

## AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** June 27, 2007

**TITLE:** To Adopt and Confirm Amendments to the Madison General Ordinances as Set Forth in Attached Exhibit X Pursuant to Sec. 66.0102, Wis. Stats. Repealing and Recreating Chapter 31 and Amending Portions of Chapter 28 and Chapter 1.

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

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

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** June 27, 2007

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Lou Host-Jablonski, Marshal Rummel, Bruce Woods, Cathleen Feland and Todd Barnett.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of June 27, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** for continued discussion to a future special meeting. Appearing and speaking on behalf of the ordinance amendments were Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator, Kathy Voeck, Assistant Zoning Administrator, Assistant City Attorney Lara Mainella and Alan J. Martin, Secretary, Urban Design Commission, all of which represent and are members of the Signtast Staff Team. Mark A. Olinger, Director of the Department of Planning and Community & Economic Development appeared to discuss history and background of the formulation of the Signtast Team and their efforts over the last nine years to develop the draft ordinance. He emphasized that the draft ordinance purpose was to provide for expected outcomes such as the following:

- A way to enable interesting signs not consistent with existing ordinance provisions.
- A way to handle signage on big sites such as Planned Commercial Sites and large multi-phased planned developments.
- Ways to handle signage in office parks.
- The allowance for 24" projecting signs into the street right-of-way as a mechanism to eliminate the need for the use of sandwich boards.

As an overall theme to balance the competitive advantage that the new built environment has over older structures in regards to signage. He further emphasized the need to forward the draft ordinance and any subsequent revisions for approval in order to relieve issues with the existing ordinance and provide for more creative options for signage within the City.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Happy with ordinance as drafted except in regards to maximum square footage of signage allowed on an entire zoning lot.
- Signage is stand in for bad architecture and bad site design.

- Signage should provide for the need to identify but not go beyond; reducing clutter. Signage should provide for legibility and good urban design. There is a difference between good urban design and marketing must be for identification only.
- Recognize that there are two opposing sides on any signage issue; need to look at limiting the number of sides of a building for wall signage, as well as limit all signage to a maximum level for all types and distribute accordingly.
- On pylon signs versus building signage placed on buildings there needs to be fewer pylons on the landscape.
- Provide for building wall signage based on the ordinance standards with pylon or ground signage based on demonstrated need.
- All ground signage should be allowed only on a demonstrated hardship basis.
- As an alternative, a cap on total square footage of signage on a zoning lot could be a good thing but need a way to monitor.

Further discussion on the issues between Olinger, the Commission and staff centered around the need to provide for a level playing field relevant to the amount of signage provided between new, large big box development and urban retail/commercial and existing small to medium size retail centers. Staff suggested taking existing language in both the Street Graphics Ordinance and the Zoning Code, which regulates Planned Commercial Sites (retail development within integrated cross-access with retail at a minimum of 25,000 square feet of a development 40,000 square feet in size) and “Big Box” development featuring retail in excess 40,000 square feet in size as a level that would require more restrictive signage provisions already defined within the parameter of both codes. The larger Planned Commercial Sites/”Big Box” developments because of the size of the buildings normally get more signage than the small to medium retail centers and urban retail development due to the extensive size of the buildings. Therefore to create a limitation on the amount of signage for these facilities would get to the heart of what the Commission desires to provide for more restrictive regulation. The Commission also noted that it wanted this criteria to apply to Planned Unit Developments which would normally not be subject to the same provisions, if for the same levels of retail/commercial use.

As a follow-up to the previous meeting held on April 30, 2007 staff distributed to the Commission draft ordinance options and revisions that provided for the following:

- Maintenance on ban on flashing graphics with animated graphics also banned due to constant changing (considered as flashing).
- Group and regulate collectively scrolling, changeable digital copy and LED/video (static) in one category. All would be subject to a change of copy to an interval of once an hour with all copy to feature a dark colored background or field.
- Time/temperature and stock market are acceptable under current draft ordinance.

Staff noted that draft ordinance provisions to address issue of brightness had yet to be formulated.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Host-Jablonski, seconded by Woods, staff was instructed to provide draft language relevant to the level of signage allowed for Planned Commercial Sites, big box development, as well as PUDs for similar commercial/retail uses that would restrict the amount of signage allowed for further consideration by the Commission. The motion also provided for acceptance of the draft language relevant to scrolling changeable digital copy and LED/video (as drafted by staff). The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0).

There are no rankings for this project.