

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: September 2, 2020

TITLE: 1007 & 1027 Fish Hatchery Road –
Comprehensive Design Review in UDD
No. 7. 13th Ald. Dist. (60813)S

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: September 2, 2020

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Shane Bernau, Tom DeChant, Jessica Klehr, Syed Abbas, Christian Harper and Russell Knudson.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 2, 2020, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a Comprehensive Design Review located at 1007 & 1027 Fish Hatchery Road. Registered and speaking in support was Jake Bunz, representing Peloton Residences. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Brad Hubbard.

Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator introduced the project, noting that staff has struggled with this application relative to the standards; it needs more information and consideration from UDC. The overarching principle is this application lacks a lot of the detail and information typically included to allow staff to review it relative to the criteria. There are a number of exceptions to the Sign Code being requested: to allow for large address numbers higher up on the façade facing towards Fish Hatchery; these are additional signs beyond canopy signs which have already been permitted (the Sign Code allows a wall sign or in lieu, a canopy sign). Now they are asking to add address signs as additional wall signs. The Commission can approve this CDR including or excluding any signs. In terms of addressing, the City does see requests for overly large numbers that don't fit ordinances or what the Fire Department requires, and it is intended to be building signage at that large size. This is a long building with multiple "pods" that will be effectively addressed like any other multi-building site. The main issue with the signs are height, lack of contextual detail, and omission of renderings to relate to the immediate area. The adjacent medical office building on Park Street has addressing as a wall sign but no other signs, it's very ineffective, and it's an office building, not residential. It was approved under the old code, and since 2015 we've been using conventional signage districts and CDRs for exceptions. The application lacks detail showing visibility and graphics, it faces a parking ramp to the south and shared driveway, it is not facing an eligible parking area so it needs an exception. On the Park Street side, there are two commercial sections to this building: live-work units to the south and stand-alone commercial tenants on the first floor to the north. The live-work request is for both projecting and canopy, projecting underneath the sconces at grade less than 10-feet, which is probably fine in that they won't interfere with the pedestrian way. But they lack detail and we question why they need to be illuminated directly underneath lighting sconces. The tenant space further north gives no detail and the graphic doesn't seem to be correct. It lacks understanding of the space below, and we

don't know what we would be approving a permit for. The ground sign appears OK, although it is located within the intersection vision triangle and needs approval from City Engineering.

Jake Bunz spoke in support of the project. The building was built in phases as three separate buildings, the purpose of the wall signs is more of wayfinding for guests and deliveries because there are multiple entrances into the building, particularly 1027 on the south facade, the main entrance for Building D, which has a separate entrance. The canopy signs are 5 ½ feet off the façade, with projecting blade signage below that at 7'6" high, located out of the pedestrian way in a recessed area. He showed two non-illuminated options as they want to give tenants an opportunity to choose. The ground sign, used to distinguish the commercial tenants on the property, is 4-feet tall, and they did get approval from City Engineering today to be in the vision triangle.

The Commission discussed the following:

- How thick is that ground sign? That vision triangle is very critical. It's a concern to me and the neighborhood.
 - Five-feet wide at its widest point. It's on our property on the corner, 30 or 35-feet away from the street.
- There will be neighborhood reaction to that. Another concern is related to the live-work signage, I personally prefer one or the other, canopy or projecting, but both will feel very visually cluttered. I would prefer to see canopy signage and omit the blade signs.
- I agree with the projecting signs under the canopies. I'm certain that we wouldn't want to see those lit, also confident that they are unnecessary, redundant and would prefer the canopy sign alone. Maybe your tenants might want to use those spaces as cafes, they could have seating.
- I'm not entirely clear how much precedent matters, Exhibit H provides precedent across the street. Are those signs lit the way the number signs are lit in this project? Wonder if we have a good understanding of what the precedent is for having the address signs lit.
 - Those are not lit.
 - (Tucker) They may be halo lit.
- The number signs, they're so big. This is a very attractive building, people are going to know it by name. Not only the size but the placement, they should be smaller and should match, be lower. I'm not sure where you think these would be seen from. Seems all wrong. Concur with the signs on Park Street, having both projecting and canopy seems redundant, particularly given the smallish size of these buildings.
- That might go back to the comment from Matt about lacking context and detail. I'm not really understanding the experience coming up and down Fish Hatchery Road.
- I agree that canopy signage is preferable to wall blades. If they do blade signs then they should not be lit.
- I assume when we're looking at this elevation of 1007 there's an outline to show a signable area, correct?
 - Yes, outlining of designation of the signable area. The raceway is black.
- I don't think it enhances the building at all, I think it detracts. The positioning is very awkward, we don't know what that looks like in the daytime. I don't think they're effective, people are not looking up that high for an address. The 1027 illustration, are those signs on the canopy or are they on the building?
 - On the building.
- Why wouldn't they be on the canopy?
 - I wasn't a part of designing the signs in the beginning.
- It's inconsistent with what you're doing on the other side of the building and some other areas. When you're under that canopy you're not going to see those numbers. I would vote for those to be on the canopy themselves.

- Acknowledge that we're seeing signage on the windows and glass on the doors, it's already getting over-signed.
- There are five exceptions being asked for.
 - (Tucker) You could approve as submitted, refer any aspect for more detail, opine and make a finding of denial on some aspect of it. You don't need to make a decision if you feel you don't have the information. Give clear direction in that regard.

Ald. Evers, District 13 commented that less is more in the mind of many Bay Creek and Greenbush residents. Aesthetically this should be non-illuminated and not be obtrusive. The design of this building has a landmark quality, if someone is being directed to this building it will be easily identified. It's not necessary to use the existing base of the building to advertise it, modesty in this instance is called for.

ACTION:

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Braun-Oddo, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1) with Abbas abstaining. The motion provided for submittal of a reworked proposal that addresses the Commission's comments as follows:

- Add detail, particularly perspectives down Fish Hatchery Road and Park Street.
- Add daytime and evening illustrations of signage.
- Include a visual from Parr Street over the vision triangle with the sign in place.