

## AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

|  |   |
|--|---|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION   | <b>PRESENTED:</b> June 22, 2011                                 |
| TITLE: 3550 Anderson Street –<br>Comprehensive Design Review of<br>Signage for Madison College. 17 <sup>th</sup> Ald.<br>Dist. (22901) | <b>REFERRED:</b><br><b>REREFERRED:</b><br><b>REPORTED BACK:</b> |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary  | <b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>                                     |
| DATED: June 22, 2011   | <b>ID NUMBER:</b>   |

---

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Richard Wagner, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Mark Smith, Melissa Huggins, Jay Handy, Todd Barnett, Dawn O’Kroley and Henry Lufler.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of June 22, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a Comprehensive Design Review located at 3550 Anderson Street for Madison College. Appearing on behalf of the project were Geoff Sabin, Mike Stark and Gil Jevne, all representing Madison College. Jevne presented a standardized signage package to present a consistent and organize image that relates to the landscape, architecture and functionality of the campus, these designs will also be used at other Madison College campuses. The signage system is to identify the campus, guide visitors, students and faculty, promote brand awareness to the general public and aesthetically campus environment and user experience. They have several sign types including monument entrance signs at arrival points to the campus, vertical monument signs with wayfinding, directional signs, secondary directional signs, building identification ground signs, building identification on building lettering and cast signs, parking lot identification banners mounted on light poles, and four-sided pedestrian kiosks. The goals are to minimize traffic on Wright Street by directing people in and around the campus and avoid this section of Wright Street. Local materials and native landscaping will be used. Sabin reviewed the signage types and materials. The goal is to provide arrival to the campus as well as outreach to the community, which could be displayed with digital messaging. It is a one color LED display and doesn’t change any more than every five (5) minutes; it would be used for event outreach, not advertising. The stone would make up a large portion of the sign using native Wisconsin limestone. They are asking for a variance for one sign that is 3’9” over what is allowed by the sign code. Smith asked is the monument sign rests inside the limestone; Sabin replied yes. Smith also inquired about the detailing of the cabinetry for the sign and suggested that they be careful about water in the joints between the stone and the cabinet. Rummel stated she would find it helpful to have signage that lists where specific buildings are. Sabin replied that these signs will go through another round of adjustments, and one of the goals of the college is to make sure they are getting the vehicles to the correct place first, then moving the pedestrians. Names of buildings on signage is a possibility for the buildings that are farther out from the campus. Rummel reiterated that as a visitor she does not feel these signs tell her what she needs to know. Using the electronic message board is one option for solving this problem. Barnett expressed concern about the electronic message board/monument sign being placed in the limestone; it would be more successful if it were brought out to the edge. He is unsure if the variance is justified for signs B1 and B2. He asked if they looked at bookend signs that were shorter with one for a branding element and the other with directions, bringing the scale down by about half but keeping identity and direction. Harrington

inquired about the need for an electronic message board; he stated that the UW-Madison campus does not have anything like that and they are a much bigger campus. Sabin responded that Madison College is a much more vehicle-oriented campus with fewer pedestrians and electronic message boards are a better way of catching their attention. Wagner pointed out one of the signs for Protective Services is on the other side of the street. Sabin stated that the signs are not necessarily up to date on the labeling and as displayed are prototypical examples of the variety of signage types to be employed. Huggins struggled with the role of the secondary signage and considered it cluttered. Sabin stated that as the site develops and perhaps another swatch of land is acquired some of the messaging might be to address people coming from another direction; some of the signs are placeholders in considering the master plan for the future of the campus. O’Kroley suggested studying some of the signage, how they will be viewed from the approach and which directions certain signs will face. Jevne replied that they have studied various sizes of signs, but when you are in the potential location of the signage surrounded by very large buildings, it becomes clear that the signs need to be larger. She suggested they consider “cleaning up” the language to simplify it.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Smith, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion provided approval of the signage package as presented with consideration of the comments made at the applicant’s option.

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 6, 7, 7, 7, 7 and 8.

**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 |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <b>Member Ratings</b> | -         | -            | -              | -                              | 7     | -                                   | -             | 7              |
|                       | -         | -            | -              | -                              | 7     | -                                   | -             | 7              |
|                       | -         | -            | -              | -                              | 8     | -                                   | -             | 8              |
|                       | -         | -            | -              | -                              | 7     | -                                   | 7             | 7              |
|                       | -         | -            | -              | -                              | 7     | -                                   | -             | -              |
|                       | -         | -            | -              | -                              | 6     | -                                   | -             | 6              |
|                       | -         | -            | -              | -                              | 7     | -                                   | -             | 7              |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |

General Comments:

- Attractive package. Consider wayfinding signs for specific buildings.
- Well crafted/developed.
- Tall pylons are fine.
- Could be simplified – many signs. Where does the Commission stand on message boards?
- Message board seriously has the appeal of a Walgreen’s sign.
- Avoid too much clutter.