

## AGENDA # 8

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** August 14, 2019

TITLE: 120 E. Lakeside Street – Signage  
Exception in UDD No. 1. 13<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist.  
(56978)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: August 14, 2019

**ID NUMBER:**

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of August 14, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a signage exception in UDD No. 1 located at 120 E. Lakeside Street. Registered in support of the project was Luke Severson. Registered in opposition was Ald. Tag Evers, District 13. The applicant is asking for an 80 square foot sign to replace the existing larger sign, where the maximum in UDD No. 1 allows for 40 square feet. It meets the setback for John Nolen Drive and meets the zoning ordinance.

Ald. Tag Evers registered as opposed; the applicant did not reach out to the Alder or the Bay Creek Neighborhood Association. He is opposed to an illuminated sign for a 9-5 business.

Ron Shutvet registered in opposition, noting that this would create an unfortunate precedent and invite other daytime businesses to request illuminated signs.

The Commission discussed the following:

- I was surprised that there is nothing about illuminated signs in UDD No. 1 guidelines.
  - UDD No. 1 doesn't specifically talk about lighting specifically; the Zoning Code does allow for illuminated signs.
- It appears that the signable area is significantly larger to allow for the graphic of the sign. What would the signable area be if it just said "Gallagher." Is that closer to 150%?
  - Likely yes, we'd end up closer to 150%.
- Just to confirm, the Vandewalle sign is not changing at this time?
  - Correct, just Kelly Financial.
- That wall sign is also oversized by UDD standards?
  - Yes.

- What concerns me is the lit side is the part that faces the residential area, not John Nolen Drive. Scale-wise it will look odd if the Vandewalle sign stays and the Gallagher shrinks to the allowable. But the lighting aspect concerns me. If the Gallagher were unlit but larger I could accept that.
- I would concur that it looks kind of ridiculous at the smaller sign, even without the Vandewalle sign. If it wasn't lit at all, or if it was backlit I would have no problem approving this tonight at the larger size. The fact lit is an issue.
- The letter from the neighborhood notes that the present sign is 2" thick but the new one is 4", is that because they would be illuminated?
  - Correct.
- The other sign that's staying, is that lit?
  - No there's no other lighting on the other signs.
- I agree, I would approve the larger sign unlit without the logo, then it's in keeping with the other one and it's balanced.
- Vandewalle and Kelly have their logo within the overall height of the letters, it kind of pops out.
- Backlit is a lesser evil but I would opt for no lighting.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Asad, seconded by Klehr, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion provided for an increase in sign size, without illumination, and the logo within the size of the letters at 2" thick.