



October 11<sup>th</sup>, 2018

City of Madison, Planning & Zoning  
126 South Hamilton Street  
Madison, WI 53701

T 757.427.1900 x4105  
F 757.427.1900

10833 Valley View St  
Suite 450  
Cypress, CA 90630  
[www.AGI.net](http://www.AGI.net)

RE: at home Comprehensive Design Review

Dear Janine,

Enclosed is an application seeking a Comprehensive Design Review (CDR) approval for signage at a new 'at home' retail store. The request is related to an existing 'big box' retail store located at 7050 Watts Road, in the City of Madison. We are requesting CDR to place two (2) wall signs on the west elevation (main entrance), (1) wall sign on the north elevation (facing the freeway), (1) wall sign on the south elevation (facing parking lot), and one (1) pylon sign along the freeway to replace the current pole sign on the shared property with Walmart. All wall signs are comprised of individually illuminated channel letters.

The subject property is located on the north side of Watts Road, just west of Gammon Road. It is located directly to the south of WI-12 Beltline Highway. The property is a former Sam's Club warehouse retailer and is currently vacant. The property is situated at an angle and has frontage along both Watts Road and WI-12 Beltline Highway. The building itself is large, at 118,768 square feet. After our meeting on September 26<sup>th</sup>, 2018 and October 9<sup>th</sup>, 2018 our application has been revised and is attached.

The first portion of our request is in regards to two (2) wall signs that are being proposed on the west elevation of the building. This elevation is the main entrance for the building. We are seeking an approval to have (1) wall sign more than 4 feet above a roofline, and more than 120 square feet. This is sign #01. We are also seeking an approval for a second wall sign on the front elevation, which the Zoning Administrator has determined is not code compliant. In addition to the two signs on the front elevation we are also proposing (2) additional wall signs and (1) pylon sign that are all code compliant.

Sign #01, on the front house element, measures 7' tall (overall height) by 32'-11" long. By using the zoning code's calculation method of 2 boxes, the sign adds up to 179 square feet. Sign #02 would read 'The Home Décor Superstore' and would be placed to the left of the entrance house. This sign measures 2'-4" tall by 42'-1" wide for a total of 99 square feet.

The remaining portion of our CDR application are for (2) wall signs #03 & #04, and (1) pylon sign #06 which are all code compliant. Listed below is how our application relates to the Zoning Code standards for a Comprehensive Design Review:

1. The proposal shall create visual harmony between the signs, building(s), and building site through unique and exceptional use of materials, design, color, any lighting, and other design elements; and shall result in signs of appropriate scale and character to the uses and building(s) on the zoning lot as well as adjacent buildings, structures and uses.
  - a. All signs proposed on this building do create a visual harmony between themselves. They are all proportion in relation to the overall size of this large 'big box' retail building. The signage proposed is not different than what other big box retailers' use in their national branding storefronts.
  
2. Each element shall be found to be necessary due to unique or unusual design aspects in the architecture or limitations in the building site or surrounding environment; except that when a request for an Additional Sign Code Approval under Sec. 31.043(3) is included in the Comprehensive Design Review, the sign(s) eligible for approval under Sec. 31.043(3) shall meet the applicable criteria of Sec. 31.043(3), except that sign approvals that come to Comprehensive Design Review from MXC and EC districts pursuant to 31.13(3) and (7) need not meet the criteria of this paragraph.
  - a. For Sign #01 - the front entrance of an 'at home' storefront consists of a fabricated 'house element'. We are proposing a sign where the tallest letter, the 'h' reaches 7' tall. There are two exceptions to the code:
    - i. Roofline - when examining the individual letters proposed, a majority of the letters are at the 4' height limit above the roofline. Only the 't' and 'h' extend above the 4' requirement. The intent with this design is to keep it consistent with the zoning code but also the 'at home' branding standards.
    - ii. Size - when combining the three red boxes (attached brand book) to calculate square footage, the sign measures 179 square feet. While that is above the 120 square feet allowed it is under the 180 square feet allowed by granting a variance/CDR by the Urban Design Commission.
  - b. For Sign #02 - this is an 'accessory' sign that lists at home services. It is a set of channel letters that is to be placed on the left side of the house element and below the roofline. There is one exception we are seeking:
    - i. The Zoning Administrator has deemed that this sign does not meet the definition of an accessory sign because it does not list explicitly what is sold. That is simply not true. At home is a truly 'The Home Décor Superstore', and that is exactly what they sell, Home Décor. There is no other retailer out there with the same product line up and composition as 'at home'. While I know this store is new to Madison, once open you will see that accessory sign is describing what is sold.



3. The proposal shall not violate any of the stated purposes described in Secs. 31.02(1) and 33.24(2).
  - a. This proposal does not violate Secs. 31.02(1) and 33.24(2)
4. All signs must meet minimum construction requirements under Sec. 31.04(5).
  - a. All signs do meet the minimum construction requirements
5. The proposal shall not approve Advertising beyond the restrictions in Sec. 31.11 or Off-Premise Directional Signs beyond the restrictions in Sec. 31.115.
  - a. This proposal does not approve additional advertising for Sec. 31.11 and 31.115
6. The proposal shall not be approved if any element of the plan:
  - a. presents a hazard to vehicular or pedestrian traffic on public or private property,
  - b. obstructs views at points of ingress and egress of adjoining properties,
  - c. obstructs or impedes the visibility of existing lawful signs on adjacent property, or
  - d. negatively impacts the visual quality of public or private open space.
    - i. Our proposal does not do any of the above listed items.
7. The proposal may only encompass signs on private property of the zoning lot or building site in question, and shall not approve any signs in the right of way or on public property.
  - a. All signs proposed are on private property.

As you can see based on our reasons give above, strict adherence to the Zoning Code will result in an undue hardship for the subject property in related to signage.

If you have any questions or need anything else please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you!

**Jimmy Fuller**  
Project Manager

 **AGI**  
10833 Valley View St #450  
Cypress, CA 90630  
M 714.273.0776  
O 800.877.7868 ext.4105  
[jfuller@agi.net](mailto:jfuller@agi.net)