

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** May 24, 2006

TITLE: Amending Section 33.02(4)(f) to clarify requirements and Sections 28.085(3)b.2., 28.09(3)(a), (b)4., (d)25., (4)(b)5. and Section 28.12(12)(a)4. to be consistent with Section 33.02(4)(f). Revision to Large Format Retail Ordinance. (03488)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: May 24, 2006

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 24, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of ordinance amendments to revise the provisions to the large retail ordinance. Speaking on behalf of the ordinance amendments were Bradley J. Murphy, Director of the Planning Unit, Department of Planning and Development and Rebecca Cnare, Urban Design Planner. Cnare spoke and referenced to the Commission several memos within the application packet (two from Ald. Golden and one from Bill Fruhling/Rebecca Cnare) that qualify the issues to be addressed with the collective amendments relative to defining convenience retail and associated parking standards, establishing a hardship clause, creating tiered parking requirements including a parking maximum and provisions for economic impact statements. Murphy provided further detailing on the proposed amendments as they relate to discussions on the issues at the Plan Commission level. Discussion by the Commission emphasized the following:

- No quantifiable standard on infiltration provisions; issues with inconsistency and lack of good information to evaluate and make decisions. Concerned that the new requirements for excessive parking does not have any associated metrics to guide the Commission on appropriate levels of landscaping, stormwater infiltration, etc., as specifically geared towards developing metrics for Section 33.02(4)(f)9.b.i. and 33.02(4)(f)9.b.ii.
- Problem is not with supply of parking but management of supply for example; shared parking provisions. Would like to see a shared parking option added to Section 33.02(4)(f)9.b.iii. as follows:

“...shall have a TDM Plan, a shared parking plan with adjacent parcels, or participation in a TMA...”

- Need to redefine existing parking lot standards for the amount, function, and location of landscaping. Examine larger issues of rethinking overall parking lot standards and landscaping/infiltration for retail development.
- Section 33.02(4)(f)9.b.iii. should include a provision that TDMs shall be reviewed by staff at a regular interval, every three years at a minimum, or with annual review.

ACTION:

On a motion by Host-Jablonski, seconded by Ald. Radomski, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0). The motion to refer, directed staff to meet with other City agencies (City Engineering and Traffic Engineering) to develop and create quantifiable standards in regards to Sections 33.02(4)(f)9.b.i. through 33.02(4)(f)9.b.iii. for stormwater infiltration and landscaping including providing for shared parking as part of a Transportation Demand Management Plan to be incorporated within the ordinance amendments upon further discussion and review by the Urban Design Commission.

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, 6 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: Section 33.02(4)(f)

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

General Comments:

- I'm glad that we can "combine" this good proposal with strengthening the parking lot design standards. Thank you, Alder Golden, for advancing this improvement.
- Incorporate our additional recommendations.
- The problem is not the actual supply of parking, even at minimums, the problem is managing it. Time shared parking is critical to provide an adequate supply while minimizing the overall asphalted footprint. Ultimately, this will save money for business, help our watersheds, and create walkable places.
- Big box – updating the parking lot standards to give these a quantifiable basis.