

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: May 11, 2016

TITLE: 7401 Mineral Point Road – Comprehensive Design Review for “Shopko.” 9th Ald. Dist. (42615)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: May 11, 2016

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Tom DeChant, Cliff Goodhart, Richard Slayton, Lois Braun-Oddo, Sheri Carter and John Harrington.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 11, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** a Comprehensive Design Review for “Shopko” located at 7401 Mineral Point Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Kathy Friedland-Howard and Chris Wrobel, representing Shopko.

Shopko is rebranding with a green color to differentiate from other retailers. They discussed the importance of creating consistency across all of their marketing, as well as the exterior and interior of their stores. The current sign is 249.47 square feet, condensing the size in scale with the building.

Secondary signage including ground signage and directional will not change structurally, just change out in color.

The Secretary noted that the painting of the façade is the “façade alteration,” which the Urban Design Commission provides a recommendation on to the Plan Commission or the Director of Planning. The signage itself reflects the change in the code that limits the amount of how big a sign can be on a building. Staff’s objection is that in looking at where the green color is to be applied, there are architectural features that limit that extent. The sign itself is big as proposed, but by painting the background green, it actually makes the sign more billboard-like and not in context with the existing architecture of the building. Signage should integrate with the façade rather than become the façade.

Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator remarked that the overall sign size on an establishment that is over 25,000 square feet in area is limited to 120 square feet per sign. The alternative is a variance to exceed the sign size by up to 50%. Requests for larger signs then require a Comprehensive Design Review. The directional signage is just a change of copy. It is necessary to make a finding that the seven standards of CDR are being addressed with the large wall signage.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Is there an option to eliminate the canopies over the doors, to retrofit those into signage rather than put brick in between?
 - Those are glass and metal structures. It would be difficult.
- As an alternative they could introduce an architectural feature that contains the new signage. The Green Bay example you gave us, the balance of the sign area to the amount of green on the one, and secondary it was framed in a color that matched the existing building. Even the one on Mineral Point Road has a masonry band and you're painting right over; I would encourage you to create an architectural feature on the building that you could then put the sign on. Painting concrete block primary green, I don't know that it will look good for very long.
- The signage is more proportional with the green.
- If you have that much green it would still be much larger than our signage code would allow for a signable area.
- So you're counting the green as signable area?
- They've presented it to us as part of their branding.
- Need to create an architectural feature to put the sign on.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Goodhart, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The referral noted the need to create an architectural feature to provide as sign backdrop as referenced in the examples by the applicant, and to come back with something incorporating architectural details along with a scale in context with the building's faced closer to a permissible sign area.