

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: July 31, 2019

TITLE: 3241 Garver Green – Comprehensive Design Review for Garver Feed Mill. 6th Ald. Dist. (56485)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: July 31, 2019

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner*, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Rafeeq Asad, Tom DeChant, Cliff Goodhart*, Christian Harper, Jessica Klehr and Shane Bernau*.

*Wagner and Bernau recused themselves from this item. Goodhart acted as Chair.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 31, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a Comprehensive Design Review located at 3241 Garver Green. Registered in support of the project were Bryant Moroder and Mary Beth Growney Selene, representing Ryan Signs, Inc. The team has been redeveloping this historic site for the last five or so years. Moroder reviewed the history of the project and shared photos of the interior and exterior transformation. He reviewed each of the proposed signage areas, the site plan and elevation views. Architects were asked to incorporate the history of the site in their designs. He reviewed the sign designs and locations. Railroad ties removed from the ground are being used on the site, as well as other salvaged building materials.

The Secretary elaborated on the provided staff report. Zoning staff is generally supportive of the sign package, except for the main façade where there is a ghost sign and two wall signs, they asked for justification of so many signs on that elevation.

Growney Selene discussed appreciating the history of the building, which the legacy signs do. They are also helping their guests understand that there are multiple opportunities for entry into the building, in addition to two tenants that have quasi-private entrances. The first part of the building was built in 1906, neon was invented in 1902. While we don't find any pictures of neon, it's entirely possible there was some neon in this building. The Landmarks Commission spoke in favor of the neon as well as the canopy signage. The identity on this south elevation is the bike path where there is a tremendous impact on the focus of people on the path using this south entrance. The code talks about large buildings exceeding 125-feet in length; unfortunately we don't meet those qualifications for two wall signs. The size of the neon sign is less than half of the canopy sign, unfortunately it is not half the height. We are asking you to possibly consider this a pseudo-accessory sign. This project has also been reviewed and approved by the State Historic Preservation Office and the National Parks Service.

Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator noted that this is not an accessory sign. Staff's concern is that the decision is based on the standards for Comprehensive Design and what the ordinance says. Standard 2 talks about necessity due to unique and original design aspects.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Explain to me how the arched entrance will be used and what it leads to in the building.
 - They're both entrances into the common areas/public spaces of the building. There are two because it's a large building with multiple entrances.
- I can't tell how big the lettering is on the ghost sign. Does it fill that whole panel?
 - The photos give you a better sense. It says "Garver Supply Company." That will be repainted its previous iteration. The other signs will say Garver Feed Mill to address the different history of the building.
- I don't think you need three signs that say Garver.
 - It's about wayfinding. There's multiple entrances. It's making sure we're not crowding one door over another.
- I see references to a neon sign on the north side of the building but I don't see any pictures.
 - Yes, it's in there.
- It's just a duplicate of the same sign on the south side?
 - Yes. A little smaller.
- I guarantee there were no neon signs in previous iterations of this building.
 - Perhaps.
- I see on the north entrance you have "entrance" painted on glass above the doors. Were you intending to do that at the southeast entrance? If you really want people to feel they can go into both of them, instead of neon have another entrance sign to be consistent with the others.
 - With the canopy sign not being illuminated we do want identification visible after dark.
 - The canopy letters stick out about 8-feet; the neon will be flush to the building. There is no canopy where the neon sign is located.
- In terms of wayfinding, the two entrances on the south side are not that far apart. They are signed differently but not distinctly in terms of what is inside. I don't want you to come back needing directional signs toward certain tenants.
 - The two tenants on the west end of the south building each have their own entry as well as access to those tenants from the common area. They will have the capability of having exterior signage at those entrances, and those signs are code compliant.
- You're just talking about building signage, not identification? I don't mind the sign on the canopy but I don't think you need the ghost sign, the canopy and another lighted sign. If you put the entrance on the glass, that's a different story but to just keep calling out the name of the building seems unnecessary.
 - Having an illuminated sign is important. The one above the arch, there was one there originally so it gives attention to the history. I don't think it's that obtrusive. This is the historic façade of the building that the State cares most about.
- Is your intention with the ghost signs to paint them as they would have looked when they were done, or given a faux aged treatment?
 - It'll be more of the aged look.
- I think the building can handle an extra neon sign. I feel like you do need another clue of the second entrance but you need something to balance those two.
 - We'd be happy to drop the "Hello There" to make it more consistent.
- The argument says you need to know how to enter the building, these only identify the building, they don't say enter, which makes it unnecessary.

- It's a subtle queuing.

ACTION:

On a motion by Braun-Oddo, seconded by Klehr, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (3-2) with Braun-Oddo, DeChant and Klehr voting yes; and Harper and Asad voting no.