



# City of Madison

City of Madison  
Madison, WI 53703  
www.cityofmadison.com

## Meeting Minutes - Approved URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

---

Monday, December 7, 2009

5:00 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.  
Room LL-130 (Madison Municipal Building)

---

### CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

**Present:** 5 -

Marsha A. Rummel; Bruce F. Woods; Richard L. Slayton; John A. Harrington and R. Richard Wagner

**Excused:** 5 -

Mark M. Smith; Dawn O. Weber; Todd R. Barnett; Ronald S. Luskin and Jay B. Ferm

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### BUSINESS BY MEMBERS

#### Discussion of Meeting Protocol and Procedures

On initiation of discussion, Woods noted that eating during the meeting by members was a distraction on the proceedings as well as discourteous to applicants in the public. In addition, speaking out of order, interruptions of the presenter and/or speakers was noted as getting out of hand. Further discussion by the Commission noted the following:

- When speaking don't interrupt during presentation, it lengthens. Need to let speakers finish.
- Presentations by applicant should not be interrupted by questions. Members should write down questions for later. For big presentations, let public speak after presentations with Urban Design Commission deliberation to follow; let body deliberate on its own business separately.
- For projects such as the Edgewater, limit public comment; strict enforcement of the three minute rule.
- Limit but allow adequate time for presenters beyond three minutes. Suggest a time keeper for the presenters. Allocate a known time period for each item but need to extend time period supported by making a motion in a succinct period of time to focus on issues necessary for address.
- Be more concise with review and deliberation; determine which projects don't need as much time and minimize review.
- Limit Commissioner remarks during deliberation to two opportunities.
- Make motion deliberately to focus issues, amendments will disclose any lack of consensus on a motion. The order on any one item should be the presentation, registrants from the public speaking/questions, with one round of questions by the Urban Design Commission, where questions in order start with the next person over on each rotation of initiation of questions by the Chair around the table, which should be followed by a motion which limits the Commission two chances to speak.
- Maintain issue under discussion to questions and limit to prescribed areas such as landscaping, site plan, architecture, etc.

- Control and eliminate chatter from the public gallery.
- The Commission should be more stuffy or formal about behavior at the meeting.
- Once a motion is made the order of discussion shall be centered around site planning, architecture, landscaping with traffic and other issues on the project at the discretion of the Chair.
- Eating at the table should be eliminated.
- If a member has to eat, decide which item he/she could step out on and eat outside of the meeting room.
- Food and eating discourteous to applicants and public.
- Limit eating period to the portion of the meeting dedicated to approval of the Minutes only section and the posted break time. Adherence and consideration of these rules of order are noted at the Chair's request.

### **SPECIAL ITEM OF BUSINESS**

1. [15932](#) Adopting and confirming amendments to the Madison General Ordinances as set forth in attached Exhibit F pursuant to Sec. 66.0103, Wis. Stats. to revise the City's Zoning Ordinance.

#### **This Ordinance was Rereferred to the Urban Design Commission**

To initiate discussion of the Zoning Code Rewrite, staff noted the previous issues as contained within the special meeting minutes of October 28, 2009. Tucker noted the need for the Commission to provide for the continued orderly discussion of each of the sections of the Zoning Code as an amendment, noting any issues with any requirements requiring more attention. Tucker noted upon complete review of the zoning amendments, he noted that the Commission should attempt to summarize provisions of concern and make a recommendation to the Plan Commission on necessary modifications based on its discussion. Woods noted the need to thoroughly review each section in an orderly fashion and make any comments necessary on a page by page and section by section basis. A review of Section 28.061 General Provisions for Mixed-Use in Commercial Districts noted the following:

- The design standards as previously noted need flexibility. Tucker referenced the waiver system within the ordinance on Page 37, which was commented on as needing more work.
- Non-street facing façades allow and encourage blank walls, needs to be amended.
- The "compliance and feasible" references on Page 37 need to be reworded to be more clear.
- The table 28D-1 on Page 39 relevant to building materials has issues with encouraging the use of vinyl siding; it was felt it should not be allowed at all. The language needs to be stronger to note UDC required projects required adherence to a higher standard. High quality materials should exclude the use of vinyl. The table should be amended to eliminate the use of vinyl as indicated within the chart. Provide an asterisk to note that vinyl siding is not on the list of materials.
- The use of vinyl should require UDC approval.
- Use of reflective glass or spandrel glass should be allowed more extensively.
- Don't like mirrored glass.
- Metal panel OK as a base/bottom of a building material.
- Fiber cement panels should also be OK as a base/bottom of building material.
- Brick size should be differentiated standard versus Gnormous brick sizes (standard versus utility for example). Encourage use of standard brick versus large, should be based on some coherence in brick size based on context with existing buildings.
- Reflective glass should be shown as an innovative element of a superior design.
- Relevant to P.3 [Design Guidelines](#) on Page 39, Tucker noted that the current draft document not within the packet is now being modified to provide for barrier free provisions.

- Relevant to Section 28.06(2) Neighborhood Mixed-Use District on Page 48, the exhibits should be of comparable scale.
- Build-to lines for fixed frontage eliminate option for street trees. Tucker noted the issue could be addressed with mapping fixed frontages to allow for street trees.
- Relevant to Section 28.063 Traditional Shopping Street District:
  - o Adjust building placement based on width of available terrace. Less terrace, more setback, more terrace, little to no setback. Need to incorporate sidewalk width to interplay with setback requirement.
  - o Need flexibility but want buildings to hold corner.
  - o Need real data to guide setback requirements for fixed versus flexed frontage as provided on Page 51, P. 6, Frontage Requirements.
- Relevant to Section 28.065 Commercial Corridor-Transitional District:
  - o Need to provide references that require four-sided buildings beyond the primary street side façade.
- In conclusion of the discussions, Tucker noted the importance of getting back from comments from referral bodies in order to report and share with the Plan Commission and the public at a future public hearing.

## ADJOURNMENT

**A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Wagner, to Adjourn at 7:12 p.m.  
The motion passed by voice vote/other.**