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THE ISTMUS 2020 COMMITTEE REPORT

A Guidebook for a Model Isthmus

When we look at the most beautiful towns and cities of the past, we are always impressed by a feeling that they are somehow organic.

This feeling of "organicness" is not a vague feeling of relationship with biological forms. It is not an analogy. It is instead an accurate vision of a specific structural quality which these old towns had ...and have. Namely: Each of these towns grew as a whole, under its own laws of wholeness...and we feel this wholeness, not only at the largest scale, but in every detail: in the restaurants, in the sidewalks, in the houses, shops, markets, roads, parks, gardens, and walls. Even in the balconies and ornaments.

Christopher Alexander et al.,

Section I: Introduction

The Isthmus 2020 Committee's Charge

The Isthmus 2020 Committee was created to study future population and employment trends in Madison's Isthmus. These future population and employment trends were critical considerations during the VISION 2020 Dane County Land Use and Transportation planning process.

Construction of new buildings in the Isthmus often poses special challenges. There is relatively little vacant land. Land and construction costs are higher than for land readily available on the edge of communities throughout Dane County. Demolition of buildings, the appearance of new buildings, and public subsidies are often controversial. The Committee's job was to assess these challenges as well as the opportunities for development and then project what portion of the County's expected population and employment growth can be absorbed by the Isthmus.

The Committee concluded there is a strong untapped market for additional housing in Isthmus neighborhoods but only if this housing is built in ways that are consistent with traditional neighborhood qualities that enhance the Isthmus as a place to live. Our report is a guidebook for how this can be done.

Population Projection and Related Assumptions

In response to our charge, we concluded that an additional 4,500 housing units could be built in the Isthmus by the year 2020. This projection was based on the following important assumptions.

1. Real estate market opportunities exist in the Isthmus now and will continue to exist in the future to meet housing needs of first-time homebuyers, established homeowners, an aging population, and a diverse group of renters who want to live in an attractive urban setting.

Appendix A contains Isthmus data on building permits, renovation, and residential assessments. The data suggest that there is strong market acceptance of new units, significant investment in existing units, and substantial increases in the market-based value of existing units, particularly single-family units.

2. New housing development must improve the character of neighborhoods, not just increase density. Recognition of
existing neighborhood character helps gain necessary support for public and private actions needed to build additional housing. It will also build confidence that these neighborhoods are and will continue to be good places to live. Confidence that things are improving, if only modestly, is necessary to create a market demand for additional housing.

3. Good locations exist where new housing can be built in a way that will complement and enhance existing residential neighborhoods. It is important that an aggressive effort to build additional housing not require extensive demolition of housing that is perceived to be valuable to a neighborhood.

Possible locations where additional housing can be built include: the Yahara River corridor; both the east and west rail corridors; near Campus, particularly to the south of Campus; Downtown around the Capitol Square, either on the Square or within a few blocks of it; and the Bassett Neighborhood. Appendix B generally illustrates these possible locations. Above and beyond the possibilities we identify, additional good infill opportunities will be identified by property owners, neighborhoods, the City or others if we create a clear understanding of what is acceptable new housing development that also reflects a market need.

Although we have not considered specific South Madison locations for additional housing, we believe opportunities for new construction and renovation exist and can play a role in improving perceptions of this area as it has for others. For example, City supported projects such as renovation of the "Four Yellow Houses" on Williamson Street into cooperative housing nearly two decades ago helped change the perception that Marquette was a declining neighborhood.

Employment Projection and Related Assumptions

We concluded that an additional 14,000 jobs can be accommodated in the Isthmus by the year 2020. At the same time, the Committee concluded that additional roadway capacity through the Isthmus is limited. Many roads are now congested. High job growth will require more use of and investments in transportation modes other than automobiles. The City, Dane County, the State of Wisconsin, the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and the private sector will need to be partners in achieving the targeted employment growth and related transportation solutions. The State of Wisconsin should be commended for the location and construction of the Department of Administration building on East Wilson Street and the new court building on West Washington Avenue. The State should continue to agglomerate its facilities in the Central Business District.

The continued growth of employment in the Isthmus is an important element in maintaining downtown vitality, strengthening Isthmus neighborhoods, and promoting transit systems with either urban or urban and regional service. But improvements in mass transportation, particularly the rail transit alternatives, need to be made to make the Isthmus an even more attractive business location. New construction for offices and other uses to provide space for employment growth will need to be reviewed in conjunction with parking, roadway capacity, and access to transit service and to bicycle and pedestrian amenities. Although new and existing development in the rail corridor may ultimately be served by rail transit, this service will not likely occur for some time. In the interim period before any rail transit is operative, new developments -- both within and outside of the rail corridor -- should be promptly and adequately served by bus and fully integrated into the bicycle and pedestrian networks.

Light or high-tech industries with low impacts on neighborhood design and the architecture of the existing built areas could be appropriate in parts of the Isthmus to keep a mix of jobs and
income available in the City and the region. Commercial and industrial areas should primarily be located with concern for transitional design and low impacts on neighborhoods. Several recent projects along the rail corridors have shown good reuse of land and increased the employment numbers for the area, as exemplified in the table below.

