

## AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION  
TITLE: 710 John Nolen Drive – Street Graphics  
Variance in Urban Design District No. 1.  
14<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (07168)

**PRESENTED:** August 22, 2007

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: August 22, 2007

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Michael Barrett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, Jay Ferm, Lou Host-Jablonski and Todd Barnett.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of August 22, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a street graphics variance located at 710 John Nolen Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project was Ryan Coffey, JNB Signs. Prior to the presentation, staff noted that the site contained an existing two-story office/commercial building, which when originally built, provided for little to no signage on the site outside of an approved ground sign located between the building and its John Nolen Drive frontage. The wall signs as proposed provide for an extension of the limited scope of signage already approved on the site. The wall signs are located on the building's west elevation immediately abutting John Nolen Drive and are located on opposite sides of a combination two-story window/doorway element at a height of 21-feet, a 25.4 square foot sign is located to the left of the window/door element with a 40 square foot sign located to its right side. The signage is not illuminated and identifies the building's tenants (Zone 4 Fitness and Physical Therapy Rehab Specialists). Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- The alignment of the wall signs as shown on the digital overlay versus the typical details are inconsistent in that the digital overlay features their alignment with the horizontal mullion of the upper window feature with the individual typical details noting their location as an off-set to the mullion, as well as the joint line on the façade of the building.
- Some Commission members expressed their preference for the signage location as detailed.
- Upon further discussion it was noted that the joint line could be considered as architectural detail which would limit the length and width of the proposed signage to be succinct with the area between the joint lines.
- Concerned with the internal illumination of the signage featuring an internally illuminated can.
- Both graphics could be modified to fit within the confines of the horizontal band between joint lines.
- Consider modifying the existing ground sign to meet signage needs without further consideration of wall signage.
- The signs will appear billboard line, especially at night when lit and will detract from the building.

## **ACTION:**

On a motion by Host-Jablonski, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0). The motion required address of the above stated concerns, in addition to looking at a sign package that integrates better with the architecture of the building, features backlit letters. If an internally illuminated can is to be further considered, minimize and flatten. In addition, look at modifying the ground sign as an alternative to the proposed wall signage.

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 3, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 710 John Nolen Drive**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	5
	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	4
	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	4
	-	-	-	5	5	-	-	5
	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	6
	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	3
	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	3

**General Comments:**

- Signs should not cross reveal lines.
- Sign is too boxy for the building and should be slim and less obvious as a box.
- Sign box too thick.
- Nice graphic. High expectation for gateway location.
- Signs seem like billboards; don't mess with good architecture.
- Inappropriate sign package that does not integrate at all with this building architecture.