

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 8, 2017
TITLE: 1965 Atwood Avenue Major Alteration to a Comprehensive Design Review for “Monona Bank”	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: November 8, 2017	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Amanda Hall, Lois Braun-Oddo, Cliff Goodhart, Rafeeq Asad and Tom DeChant.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 8, 2017, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a major alteration to a Comprehensive Design Review for “Monona Bank” located at 1965 Atwood Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Monica Schneider, Mark Schellpfeffer and Josh Westby, representing Monona Bank. The applicant presented the current rebranding design that removes the name “state” from all signs and described the existing sign conditions. All signs since the original Chase Bank cover architectural details. The current sign covers up details and the proposed new sign will cover the same.

Matt Tucker gave a Zoning staff report. The existing CDR was approved in 2015 for the bank. The building has been used as a bank for many years. In investigating the application, it was discovered that architectural detail is covered up. The Sign Code requires that new signs be in a signable area not covering up architectural detail. The standards of approval for comprehensive design review state that signage should be better than what is ordinarily permissible. We don’t want to use a comprehensive design review to create conditions worse than what the Sign Code allows. The existing sign on the west face would be replaced. The team shared a photo of the historic façade sign.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Architectural elements are the scribed letters (refer to historic photo).
- The alternative in the packet respects the horizontal lines and details and does more justice to the building.
 - The applicant does not prefer this design, they have concerns with visibility and readability to turn/enter.
- Have you considered making them all caps and broadened? Spaced further apart? Lower case is not as appropriate to building.
 - We can make it wider, but the bank president requested smaller.

- Like the sign that complies, within the band, like the second proposal with all caps, stretched version. Can cover the original carved sign.
- For clarification, talk about the signable area, not the font.
- What if the left sign panel moved up and just replaced the front cover?
 - (Tucker) I don't think the original CDR was done correctly; it wasn't clear with the original application. This still needs a CDR for covering 100% of a signable area in lieu of 30%. Recommend remain content neutral, but tie to the historic quality of the site and building.
- Does it have to be as wide to cover existing?
 - Yes.

ACTION:

On a motion by Braun-Oddo, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a major alteration to a Comprehensive Design Review. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (5-0). The motion provided for the following conditions:

- Approval of the smaller wall sign option shown in the package that does not cover architectural detail.
- Not Approved: The large corner wall sign that covered architectural detail
- Other wall signs approved.