

AMENDED REPORT

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: October 21, 2009

TITLE: Creating New Section 33.24(15) and Renumbering Current Section 33.24(15) to Section 33.24(16) to Establish Urban Design District No. 8 and Amending Section 33.24(11)(b) of the Madison General Ordinances to Move Properties From Urban Design District No. 4 to Urban Design District No. 8. (15783)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: October 21, 2009

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Dawn Weber, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, John Harrington and Jay Ferm.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 21, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED ADOPTION** of the ordinance amendment establishing Urban Design District No. 8 with further clarifications to its previous recommendation of adoption from its meeting of September 16, 2009. This item was re-referred back to the Urban Design Commission by the Common Council based on issues that required further clarification as a result of two conditions recommended by the Commission on the ordinance based on feedback by Assistant City Attorney Kitty Noonan. A provision of Section 33.24(15)(e)7.b.v. Guidelines was recommended to be modified to strike the “if necessary” language from its text that originally stated “franchise businesses may be required to modify their corporate designs, if necessary, to fit the district’s character” (see attached UDC report of October 7, 2009). Continued consideration of uniform standards for canopy trees on the street was referred to the Urban Design Commission meeting of October 21, 2009 to allow staff and the City Attorney to draft language based on input by the Commission. The draft language, which modifies the original language contained in Section 33.24(15)(e)5.a. and 33.24(15)(e)5.b. was presented to the Urban Design Commission for discussion at its meeting of October 21, 2009 and recommended for approval.

ACTION:

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED ADOPTION** of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0-1) with Barnett abstaining. The motion accepted both the revised language relative to “franchise businesses” on discussions by the Commission and uniform standards for canopy trees as follows:

- Section 33.24(15)(e)7.b.v., Guidelines shall be modified to read as follows: “Franchise businesses may be required to modify their corporate designs to fit “the District’s character.”
- Section 33.24(15)(e)5.a. and 33.24(15)(e)5.b. shall read as follows:

- a. Requirements.
 - i. The street face shall be dominated by canopy trees in both the building setback and the public right-of-way.
 - ii. The type, number and location of canopy trees in the building setback shall be coordinated with the type, number, and location of canopy trees in the public right-of-way.
 - iii. When planted, canopy trees shall have a caliper and height relationship consistent with the provisions of Table 1 in Section 1.2.1 of the American Standard for Nursery Stock (ANSI 260.1-2004).
 - iv. Terraces shall have a minimum width of ten (10) feet to accommodate growth of canopy trees.
 - v. If a public sidewalk is within six (6) feet of the public street, canopy trees shall be planted on the building side of the sidewalk.
 - vi. Unless existing infrastructure interferes, canopy trees shall be planted at a spacing of no greater than forty (40) feet on center.
 - vii. Unless existing infrastructure interferes, canopy trees planted along street faces, in parking lots, and parking lot islands shall have a mature height of at least sixty (60) feet.
- b. Guidelines.
 - i. Canopy trees should be located in all terraces and medians.
 - ii. When space permits, canopy trees should be located on both sides of the public sidewalk.

*NOTE: The “Summary” was consistent with the deliberation of the Commission on this item with inconsistencies previously reported within the “Action” section of the report requiring amendment.

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 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: UDD No. 8

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

General Comments:

- Language about trees in UDD #8 sets important precedent.