The first floors of buildings in neighborhood main street areas can provide local residents with retail goods and services; office and residential space could be provided, either singly or in combination with each other, on the upper floors of main street buildings. Some small-scale commercial and office uses can intermingle with residential uses as described later in this report's section on the Physical Attributes of Traditional Neighborhoods on page 8. Well designed projects for Isthmus office and commercial space have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>ESTIMATED NO. EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>LOT AREA (Acres)</th>
<th>YEAR OCCUPIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreet Industries²</td>
<td>60-65</td>
<td>931 East Main Street</td>
<td>Office, Light Industry</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Administration (DOA)</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>101 East Wilson Street</td>
<td>Office (Primarily State Offices)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Co. West Rail Corridor Development³</td>
<td>830-1,000</td>
<td>600-700 Blocks of Regent Street</td>
<td>Office and Retail</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>1992-1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority (WHEDA)</td>
<td>Approximately 500-700, Pending Further Analysis</td>
<td>201 West Washington Avenue</td>
<td>Office (Primarily State Offices)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonic Foundry⁴</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>754 Williamson Street</td>
<td>Office, Light Industry</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Madison, Department of Planning and Development, Planning Unit, TAV, 1997.

Footnotes:

¹ The Isthmus Rail Corridor is defined here as that area within 1/4 mile of an existing rail line that transects the Isthmus.

² This was formerly the site of the Greyhound Bus Depot.

³ This development on the north side of Regent St. between W. Washington Ave. and Murray St. consists of four adjacent developments by the Alexander Company. The fourth and final building of the agglomeration is presently under construction. At full buildout, the entire four-building development should contain about 830 - 1,000 employees.

⁴ Sonic Foundry will be moving to this site from the Madison Enterprise Center (MEC) once renovations are complete at the new site. Sonic Foundry anticipates expanding even more over the next 12 to 18 months in terms of both physical area and in the number of employees.
been successfully absorbed by the market and are generally compatible with existing uses. On-street parking in main street areas, including the Central Business District, is critical to the commercial success of these areas and should not be removed, even in the face of increasing roadway congestion levels and increasing pressure to utilize the parking lanes for expanding roadway capacity. Some temporary removal from limited, selected routes during peak hours only may be tolerated, but its wholesale elimination is highly discouraged.

Isthmus residential growth will create additional local market demand for household serving businesses. Some entrepreneurs may be expected to operate home-based businesses or seek locations within their neighborhoods, adding to the employment opportunities. Potential employment - generating, infill redevelopment space in residually zoned areas of the downtown could be increased by eliminating backyard parking. Backyard parking should be removed from residually zoned areas of the downtown.

Rail a Key Element in the Future Regional Employment Growth

Improvements in mass transportation, particularly the rail transit alternatives, will make the Isthmus location more attractive as a business location. Many who now consider driving and parking in the Isthmus a significant business disincentive for certain operations need to be persuaded that alternatives to congested roadways and difficulty parking will be provided. Enhanced transit service, creative parking programs, and the construction of appropriately sited and designed parking facilities are examples of ways in which access to downtown businesses can be improved.

Developing an enhanced and attractive mass transportation system linking the Isthmus with other activity centers and residential neighborhoods throughout the metropolitan region is another alternative means of facilitating access to downtown businesses and is essential to encouraging the recommended employment growth for the Isthmus. Without such a system, further employment growth will only present greater roadway congestion during rush hours.

The Committee believes that rail transit provides the greatest opportunity to maximize the Isthmus' central position and function in the region. Rail transportation could be particularly attractive if employment-generating activities are developed in the areas along the present rail corridors. Since additional roadway capacity is limited in the Isthmus, adding regional passenger rail service to the existing rail corridors is one good way of increasing the region's overall transportation capacity. Passenger rail service will need to be coordinated with freight rail service in the same corridors. Preserving the existing employment-generating land uses along the rails corridors, and attracting future employment-generating land uses to the corridors, will lend support to the viability of rail as a transit option. The rail corridors are a regional resource that serve both the Isthmus and the larger area.

SECTION II: RATIONALE

Why Build Additional Housing in the Isthmus?

Building additional housing in the Isthmus addresses many important public policy goals.

1. New housing development is part of a strategy for building stronger neighborhoods or new neighborhoods in locations where the neighborhood fabric is weak or non-existent. For example, the South Campus neighborhood is a weak neighborhood that would benefit from additional housing development at key sites. At other locations, there is a substantial amount of underutilized land that can be
productively used for residential infill development. The portion of the Bassett Neighborhood bounded by Bedford Street, Proudfit Street, and West Main Street now has a mix of housing and commercial development without a distinct neighborhood character. It would greatly benefit from additional housing development.

Very little of this land is readily available for development today. Its development for housing is feasible only in the context of credible plans with strong public support.

