

AGENDA # 5.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: October 19, 2005
TITLE: 222 West Washington Avenue – Final Signage Packet Approval in the C4 District.	REFERRED:
	REREFERRED:
	REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: William A. Fruhling, Acting Secretary	ADOPTED:
	POF:
DATED: October 19, 2005	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Paul Wagner (Chair), Bruce Woods, Lou Host-Jablonski, Lisa Geer, Ald. Noel Radomski, Todd Barnett, Cathleen Feland, Robert March and Michael Barrett.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 19, 2005, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the final signage packet (ground sign and address sign only) in the C4 District for a building located at 222 West Washington Avenue. Melissa Destree, with Destree Design, stated that they are requesting approval of the address sign and ground sign (signs “A” and “B” in the submittal) and she would like feedback of the other signs. Host-Jablonski suggested reversing the black and white on sign “D”, and he was not supportive of sign “G”. Ryan Coffey, of the Fiore Companies, registered in support.

ACTION:

On a motion by March, seconded by Woods, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the final signage packet (ground sign and address sign only) in the C4 District for a building located at 222 West Washington Avenue. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote.

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, 6, 7, 7, 8 and 9, with 3 abstentions from the rating process.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 222 West Washington Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	9	-	9	9
	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	8
	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	6
	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	6
	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	7

General Comments:

- Signs A and B only.
- Very nice sign package.
- A and B signs are just fine...(the other signs proposed are problematic, but these designs were withdrawn by the applicant).
- Tasteful designs well-suited to site (A and B).