

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

**REPORT OF:** URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** January 12, 2022

**TITLE:** 5045 Eastpark Boulevard - Signage  
Exception. 17th Ald. Dist. (68502)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Kevin Firchow, Acting Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** January 12, 2022

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Shane Bernau, Russell Knudson, Craig Weisensel, Christian Harper, Jessica Klehr, Christian Albouras and Rafeeq Asad.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of January 12, 2022, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a signage exception located at 5045 Eastpark Boulevard. Registered in support was Kathryne Kippes, representing La Crosse Sign Group.

This item was approved as a consent item with the finding that all applicable standards are adequately addressed and with all the staff recommendations contained in the report.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Klehr, seconded by Braun-Oddo, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0).

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** January 12, 2022

**TITLE:** Adopting the Greater East Towne Plan as a supplement to the Comprehensive Plan and directing staff to implement the recommendations contained in the plan. (68802)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Kevin Firchow, Acting Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** January 12, 2022

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Shane Bernau, Russell Knudson, Craig Weisensel, Christian Harper, Jessica Klehr, Christian Albouras and Rafeeq Asad.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of January 12, 2022, the Urban Design Commission

Bill Fruhling, Principal Planner with the Planning Division reviewed the plan and the Commission's clarifying comments from the informational presentation. The plan has been refined

Future development

New street connections

Wide variety of uses

Allow East Towne area to evolve into a more dense area of development

Whole purpose of plan to provide framework for this area to evolve into its next iteration over the coming decades

Comp Plan RMU Regional Mixed-Use in mall area, Community Mixed-Use, General Commercial. Provide roadmap for this to develop into a multi-use complete area with residential uses, commercial and office uses, parks and open spaces. Key recommendations of Comp Plan was to prepare plans like this for both West Towne and East Towne malls. See these as areas that could see significant change. Common Council adopted the Odana Area Plan in September of 2021, this follows.

Proposed future land use map and street network for this area. Trying to break down very large chunks of land to enhance connectivity and provide a more developable block pattern. Some of these blocks can be broken down even further, particularly in the more residential areas. Trying to identify those important street connections, wanted to provide a flexible framework to accommodate a variety of development patterns. Don't want areas to be dominated by any one type of use or development.

Tried to concentrate higher densities and more intense uses closer to the BRT stations. Also reflected in maximum building height map. Specific recommendation to revise UDD No. 5 to implement the design

recommendations in this plan, including the design elements appendix, as well as expand the boundaries to Interstate, consider expanding south to include some key sites. The Zoning Code also includes provisions for transit-related overlay districts for possible interplay between the UDD requirements and the TOD requirements. Plan recommends to consider utilizing the TOD development as necessary to implement some of the land use design and transportation goals if not adequately addressed in UDD No. 5 requirements. At this point those are not known; keep open the possibilities of using those tools. Current boundary shown, proposing extending all the way to the Interstate, also may be key sites south of E. Washington Avenue that may not have frontage but may be determined to be key sites. Want to be sure UDC gets the opportunity to review those developments and that they are in line with UDD 5 requirements. These would get started in 1-3 years.

Introduced at council January 4, visiting boards and commissions this week, recommendations made will be advisory to plan commission who will consider this plan on February 7, council consider adopting on February 7.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Adoption does not automatically mean rezoning of these districts?
  - Does not, but plan recommends which districts could change, to proactively rezone these properties but the adoption of the plan itself does not do that. It is a separate process.
- UDC reviews rezoning applications?
  - No just PC and ultimately Council. Likely the proactive rezonings would occur before changes to UDD No. 5.
- Any thoughts about dedicated park and ride infrastructure?
  - The idea has been around for a number of years, even before the BRT discussion. But not specifically come up in this discussion. The TPPB considered this plan but they did not raise that issue.
  - The BRT route will extend past East Towne and there are park and ride lots in those areas.
- Perhaps if it's done thoughtfully
  - There's enough in this plan that if there was a park and ride facility it would be in some sort of structure. One of the goals of this plan is to get rid of large surface parking lots.
- Any thoughts about key sustainability ideas that are pertinent to this particular area?
  - Green and Resilient chapter of the plan has the obvious sustainability recommendations. The approach we take is like many comprehensive plans, sustainability is one of the core values of this. Because that is part of our approach to plans now, when we have everything from the land use patterns to the transportation networks and building heights, all of that is looked at with an eye towards making a more sustainable place in the long run. There are recommendations, particularly on Page 39 of the plan, that talk about all kinds of energy efficient buildings, plant types, kind of a greatest hits on that page.
- School districts, good portion of the proposed residential area would be in the Sun Prairie School District. Would a school come into this area, how will families get to those schools?
  - We have had discussions with the MMSD and the Sun Prairie School District. Basically that whole area east of Zeier Road is in the Sun Prairie School District and a long way from the schools. They have no interest in putting a new school in this area; it was left that the school districts will continue to talk, but right now there are no plans to change that school district boundary or build a school in this area.
- Your new zoning map would permit a school in one of the areas shown?
  - Absolutely.

- Follow-up on the building height map related to the view corridors to the Capitol? You can see it from I90/94 through most of this stretch.
  - We did talk about that more as a team after the comments here at UDC. Going back to the Comp Plan for guidance on that reinforced the focus of view corridors on streets that are generally aligned with the Capitol and from public places like parks, but not when you're driving down the Interstate at a high rate of speed, looking to the side to see it. That wasn't consistent with the Comp Plan focusing on those premier corridors and big opportunities.
- Is this an opportunity to talk about refining UDD No. 5?
- (Kevin) The updated UDD 5 itself will be a separate effort that the UDC will be a lead on. We'll be revisiting that schedule in the coming months. Originally staff wanted to look at the standards, if there is a recommendation as part of that process to expand the boundaries. This would be setting the table for it.
  - When we established UDD 7 on S. Park Street, there are some areas that had some big development potential without necessarily fronting S. Park Street. The boundaries are not solely those with that frontage. We're not looking for a big land grab but want to think strategically about how things may develop in the future when we get to that point.
- Would UDC have input on changes permitted heights before the changes to UDD No. 5 would be presented to us?
  - The UDC would play a key role in revising the Urban Design District. If we determined that the best way to implement the proposed maximum building heights was to specify those building heights and specify those within the boundary of the district you would have an opportunity to weigh in.
- I was hoping the height map wouldn't be baked into the zoning district and go by the UDC process.
- (Kevin) Unlike the downtown districts, there is typically a maximum height allowed by right with additional height as a conditional approval. Just changing the zoning is not as specific as the downtown height map.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Knudson, seconded by Klehr, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL** of the plan. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0).

Suggest UDD 5 be extended to the Interstate for those properties fronting E. Washington Avenue, and UDD 5 wrap south for the identified buildings that are 8-stories or more. Clarify: not sure we want to specifically change any boundaries or regulations in UDD No. 5, the motion would be a recommendation for future consideration. The motion signals an intent to the Plan Commission and our acceptance of the motion that the district would be expanded and come more in compliance with this new plan.