

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: July 24, 2013

TITLE: 3550 Anderson Street – Amendment to Existing “Comprehensive Design Review” of Signage for Madison College. 12th Ald. Dist. (22901)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: July 24, 2013

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lauren Cnare, Richard Slayton, Cliff Goodhart, Dawn O’Kroley and Tom DeChant.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 24, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of an amendment to an existing Comprehensive Design Review for signage at Madison College. Appearing on behalf of the project were Mary Beth Growney Selene and Bridget Growney, both representing Ryan Signs, Inc.; and Mike Stark, representing Madison College. Staff noted that in discussing this with Assistant City Attorney Lara Mainella, if a motion for approval fails, it is recommended that a motion against the project be made while citing why it doesn’t meet the standards for approval. Growney Selene presented revisions to the signage plan including further diminishment of the graphics on each of the signs. The Group Health logo is now 2.25 square feet total; the UW Credit Union started at 4 square feet and has now been reduced to 1.8 square feet. These are strong partnerships with the college and with these sizes you will have to be within 50-feet to see these graphics. While these businesses are open to anyone in the neighborhood or anyone who is a patient/customer, they are focused on the internal campus. The health center is only available off of Hoffman and the entrance is internal to the lot. The credit union sign is parallel to Wright Street and you won’t be able to read it until you are right there. The brand for each of these partners is very important to them. Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator provided an overview of the signage package against the provisions of the “Sign Control” ordinance.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- If these signs are not approved where would any identifiers be placed?
 - Probably on the building. But it would match the address lettering and have no other information.

I feel very strongly about health care wayfinding. Signage is critical; you do use the brand, everything you can to identify the space. Both of these institutions are not-for-profit; it’s not a Subway or John Deere, it’s part of the institution. My real concern is will Group Health stay there if they can’t be identified? This might jeopardize the relationship between them and Madison College (DeChant).

(Stark) That’s a difficult question to answer but they are very concerned about their identity.

They are open to the entire public, not just the students on campus.

- I'm struggling with the argument that this is a necessary for the general public because as a cooperative, it's not open to the entire public but to their members. I'm not feeling the overarching need.
 - My understanding is that part of the reason Group Health chose this location is to serve a large number of poor people with free health care. Their intent is to help out with the neighborhood for those who don't have insurance.
- From a design standpoint there is nothing wrong with this. We're talking about the policy concerns.
- From a staff perspective it's not the logo, it's having something consistent in the family of signs produced and that since they weren't Madison College that their private entity identification be subservient to being part of Madison College signage, scaled relationships and proportions.
- I know you have scaled back the logo sizes again. Is that enough to say it meets policy?
 - Yes, and I agree. If we saw what we see today from the beginning we probably would have approved it. When it came in originally it was a totally different sign type, color, etc.

ACTION:

On a motion by Cnare, seconded by Goodhart, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** consistent with the applicable standards. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-1) with O'Kroley 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 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 3550 Anderson Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	7

General Comments:

- Nice subtle compromise.