

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** August 23, 2006

TITLE: Adopting the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Plan and Recommendations Contained Therein as a Supplement to the City's Adopted Comprehensive Plan. 19th Ald. Dist. (03712)

REFERRED:
REREFERRED:
REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: William A. Fruhling, Acting Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: August 23, 2006 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Ald. Noel Radomski, Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Lisa Geer, Robert March and Michael Barrett.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 23, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED ADOPTION** of the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Plan and recommendations contained therein as a supplement to the City of Madison's Comprehensive Plan. Appearing on behalf of the project were Archie Nicolette (Planning Unit), Bob Steffan, Celest Regenberg, Mary Lindquist, Don Beelty and Bill Fitzpatrick. Regenberg and Steffan reviewed the process for developing the plan. The number one priority was improving the condition of University Avenue, which is in UDD No. 6.

- The Commission questioned whether the recommendation that any future "residential redevelopment must be at a height and scale that is compatible with and is sensitive to the built character of the neighborhood" (p. 35) was sufficiently clear. Regenberg stated that the Steering Committee wanted to allow developers some flexibility to be creative. She noted that the plan includes examples of what the neighborhood likes and what it doesn't like.
- The Commission liked the recommendations of a connector to Marshall Park and the emphasis on stormwater management through infiltration.
- The Commission suggested some text be added to the illustration on page 56 to emphasize a strong pedestrian orientation at the corner, such as a civic entrance to a building.
- Fruhling stated that upon adoption, the plan will become the City's policy for this area and at some point in the future, UDD No. 6 will be amended to reflect the plan's recommendations. Ald. Radomski would like this done soon.
- Ald. Radomski also noted the recommendation to create a Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District, once that ordinance is approved, for lakefront redevelopment.

ACTION:

On a motion by Host-Jablonski, seconded by Ald. Radomski, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED ADOPTION**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0).

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, 7, 7.5, 8 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: Spring Harbor Neighborhood Development Plan

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.5	7.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7

General Comments:

- A well-thought out and flexible plan.
- Very thoughtful plan. This provides good guidance for developers on how and where to direct their energies. Kennedy Place type development would be perfect here.
- Strong, well-conceived neighborhood plan, which seems to have good neighborhood consensus.
- Very good neighborhood plan.
- Impressive neighborhood participation.
- Great neighborhood plan. Encourage neighborhood to work with the City on updating the Urban Design District Guidelines, and to work with the City and County on the redesign and reconstruction of University Avenue.