AGENDA#3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PRESENTED: April 9, 2008

TITLE: 1022 West Johnson Street – Construction **REFERRED:**

Signage – PUD(GDP-SIP) for a 14-Story, 163-Unit Apartment Building. 8th Ald.

Dist. (07295) **REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary ADOPTED: POF:

DATED: April 9, 2008 ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Bonnie Cosgrove, Richard Wagner and Jay Ferm.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 9, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** for construction signage – PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1022 West Johnson Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were James Miller of Ten Twenty Two, LLC; and Jim Johnson and Jon Heilmann of Stevens Construction Corp. Prior to the presentation staff noted that the Commission had previously granted the allowance for staff approval of the conventional sign package associated with the development of previously approved student housing on this site. The current consideration provides for the approval of a "temporary construction signage package" which emphasizes the development of project graphics to be located on an opaque fence wrap utilized to screen the construction site from the public pedestrian and vehicular traffic. The project graphics will emphasize required construction safety, as well as noting the range of contractors working on the site. Under the provisions of the Street Graphics Ordinance, normally a total of 144 square feet per street frontage is allowed. Since the PUD zoning on the property did not provide for the development of a project for construction graphics, staff has forwarded consideration of the sign package for formal consideration as an amendment to the approved PUD-SIP for Commission approval. Details of the construction site, fenced enclosure and combined graphics were provided for review, noting the various types of signage to be displayed. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- The color sample is more appropriate than detailed within the packet relevant to the fence wrap material.
- The "hard hat" graphic may be too large and should be located at the points of entry only. There should be no graphics at the street corner.

ACTION:

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2) with Wagner and Ferm voting no. The motion for initial approval with instructions that any utilization of a fence wrap graphic associated with any PUD development shall be formally submitted for Urban Design Commission approval for the next calendar year from the date of this approval. The fence wrap shall contain graphics which do not exceed 144 square feet per

street frontage with all other signage should be displayed within the limits to be at a similar appearance as those presented to be reviewed and approved by staff.

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, 5 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1022 West Johnson Street

| | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|----------------|-----------|--------------|-------------------|---|-------|---|------------------|-------------------|
| Member Ratings | - | - | - | - | 7 | - | - | 7 |
| | - | - | - | - | 7 | - | - | - |
| | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | 5 |
| | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | 5 |
| | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | - |
| | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | - |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

General Comments:

- Careful not to get too busy and advertise-y.
- Improved signage approach but question number of hardhats/Stevens signs.
- Muted color (brick tone versus red) is more appropriate.
- Screening is a good step. Make sure color is not the bright red shown in the renderings.
- Ballpark theme but the fabric is an improvement.