

**City of Madison
Plan Commission Meeting
August 11, 2005**

City of Madison Draft Comprehensive Plan (May 2005)

Land Use and Urban Design Questions and Comments Received

1. Should the Comprehensive Plan include a comprehensive mission, vision and values that lay a foundation for everything else?

Staff Response: This is an issue that merits further discussion with the Plan Commission. Given the magnitude and scope of the Comprehensive Plan, it is difficult to draft a vision or mission statement that adequately covers the major issues in a manner that is not so general that it is meaningless.

2. Where, if anywhere, should City of Madison peripheral growth occur?

Staff Response: The ability of the City of Madison to grow in a highly planned, sustainable manner is crucial to the economic, social and fiscal health of the entire region. Studies such as Rusk's "Cities Without Suburbs" make a compelling case for the need for central city growth. The City has limited growth options on its periphery. Long-term westside growth is constrained due to intergovernmental boundary agreements. Other boundary agreements and incorporated jurisdictions limit City growth on the south. The primary potential City growth areas not already covered by a neighborhood development plan are located on Madison's east side. The 2005 Peripheral Planning Areas map (Volume II Map 2-4) designates various areas as either: Group 1, Group 2, Group 3, or Park and Open Space. It is anticipated that most short-term (1 to 5 years) growth will occur in areas where neighborhood development plans already exist in Group 1 areas, given their proximity to existing development and urban services. Group 2 areas are generally suitable for City of Madison expansion and urban development, but not expected to begin within the next 5 years. Group 3 areas are recommended to remain in agricultural uses with no urban development expected to occur within the foreseeable future. Some of these lands may never develop, neither in the City of Madison, nor in adjacent municipalities. The City is interested in studying these planning study areas, but is not willing to concede them to other jurisdictions for development. Park and Open Space areas

generally follow environmental corridor boundaries and are intended to remain permanent open space.

3. The City should attain $\frac{3}{4}$ of Dane County growth rather than $\frac{1}{3}$.

Staff Response: Projected City growth reflects regional population trends incorporated into county and municipal projections. The location of future growth is determined by many factors including market demand, annexation, availability of urban services, green space, etc. Staff feels that the City should strive to attain no less than $\frac{1}{3}$ of Dane County population growth. It may be desirable, although difficult, for the City to attain more than $\frac{1}{3}$ of Dane County's population growth. Most of the neighboring jurisdictions want at least some growth to occur in their communities, in some cases, substantial growth.

4. How do we handle proposed map changes that result from developer's proposed projects that are currently being discussed with City staff?

Staff Response: The Plan Commission will need to guide staff about which changes it would like made to the proposed Future Generalized Land Use Plan maps. These areas include lands where ongoing discussions are occurring between City staff and property owners. Generally, developer's proposed uses for these areas are very conceptual, but may be significantly different than the proposed uses for the site as designated in the draft Comprehensive Plan.

5. How do we handle proposed map changes based on comments from neighboring jurisdictions (e.g. McFarland) or City staff comments (e.g. the need for more Employment districts)?

Staff Response: Staff requests that the Plan Commission direct staff on whether or not such changes to the Future Generalized Land Use Plan maps are desired.

6. What status do adopted neighborhood initiated plans, neighborhood development plans, and special area plans have in the context of their relation to the Comprehensive Plan?

Staff response: This is an ongoing question given the sheer number of plans and studies in the City. Some of these plans are adopted as part of the City's "master plan", others are "accepted", while others are "supplements" to the master plan and still others are neither adopted, accepted or supplements. The State's Smart Growth Law requires all plan chapters (elements) to be consistent with all other chapters. This is a significant problem to be solved in Madison since there are currently no set standards regarding what must be in these plans (e.g. consistent land

use categories, densities, design guidelines, goals, objectives and policies), or how they should be adopted (as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan?) The City will strive to address these issues, but it will need to work carefully with neighborhoods, and other organizations as plans are prepared by or for (e.g. consultant prepared plans) these organizations to ensure consistency in plan content, adoption process, relationship to the Comprehensive Plan, etc. The City will add text to the Comprehensive Plan that recommends the amendment process for the Plan and for other plans.

7. How should neighborhoods associations, planning councils and other organizations be created and what role should they have in the development review process?

Staff Response: This issue is currently being discussed and has been an area of confusion for all involved. With so many “planning bodies” and plans that are sometimes inconsistent with other plans for the same area, which ones are or will be components of the Comprehensive Plan? See Volume II Page 2-21 for existing goals, objectives and policies related to this issue.

8. Should objectives and policies that recommend adopting traditional neighborhood development and transit-oriented development zoning ordinances be included in the Comprehensive Plan?

Staff Response: This question is addressed in the draft Comprehensive Plan document (see Volume II Pages 2-12 Objective 6, Policy 1; 2-23 Objective 28, Policies 1 and 2; on Page 2-135, etc.)

9. Grandview Commons is not a good example of how new neighborhoods should be designed. The scale is wrong, lots too large, too much parking, streets too wide, and no interconnection with surrounding development on a ped-bike scale.

Staff Response: Staff disagrees with this comment. Grandview Commons incorporates many of the elements of the types of neighborhoods the City is encouraging. The City can learn much from this development and continue to improve and expand on this model of traditional neighborhood development.

10. Add a policy (page 2-12 Objective, Policy 3 that includes street sidewalk and paths that are interconnected with adjacent areas and create a “pedestrian-bicycle grid” throughout the City.

Staff Response: The Plan addresses this issue in various locations, for example, see Page 2-22 Future Neighborhoods Goal; Page 2-25 Objective 31, Policy 5; Page 2-26 Objective 33, etc.

