

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 10, 2010
TITLE: Review and Discussion of the Development Review Process Initiative- 2010, Initial Draft 10-18-10 and Economic Development Commission 10-20-10 Excerpts (18121)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: November 10, 2010	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner, Melissa Huggins and Henry Lufler, Jr.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 10, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **MADE RECOMMENDATIONS** on the Draft Development Review Process. Bradley J. Murphy, Director, Planning Division provided a brief overview of the options presented to the Commission. He stated that the Landmarks Commission and Planning Division staff have already reviewed the draft proposal. There is the possibility of forming a subcommittee to handle sign variances so the Urban Design Commission doesn’t have to take up their meeting time. Another possibility is to have one application for all meetings, i.e. the Plan Commission, Urban Design Commission and Common Council. The Planning Division would have to prepare their staff reports for both the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission. It is also suggested that ordinance amendments could possibly change the way administrative approvals are handled. It has not yet been determined what criteria is necessary to allow an application to be administratively approved. It is the hope of the Planning Division to have an applicant come before the Commission one time. Comments from the Commission were as follows:

- I have concerns with not having initial and final approvals. All the boards I’ve ever served on have had both. Most applicants don’t have the information required for final approval on their first visit.
- By giving initial approval and then final approval, we help projects become better in some ways. We can show the developer other methods of achieving their goals.
- Page 22, 2.a., uncomfortable with the façade grants being approved by staff. We’ve seen a lot of projects come through that have good intentions, but there are a lot of details that require attention and when City money is being used I feel uncomfortable about that being compromised.
- Page 23, projects involving landmarks; what if it’s in a common district?
 - There probably are landmarks in some Urban Design Districts. I don’t think there are any overlaps of Landmark Districts and Urban Design Districts. It doesn’t happen very often that both need to review a project.
- From an applicant’s perspective I think eliminating initial/final approvals would be disastrous. If an application is not fully supported at the initial level but changes are made when it comes back for final approval then it can be supported. It gives the applicant the confidence that their work is going to be fruitful.

- Page 24, implementation options number 2 for consent agendas; this needs a lot of discussion with the Commission as to who defines it now.
- At all the Mayor's neighborhood roundtable meetings, nobody supported getting rid of the super majority.
- How can you cover all the bases (neighborhood meetings, conditions met, etc.) if you take away initial/final approvals?
- We had a project that fit the space, was a really good design, about 90% of the way there, but there were issues with the other 10% so it needed to come back. I don't know how to be responsible and approve something so fast.
- There should be some connectivity with the UDC and the PC. Not a subset of conditions but maybe a commissioner who covers both commissions.
- Plans would need an extremely good staff review in order to put something on a consent agenda.
- The large scale of the mission needs to be revisited by removing small detailed things from the agenda; so the overall mission can be reaffirmed and our purview reminded.
- A review process generally can't be promised in just one meeting.
- The format of the condition letter feels very much like something that came out of the typewriter age.
- Part of this is balancing between the work of the Commission to improve projects and the work of getting things done in the community. You have to use a lot of discretion when you have a lot of power. To keep what's important and key; we've done that a little bit with signage.
- Making this process easier in some ways, and not just changing it is something we have to think about.

Following the discussion Brad Murphy noted the need for individual Commissioners to provide additional comments and feedback on the recommendations to staff relative to the Development Review Process Initiative.

ACTION:

The Urban Design Commission **MADE RECOMMENDATIONS** on the Draft Development Review Process.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: Development Review Process Initiative

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

General Comments:

- On the right track.