

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** February 3, 2010

TITLE: 202 North Charter Street – Signage **REFERRED:**
 Package for an Existing PUD(GDP-SIP) **REREFERRED:**
 Apartment Building’s First Floor Retail. 8th **REPORTED BACK:**
 Ald. Dist.

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: February 3, 2010 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn Weber, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Ron Luskin, R. Richard Wagner and Jay Ferm.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 3, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of the signage package at 202 North Charter Street.

Appearing on behalf of the project was Ryan Coffey, representing Trio Development/Dayton Charter LLC.

Prior to the presentation, staff noted that the signage package under consideration is for a previously-approved, six-story apartment building containing 3,000 square feet of first-floor retail approved by the Commission in October 2005. The project, as originally proposed, was for 16 stories on the same site of the Plan Commission consideration of the project. Staff further noted that the signage package for the retail portion of the building was never submitted for consideration as an element of the PUD as required. Staff noted that the building’s first-floor façade, as designed, did not provide for a conventionally configured wall signage outside of portions of its Dayton Street frontage with no conventional ordinance consistent wall signage areas along the building’s entire Charter Street frontage, resulting in the use of the overhang of the upper residential floors. It further noted consideration of signage areas beneath the overhang of the upper residential floors would have required consideration as part of a comprehensive design review of signage; if the property was conventionally zoned. Ryan Coffey of J&B Signs then provided an overview of the proposed signage featured the use of individual letters mounted to a suspended face or raceway beneath the building’s residential floors. Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- There should be an alternative sign package outside of that proposed.
- Like signage to feature a dark background. Coffey noted that the background is non lit and would be brushed aluminum.
- Make lettering smaller. Visually it would look much better in addition to making brushed aluminum backdrop darker to match the grey stripe of the grey band of the adjacent façade above.
- Consider floating sign over front of clear story windows with mounting within the slate wherever possible.
- Need to provide straight on elevation of building and proposed signage to see how it relates to the building as a whole.

- Talk with architect on signage issues such as the lack of effective code compliant sign band and other alternatives.
- Look at the two adjoining suspended sign areas on the building's Charter Street frontage to be developed into one ground size long panel.
- Re-examine the sign package and provide details that confirm the signage as proposed fits the rhythm of the building.
- Further consideration of the project shall be provided with a presentation utilizing mounted large scale display boards.
- Re-examine signage package for something more smaller, in scale, subtle and tasteful, in line with the building's architecture.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Wagner, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion for a REFERRAL required address of the above-stated concerns with the emphasis on the need to see changes in how they look, including dimensions and details, in coordination with the overall building architecture and full facades.

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, 4.5, 4 and 3.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 202 North Charter Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings					5			5
					5		5	5
								4.5
					4			4
								referred
								3

General Comments:

- Signage must relate to fenestration pattern.
- Is this really the best the applicant can do?
- Sign should complement architecture.
- Rendering exaggerates the inappropriateness of this sign on this building.