11. What should be done to improve the urban design process as it relates to streamlining it or making it more efficient?

Staff Response: The City is looking at the issue of providing “better customer service”. This issue is too specific for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan. Approval of the urban design process should be studied by the Urban Design Commission, City Council, and other boards and commissions. The City should establish and maintain an easy to understand, timely, and consistent development review process.

12. Should we add a goal “Require integration of single family and multi family houses on every block”?

Staff Response: Staff agrees, with the exception of requiring the integration on “every block”. Also, see Volume II Pages 2-23 and 2-24 Objective 30, Policies, 1 and 2; Pages 2-25 Objective 32, Policy 5, and Pages 2-103 – 2-107.

13. Should Volume II Map 2-5 “Potential Redevelopment and Infill Areas” be changed to exclude Mansion Hill, Third Lake Ridge, Langdon, and First Settlement?

Staff Response: Map 2-5 is a conceptual map that should not be interpreted on a lot-by-lot basis. Not all areas shown within the conceptual bubbles are recommended for redevelopment or infill. A note can be added to this area to clarify where redevelopment or infill development would be desirable, if anywhere. Also, the introductory text that explains the map can be revised to better state the intent of the bubble redevelopment/infill areas. Further, neighborhood plans or special area plans should address this issue in detail. Finally, it should be noted that the draft Comprehensive Plan does address the issue of protecting historic resources (including neighborhoods). See Volume II Objective 52, Policies 1, 2 and 3, for example.

14. Should the land use designation for the Old University Avenue-Campus Drive area? be Community Mixed Use (CMU) for the entire corridor?

Staff Response: The detailed public comments regarding proposed land use, density, building height, design, etc, for the blocks along Old University-Campus Drive area should be addressed in neighborhood or special area plans. This area is now designated Community Mixed Use, High Density Residential Medium Density Residential and Low Density Residential (see Volume II Map 2-2a).

15. What should the land use, urban design, etc. recommendations be for the East Washington BUILD area?

Staff Response: These issues will need to be addressed in neighborhood and small area plans. Care should be given to making sure that new plans are consistent with recently adopted plans for the same area. Small area plans should be consistent with other City adopted plans for the area unless there is some compelling reason to make new recommendations. Also see 4. and 6. above.

16. Should the recommended maximum height of buildings in the Bassett Neighborhood (6 stories) be changed to 4 stories?

Staff Response: City staff believes it would be appropriate to reduce the maximum building height from 6 stories to 4 stories, given the typical building heights in this neighborhood and recommended in the Downtown Advisory report. Building heights for specific areas of the City should be addressed in neighborhood or special area plans.

17. Should research parks, industrial parks, etc. be designated on the draft Future Generalized Land Use Plan maps as “mixed-use” areas rather than employment areas, industrial areas, commercial areas, etc.?

Staff Response: The draft Comprehensive Plan recommends the creation of mixed-use developments that are significantly different in size, scale and “feel (urban versus suburban)” than most employment centers in the Madison area. This issue will require additional discussion given the range of opinions on it. See Volume II Page 2-42 Objective 61, Policies 1 and 3; and Page 2-45 Objective 65. The recommendations for employment centers and industrial areas are intended to provide ancillary, nonresidential uses to serve area workers.

18. Should no permanent boundaries be established for the UW campus?

Staff Response: The draft Comprehensive Plan recommends that the City and UW work together to plan for the edges of the campus in addition to other issues. City staff has been meeting with UW staff to discuss the UW Campus Master Plan and the City’s Comprehensive Plan and how to coordinate the two plans. Also, see Volume II Page 2-30 Objective 40, Policies 1 and 2.

19. Should Park Street be more than a “Health Care Main Street”?

Staff Response: The draft Comprehensive Plan recommends a variety of land uses along Park Street. These uses are depicted on Volume II Map 2-2f. Also, see the explanatory notes 23 & 24 for more detailed information

about the Park Street-Fish Hatchery Drive area. There are a number of planning efforts underway (by various groups) for the Park Street-Fish Hatchery Drive area. One of the challenges in drafting the Comprehensive Plan is how to mesh together these individual plans.

20. Should new interchanges be constructed on the Madison area's interstate highways to facilitate economic development?

Staff Response: A new interchange on IH 94 around Gaston Road is proposed in some City plans. This interchange would greatly improve the potential for creating a large employment center on Madison's east side. At this time, given the proximity of such a facility to the Badger Interchange, it seems unlikely that the Wisconsin Department of Transportation would approve a new interstate interchange on IH 94 on the east side of Madison. Further, some comments feel that this would lead to urban sprawl.

There has been some discussion of constructing a partial interchange at IH 39/90/94 and Hoepker Road to provide more direct and convenient access to the Dane County International Airport from the interstate highway system.

21. Why hasn't a school site been included in the Elderberry Neighborhood Plan?

Staff Response: The City works with area school districts as plans by the each entity are prepared. Future schools are planned in neighborhoods adjacent to the Elderberry Neighborhood.

22. The terms "principles," "standards" and "guidelines" should be defined and used consistently.

Staff Response: Staff agrees and will revise the Plan as necessary.

23. It would be useful to provide in one place a more complete list of the subjects urban design standards and guidelines should each address, such as site design, sign control, lighting, window use and shapes, landscaping, utilities, access controls, special design themes, etc.

Staff Response: Staff will look at ways to accomplish this. Also, detailed standards and guidelines may be included in neighborhood plans and special area plans. Finally, a new zoning code may include urban design guidelines and standards.