



Agenda Item #: 2

Project Title: 655-667 S Whitney Way/601, 625, 649 Sand Pearl Lane - Comprehensive Design Review for Signage. (District 11)

Legistar File ID #: 88670

Members Present: Shane Bernau, Chair; Rafeeq Asad, Jessica Klehr, Harry Graham, Anina Mblinyi, David McLean, Davy Mayer, and Nicholas Hellrood

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Staff Present: Matt Tucker, Building Inspection Division Director

Summary

At its meeting of June 25, 2025, the Urban Design Commission **DENIED** a Comprehensive Design Review for Signage located at 655-667 S Whitney Way/601, 625, 649 Sand Pearl Lane. Registered and speaking in support were Mary Beth Growney Selene, and Danny Afable. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Bridget Hart.

Summary of Commission Discussion and Questions:

The Commission inquired about what “West End” refers to. The applicant clarified that it is the building name.

The Commission asked staff to explain the alternative process to allow an exception to the Sign Code as stated in the staff memo. The Secretary noted modifications to sign area, setback and height could request a sign that is up to 50% larger than the code would allow, or 18 square feet in this case. Staff noted that additional graphics were provided in the applicant materials that showed the compliant signage, requested signage and sign allowed with a modification.

The Commission talked about difficulty in reviewing and approving signage. Matt Tucker explained the CDR process versus the sign exception process, the importance of the criteria for reviewing CDRs, and the possible outcomes of the Commission’s potential motion(s).

The Commission asked the applicant how they arrived at the 31.55 square foot size. The applicant noted that they felt the 12 square foot size did not fit the building size, and that the prevailing speeds necessitated the larger sign.

The Commission commented that the code compliant sign looks silly and too small against the building, but that the sign, while handsome, is not of high design.

Action

On a motion by Klehr, seconded by Mayer, the Urban Design Commission **DENIED** the Comprehensive Design Review for Signage. The motion noted that ultimately the design of the projecting sign was not an issue, but that the motion for denial was based on the size of the projecting sign not complying with the findings as noted in the staff report, including those related to:

- CDR Criteria 1, based on the size of the sign being disproportionate to the building and its location not aligning with the design elements (architectural details), and
- CDR Criteria 2, as the necessity for a larger sign, mounted higher on the building was not fully demonstrated.

The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0).