## AGENDA # <u>4</u>

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSIONPRESENTED: July 11, 2007TITLE:5201 Femrite Drive - Sign Package for<br/>Previously Approved Development in<br/>UDD No. 1. 16th Ald. Dist. (06901)REFERRED:<br/>REPORTED BACK:AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, SecretaryADOPTED:POF:DATED: July 11, 2007ID NUMBER:

City of Madison, Wisconsin

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Lou Host-Jablonski, Richard Slayton, Todd Barnett, Michael Barrett, Joan Bachleitner, and Marsha Rummel.

## **SUMMARY**:

At its meeting of July 11, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a sign package located at 5201 Femrite Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were John Gibbs and Dave Nelsen. Prior to the presentation staff noted that the approval for the development of two multi-tenant industrial buildings on the site was previously provided by the Commission where the signage package was not provided for approval as required. Staff further noted an administrative approval to allow for signage consistent with the code with restrictions relevant to the type and location of signage on the building's façade was administratively approved by staff to allow for some initial tenant signage on the building. Subsequent to these approvals, the applicant requested a departure from the mutually agreed sign specification administratively approved by staff; therefore requiring formal consideration of a uniform signage package for this property located within Urban Design District No. 1. Dave Nelsen of Ruedebusch Development Corporation appeared and presented details of signage package which detailed location of wall signage on specific areas of the upper elevation of the building. Electrified signs either individual internally illuminated mounted on a raceway color matched to the building background, or halo lit with a background to blend with the building. The signage package would provide for variation in the color of sign letters at a maximum height of 30" including logos not to exceed 6 square feet. Two ground signs will be permitted at 32 square feet in size setback at 20-feet consistent with the provisions for Urban Design District No. 1. Attached to the provisions for the uniform sign package under consideration, Nelsen distributed examples of several signs to be developed on the building façade. During discussion by members, the Commission members noted that two of the three signs did not meet the requirements of the proposed sign specifications relevant to signage type, in addition to one of the signs not being consistent with the provisions of Urban Design District No. 1, which limited the total square footage to 72 square feet. Staff noted to the Commission that a departure from the proposed uniform sign specifications provided with one of the signs, as well as issues with the size of a sign exceeding the 72 square feet allowed within provisions of the district could be considered as part of a variance request requiring a public hearing by the Commission as part of a separate application. Discussion by members relevant to the signage package was as follows:

- Uncomfortable with the textual provisions that don't reflect the design of proposed and existing signage on the building.
- The mixing and matching of colors are disturbing.

## ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0) The motion required that all signs strictly adhere to the specifications as proposed and approved, as well as the provisions for Urban Design District No. 1. Any departure will require consideration as a separate variance from either of these requirements.

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, 6, 6 and 6.

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	5
	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	б
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	б
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6

General Comments:

• Appropriate language for signage for this project.