

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: September 16, 2009
TITLE: Creating New Section 33.24(15) and Renumbering Current Section 33.24(15) to Section 33.24(16) to Establish Urban Design District No. 8 and Amending Section 33.24(11)(b) of the Madison General Ordinances to Move Properties from Urban Design District No. 4 to Urban Design District No. 8. (15783)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: September 16, 2009	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Dawn Weber, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Ron Luskin, Richard Wagner and Jay Ferm.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 16, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMEND ADOPTION** of Creating New Section 33.24(15) and Renumbering Current Section 33.24(15) to Section 33.24(16) to Establish Urban Design District No. 8 and Amending Section 33.24(11)(b) of the Madison General Ordinances to Move Properties from Urban Design District No. 4 to Urban Design District No. 8.

Olinger summarized elements for new Urban Design District No. 8, which provides for the removal of properties from the existing Urban Design District No. 4 to the newly created design district in order to facilitate the implementation of the East Washington Avenue Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan adopted by the Common Council in February of 2008. Olinger detailed some of the plan's aspects against the provisions for the newly created design district, which was followed by discussion with the Commission as follows:

- Consideration of the issue of stormwater management based on districts on both publicly held and privately held lands, which could provide for enhancement of area wide stormwater management. Olinger noted the plan's emphasis is on redevelopment and revitalization of the East Washington Avenue corridor as reflected within the provisions of the design district where existing stormwater management enforced by the City Engineering Division are the basis for stormwater management within the area. He further noted that the issue of site specific stormwater management can be evaluated with consideration of individual projects within the corridor and design district. Continued discussion noted that underground storage facilities will be more feasible in the Isthmus than in the district.
- Continued discussion noted the need for uniform standards for canopy trees within the required setback along the East Washington Avenue corridor. The uniform standards should include minimum height, maximum height, standard spacing and size relevant to canopy trees on the street face.
- Issue with the use of shall and should within the provisions were discussed, questioning areas of appropriate use. Staff noted that the specific statements utilizing shall and should were more distinctly qualified within the text for "Basis for Design Review" section of the ordinance.

ACTION:

On a motion by Luskin, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED ADOPTION**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion provided for the following modifications:

- The "Landscape and Open Space" provisions in Section 33.24(15)(e)5.a. shall be amended to address the need for uniform standards for canopy trees on the street face to establish a minimum and maximum height, standard spacing and size in order to provide a street face dominated by canopy trees.
- Section 33.24(15)(e)7.b.v., Guidelines shall be modified as follows: "Franchise businesses **may be required** to modify their corporate designs, if necessary, to fit the District's character.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 6, 7.5 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: UDD No. 8

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.5

General Comments:

- Looking forward to seeing the results.
- A long process. UDD #8 reflects the discussion of where height is appropriate. Add more language about trees.