

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** September 22, 2021

TITLE: 515 Pinney Street - Comprehensive Design  
Review of Signage. 15th Ald. Dist. (67175)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Kevin Firchow, Acting Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: September 22, 2021

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Tom DeChant, Craig Weisensel, Rafeeq Asad, Jessica Klehr, Christian Harper, Christian Albouras, Shane Bernau and Russell Knudson.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of September 22, 2021, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a CDR located at 515 Pinney Street. Registered and speaking in support were Allie Novitske and Dan Yoder, representing Sign Art Studio and Ruedebusch Development. Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator spoke to the proposed signage package and reviewed staff concerns as noted in the report. Yoder presented the plans, noting this is a unique site and the sign package is designed to keep this cohesive with the existing mixed-use building. The location of the addressing for the Pinney Street side is where they felt it most appropriately located, with the design matching what was done in the first phase of the multi-use development. For the blade sign, the client wanted to give nod to the first phase of this development; the design isn't exactly a replica but alludes to it. He shared illuminated options with face-lit letters or a halo lit option; they are open to a non-illuminated option. The addressing is modest in size and scale and does meet the Fire Code requirement; the preferred option is the 2'9" illuminated design that matches the other phase of development. The north and south signs are used to identify the two entrances, with an offered alternate option at 2' and non-illuminated.

The Commission discussed the following:

- I don't have a problem with the lit courtyard signs, assuming the courtyard has lighting, not sure illuminated signs are necessary. Lit signs won't add too much from a light pollution standpoint. The blade sign and entrance on Pinney Street are confusing; the address is 515 Pinney but they added "515 @ Royster," particularly with Royster Oaks Drive there, that's a mess. The smaller sign over the entrance is not really a problem, the blade sign is big and lit, no one in a residential area will want to look at a large lit blade sign.
- I've been noticing around town the face-lit letters and the amount of light and glare that comes from them at the streetscape level, especially facing residential. We want to be careful of and avoid when possible. The halo lit letters are much better and in some cases no lighting at all is sufficient too.
- The existing sign, the tone of light with the lamp, there's a big difference in that tone of light and how it will feel near your apartment window. The bright white is not desirable.

- The intersection of Pinney and Royster being a roundabout, negotiating that with a sign on the corner not in close proximity to an entrance, it seems building signage would be closer to the building corner and parking lot, especially if it's for drive signage and not pedestrians. The address sign shown is OK between the front entrance and the drive entrance, that might be sufficient if that's illuminated as well. The interior is probably going to be lit for safety and security, lighting the sign may take away from it.
- That gets to the issue, the overall effectiveness of the signage plan. If you're coming in as a visitor looking from the north you won't see the sign that identifies it until you turn, and then it's above your head. Much about the design as the sign placement.
- Agree that the halo is much preferable. Why is there no entry sign at the south where there is also an entrance off Grand Oak Trail?
  - Some of that gets into fire code. They want your address numbers to be facing the street of which the address is.
- The sign is misplaced in that northwest corner. Seems like it should be in the southwest corner.
- (Tucker) The Commission shouldn't get involved in the fire addressing, those are exempt. That gets sorted out completely separately by the Fire Department.
- I don't see a sign along Pinney Street at the parking lot to direct people to the primary entrance. It seems like the southwest corner and the northeast corner are the two places you need the signage.
- (Tucker) We cover that in the staff report, we suggest those two corners as the best locations for signs.
  - We don't currently have anything planned in those locations.
  - We did discuss that, main goal for the blade sign is to be cohesive with the other sign on the development, the public would view this as a cross connected lot.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Weisensel, seconded by Bernau, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item to a future meeting. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (9-0). The motion noted the following:

- Consider signage locations (not the northwest corner).
- Directional signage for vehicles entering the building.
- Entrance signs that are not necessarily the address, could be branding entrance signage as well.
- Recommend non-illuminated signs in the courtyard.
- Lighting alternatives other than what was presented.