

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: October 21, 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: October 21, 2009

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 21, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED ADOPTION** of the ordinance amendment establishing Urban Design District No. 8 with further clarifications to its previous recommendation of adoption from its meeting of September 16, 2009. This item was re-referred back to the Urban Design Commission by the Common Council based on issues that required further clarification as a result of two conditions recommended by the Commission on the ordinance based on feedback by Assistant City Attorney Kitty Noonan. A provision of Section 33.24(15)(e)7.b.v. Guidelines was recommended to be modified to strike the “if necessary” language from its text that originally stated “franchise businesses may be required to modify their corporate designs, if necessary, to fit the district’s character” (see attached UDC report of October 7, 2009). Continued consideration of uniform standards for canopy trees on the street was referred to the Urban Design Commission meeting of October 21, 2009 to allow staff and the City Attorney to draft language based on input by the Commission. The draft language, which modifies the original language contained in Section 33.24(15)(e)5.a. and 33.24(15)(e)5.b. was presented to the Urban Design Commission for discussion at its meeting of October 21, 2009 and recommended for approval.

ACTION:

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED ADOPTION** of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0-1) with Barnett abstaining. The motion accepted both the revised language relative to “franchise businesses” on discussions by the Commission and uniform standards for canopy trees as follows:

- Section 33.24(15)(e)7.b.v., Guidelines shall be modified to read as follows: “Franchise businesses may be required to modify their corporate designs to fit “the District’s character.”
- Section 33.24(15)(e)5.a. and 33.24(15)(e)5.b. shall read as follows:
 - a. Requirements.

- i. Landscaping within the East Washington Avenue setbacks and terraces shall follow the approved palette and design concept, which includes uniform standards for canopy trees on the street face to establish a minimum and maximum height, standard spacing and size to provide a street face dominated by canopy trees on private property as well as the public right-of-way.
- b. Guidelines.
 - vi. Where feasible canopy trees should line all terraces and medians.
 - vii. Canopy trees that mature at 60' or higher are to be utilized along street faces (major) and in parking islands and parking lot edges that align streets unless conflicts with existing utilities or infrastructure preclude.
 - viii. Canopy trees shall be planted at a spacing of no greater than 40' on center; where infrastructure permits.
 - ix. Trees shall be planted at a minimum of a 2 ½ caliper or larger with full sized oval to rounded form consistent with the provisions of the American Standard for Nursery Stock (ANSI 2 60.1-2004) Section 1.2.1 relevant to Type 1 Shade Trees.
 - x. Consideration shall be given to double lining shade trees using both sides of the walkway when space permits.
 - xi. Where possible walks along terraces shall be setback 10' to allow canopy trees adequate area for growth. If walks are within 6' of the street, canopy trees should be planted on the side of the walk opposite the street.
 - xii. The ratio of trees shall be coordinated between canopy tree plantings within the public rights-of-way and private property within the setback.

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 7 and 7.

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								7
								7

General Comments:

- Language about trees in UDD #8 sets important precedent.