

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> April 21, 2010
TITLE: 2501 and 2601 West Beltline Highway – Modifications to a Previously Approved Comprehensive Design Review of Signage for “Arbor Gate.” 14 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (10706)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: April 21, 2010	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Todd Barnett, Acting Chair; Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Ron Luskin and Richard Wagner.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 21, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of modifications to a previously approved comprehensive design review of signage. Appearing on behalf of the project Brad Hutter, representing MILT, Arbor Gate and Bonfyre; Doug Hursh, representing Arbor Gate Development; and Sean Baxter. Under consideration is a modification to the existing Comprehensive Design Review signage package for the Arbor Gate Development, which provides for the addition of an alternate letter color and colored logo elements within the secondary sign band as well as a revisit on the projecting blade sign on the end (west elevation) of the office building for the “Bonfyre” restaurant. Hutter, Hursh and Baxter presented details of the revisions to the sign package. A review of the Bonfyre blade sign elements noted its inclusion within the original Comprehensive Design Review sign package as eliminated by the Commission with its original approval, subsequent reconsideration of the blade sign which was denied by the Commission at its meeting of September 2, 2009. The applicants noted the need for the projecting sign where people could not find the restaurant because of its location within a depression below the Todd Drive overpass and West Beltline Highway. The new blade sign’s design had been done in sensitivity with the building occupants adjacent to the proposed sign, which is a one-sided triangular shape and angled blade toward the Beltline and not visible by internal tenants adjacent to the sign. It was further noted the sign has been downsized from that contained in previous proposals. Following the presentation on the elements of the blade sign, Hursh provided a view corridor study relevant to its need, its visibility from the area. The second component of the project deals with adding more color within the secondary sign band to allow for

Hursh noted that the current pewter colored face of the signage was not visible on the north/non-sunlit elevation which facilitates the need to provide for corporate colors and logos within the secondary sign band area. The restrictions provide that logos could not count for more than 30% of allowable secondary signage area. Hursh and Hutter provided an example of the proposed signage with a graphic featuring the “singlewire” signage, a potential tenant within the building. Hutter noted that the mass of the building and the size of the sign needed more contrast in color with locations and sizes in the secondary sign band to remain as previously approved. Following the presentation Ald. Bruer spoke in support of the project, agreeing with the need to provide for more diversification within the secondary sign band, as well as the need to support the blade signage for the Bonfyre restaurant. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Appropriate change to secondary sign band but on the Bonfyre sign use cut letters.
- Question opening to multiple colors within a secondary sign band.
- Sign needs to be darker on building but leery about opening for colors and colored logo elements.
- Relevant to the Bonfyre sign need to be more integrated, more with building, architecture but understand the need.
- Relevant to locals, important for identity to have color; OK to limit to one color, lettering needs to be darker color.
- Relevant to the Bonfyre side, the blade concrete going through glass is beautiful architecturally; but now it will be diminished by hanging something from it.
- Consider a blade behind the concrete blade as a mechanism to facilitate the projecting sign.
- Blade sign in context with the overall building not significant but need to look at other solutions.
- Color will not degrade quality of building.
- Uncomfortable with blade sign as configured, need to look at options. In addition to dealing with timing of lighting.

### **ACTION:**

In support of his motion Wagner noted that he was ready to accept blade sign with design as supported by Ald. Bruer and acknowledge that color and logos need to be carefully done. Comfortable with staff review and discretion if there are issues they can bring back to the Commission. Comfortable with this blade sign as designed or as redesigned within a separate plane as recommended. Sign faces within the secondary sign band as an option to the “dark pewter” color is appropriate in combination with the use of colors as part of logo elements as restricted within the sign text.

Consideration of the signage was provided on two separate motions. The first motion provided for approval of the use of black colored letters within the secondary sign band, combined with the use of colored logo elements with discretion by staff to refer any potentially contentious approvals to the Commission for formal consideration. The second motion provided for approval of the blade sign as presented or as redesigned within a separate plane or blade as an alternative adjoining the architectural concrete blade of the building, in addition to the ability for staff to administratively approve versions under both options or refer is necessary for formal consideration. Both motions were made by Wagner, seconded by Slayton, and the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. Both motions were passed on a vote of (5-1) with Luskin voting no.

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, 6, 6 and 6.5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2501 and 2601 West Beltline Highway**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	6
	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	-	-	-	-	6.5	-	-	6.5
	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6

General Comments:

- Corporate logo colors must be subtle, dark text is good. Move Bonfyre sign out of line of wing.
- Blade sign should retain character of the architectural fin. Consider as another architectural element layered on the fin. Angle is foreign. Study time sign is lit versus building occupancy on upper levels and share with staff.
- Respect architectural integrity of building. OK with judicious use of color on tenant signage/logos.