprehensive Design Review in UDD No. 2. 1 <sup>st</sup> Ald. Dist. (06638)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: April 9, 2008	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Bonnie Cosgrove, Richard Wagner and Jay Ferm.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 9, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a Comprehensive Design Review located at 34 Schroeder Court. Appearing on behalf of the project were James Miller, representing Roger Vick; and Roger Vick, representing Beltline Madison, LLC/Advanced Pain Management. Prior to the presentation, staff noted that the application represents modification to the sign package component for a medical clinic facility development previously approved by the Commission in August of 2007. As part of the original approval of the development proposal, the applicant presented signage details that were generally consistent with the provisions for Urban Design District No. 2 in the form of a single wall sign and monument sign. The uniform sign package currently under consideration provides for an enlargement of the main wall sign graphic for “Advanced Pain Management,” to exceed 40 square feet requiring approval by the Commission. The proposed primary graphic will feature a combination logo and wall signage at approximately 99 square feet in size. All remaining wall signage is to meet the maximum 40 square feet requirement. A review of the building elevations provided details of the wall signage package, including the location of potential tenant signage. A monument sign is also proposed that will satisfy the minimum setback of 20-feet and fall short of the 75 square feet allowed at 42.88 square feet in size. The issue under consideration with the monument sign is that it is proposed to be a multi-tenant display that will feature more than “8 symbols and/or words” thus requiring a variance from the provisions of Urban Design District No. 2. The applicant proposes to limit the number of words and symbols on the ground sign to not more than 15-20 words, numbers and logos in total. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- The main wall sign on the building’s west elevation shall be modified to align with the extended vertical edge of the underlying three windows.
- The ground sign shall feature a brick face that matches the building’s brick color with its top cap squared up to match the building from side views, the banding to remain as proposed, as well as maintaining the rebuild at its bottom.
- On the east elevation, the right and left elements of sign should align with the right and left of the windows below with adjustments toward the next two left windows.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion required that the west elevation wall sign and logo align with the left window below and the “T” in Management to align with the right window below. The cornice on the ground sign shall match with the building, along with squaring up of its cap from the front and side views with the banding to remain, and the reveal at the sign’s bottom.

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 5, 5, 5 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 34 Schroeder Court**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	6
	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	5
	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	5
	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	5

General Comments:

- Nice sign package.
- Relate ground sign design to architecture.