

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 16, 2005	
TITLE: Ordinance File I.D. 02207 Adopting and confirming the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan	REFERRED:	
	REREFERRED:	
	REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED:	POF:
DATED: November 16, 2005	ID NUMBER:	

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 16, 2005, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL** of Ordinance File I.D. 02207, adopting and confirming the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan. Appearing on behalf of the plan was Michael Waidelich, Principal Planner; Rick Roll, Planner IV; and Rebecca Cnare, Planner II. Discussion on the plan centered around its "Land Use, Volume II-Recommendations" as follows:

- Page 2-17, Objective 19: Voiced support for this objective, concerned that we have been seeing some "leapfrogging" over undeveloped land with some new developments on the west side.
- Page 2-36 Objective 48, Policy 3: Concerned that the statement that "The greater the height-to-width ratio the better" needs to have some limitations attached to it, otherwise one could potentially end up with canyons like downtown Chicago. Need to have some optimum height-to-width ratio standards.
- Page 2-37, Objective 48, Policy 6: Statement "Architectural styles,...should relate to a common vocabulary of materials and scale" is too restrictive in that it implies, a broadscope uniformity of materials and style. This may be desirable for a locale, neighborhood, or district, but is certainly not intended on a citywide scale.
- Page 2-37, Objective 48, Policy 7: "Prohibit" is too strong of a statement. There may be some corporate designs that are of good design and would be viewed as desirable or acceptable in some locations.
- Page 2-39 to 2-40: It was noted that the transportation component of the Land Use Chapter may conflict with the Transportation Chapter.
- Page 2-61, Objective 87, Policy 1: "Flexible Building designs" needs clarification. Building codes requirements may conflict with trying to convert a building designed for residential to commercial use. Discussion clarified that there is precedent in buildings designed for first floor commercial use with residential above, but that the first floor gets used as residential initially until there is a demand for commercial use. This could be clarified in the text.
- "We are playing chicken with our neighbors to see who can get to the greenspace first. I would like to see very significant open/greenspace between communities." Would like to see two versions of the peripheral area map; the existing map, and an additional one that illustrates best-case scenarios of open space agreements.

In response to the discussion on these elements, staff provided supportive information and details contained within the text of the plan document with any necessary clarifications and concerns provided by the Commission on the plan to be further explored with Plan Commission consideration of the draft plan.

ACTION:

On a motion by Geer, seconded by Host-Jablonski, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL** of the ordinance. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0). The motion recommended approval of the ordinance with the above stated comments, concerns and clarifications.

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 Commission did not apply the ranking process to this consideration.