

## AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** May 16, 2012

**TITLE:** 700 South Park Street – PUD(SIP),  
Alteration to an Approved Signage Plan for  
St. Mary’s Hospital in UDD No. 7. 13<sup>th</sup>  
Ald. Dist. (26345)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

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

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** May 16, 2012

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, Todd Barnett, Melissa Huggins, Tom DeChant and John Harrington.

\*Due to a computer hard drive failure relative to recording of the meeting; this report is an abbreviated summary of the review by the Urban Design Commission.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 16, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of an alteration to an approved signage plan located at 700 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was Mary Beth Growney Selene, representing Ryan Signs, Inc. Growney-Selene provided an overview of the existing PUD(SIP) sign plan for the St. Mary’s Hospital campus, detailing the array of existing signage comprised of wall signage, identification and wayfinding signage. The amendment provides for an array of exterior, non-illuminated, projecting and wall mounted decorative and informational banners to create meaningful linkages with the community with messages involving St. Mary’s Mission Services, recognition awards, community history and seasonal displays. Growney-Selene provided a detailed overview of the proposed banners in contrast with existing signage. Following the presentation, the Commission’s comments were as follows:

- Need to base approval on an appropriate measurement; afraid of screening out the buildings.
- Remove use of trellises on Erin Street for banners.
- Amended sign package is way too much; banners on face of Erin Street façade are billboard like.
- Face mounted banners on Brooks Street a problem.
- If this revised sign package is similar to that approved for Meriter, want to review what was approved for Meriter and provide for a similar sign standard.

### **ACTION:**

On a substitute motion by Barnett, seconded by Harrington, the banner amendment sign package was **REFERRED** with the Commission stating that the concept may be alright if similar to that approved for Meriter, but they want to review the Meriter sign package in contrast with the proposal. The motion passed on a vote of (4-2) with Barnett, Harrington, Slayton and DeChant voting yes; and Huggins and O’Kroley voting no.

The substitute motion replaced a previous motion for approval on a vote of (4-2) with Barnett, Harrington, Slayton and DeChant voting yes; and Huggins and O’Kroley voting no. An original motion for final approval by Huggins, seconded by O’Kroley was replaced by the substitute motion.

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 is 5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 700 South Park Street**

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

General Comments:

- Perhaps a bit too much.
- Too much signage.
- Banners are too much - obscures a really nice set of buildings and their architectural aesthetic.