2. **New housing development in the Isthmus is a cost effective use of the existing infrastructure including the transportation network.** New households in this area will drive fewer miles on average and use non-auto modes of transportation more than new households at other locations. Additional residents in the Isthmus can usually be well served by existing transit service without costly extensions.

3. **New housing development can help maintain integrated schools.** Public schools that serve the Isthmus have a mixed population by income and race. New housing suitable for families with children can help maintain a stable school population.

4. **New housing development supports businesses and street life in the Downtown.** The quality of a worker's or a visitor's experience in the Downtown and Campus area is greatly affected by an attractive, safe urban setting. As long as the Isthmus is a good place to live, it will be a good place to work and do business. Walkable streets, main street settings, and the businesses that thrive in them, historic buildings, and stable neighborhoods make attractive destinations. Madison should follow the lead of those villages and small cities around the State that are capitalizing on the appeal of attractive main streets.

---

**All Neighborhoods as Good Places to Live**

...the overriding rule requires only one thing: that every act of construction, every increment of growth in the city work towards the creation of wholeness.

Christopher Alexander et al., p.29

Committee members respect the full variety of good, attractive neighborhoods existing throughout the City. We recognize that all residential neighborhoods have basic requirements that need to be understood and valued by their residents and others. Our report describes many of these requirements for Madison's older neighborhoods. Newer neighborhoods have similar needs for relating well to surrounding areas and for good pedestrian, bike, and transit connections. We have not addressed neighborhoods outside the Isthmus because it was quite appropriately not part of our charge. In the future, perhaps a similar committee process can be established to take a comprehensive look at other areas of the City. Appendix C depicts the boundaries of Isthmus neighborhood associations.

---

**The Isthmus As a Good Place to Live**

...an urban process can only generate wholeness when the structure of the city comes from the individual building projects and the life they contain, rather than being imposed from above. Wholeness only occurs when the larger urban structure, and its communal space, spring from these individual projects.

Christopher Alexander et al., p.249

The illustration on the following page depicts the Isthmus 2020 Study Area.
ISTHMUS 2020 STUDY AREA

LOCATION KEY

1. Eagle Heights
2. Glenway Golf Course
3. Forest Hill Cemetery
4. Edgewood Campus
5. Vilas Park/Zoo
6. Camp Randall & Field House
7. Bascom Hill
8. Memorial Union
9. Monona Terrace
10. State Capitol
11. James Madison Park
12. MG&E
13. Breese Stevens Field
14. Tenney Park
15. East H.S.
16. Oscar Mayer
17. Olbrich Gardens
18. Kohl Center

Prepared for the Isthmus 2020 Citizens' Advisory Committee by the City of Madison Department of Planning and Development, TAV, January, 1997.
At this time, over 70,000 people live in the Isthmus study area. The boundaries of the study area roughly correspond to Madison's older traditional neighborhoods.

Our recommendations convey a consistent message: The future growth and vitality of the Isthmus lie in respecting the original traditional neighborhood qualities of Isthmus neighborhoods and in keeping a continuous pedestrian character for the Isthmus as a whole.

The Committee's recommendations flow from a strong appreciation for many of the existing conditions in Isthmus neighborhoods. These conditions are based on the fact that these traditional neighborhoods were platted before the advent of the automobile. The early City was designed for the convenience of pedestrians. The major modes of transportation were walking, horses, and, eventually, the streetcar. The streetcar, like transit today, was an extension of the pedestrian mode. One must walk to the stop and walk from the streetcar to one's destination.

In these neighborhoods, the pre-automobile design of houses and apartments on small lots continues to benefit neighborhood residents and the broader community. Continuous sidewalks and a street grid system provide many connections to the surrounding community. Neighborhood main street areas are close to residences. Major places of employment are nearby.

These traditional neighborhood features create a pedestrian-oriented environment that encourages people to use non-automobile forms of transportation. Isthmus residents do so in fairly large numbers. The 1990 Census data in Appendix D, Figures 1 and 2, reflect this in the high number of Isthmus residents walking, biking or riding the bus to work.

During the 1950's and 1960's, traditional neighborhoods like those in the Isthmus were often considered obsolete. In some cases, major renovation was prohibited by zoning codes intended to shorten the life of non-conforming houses that did not meet "modern" setback requirements for front, rear, and side yards. Mortgage financing for non-conforming houses was difficult to obtain. Reinvestment necessary to renew older housing stock did not occur.

Madison's planning and development practices have evolved over the past twenty-five years to accept and, in many cases, actively support the traditional neighborhood features of Isthmus neighborhoods. Much of this evolution has been driven by City-supported neighborhood plans and by the rejection of development projects and public works projects that were not acceptable.

The future vitality of urban areas with small residential lots and apartments lies in our ability to keep them attractive places to live or, in some cases, to make them attractive places to live. Frequently, we understand what our own neighborhood needs to remain a good place to live, yet we continue to see other neighborhoods as our traffic corridors. We lose sight of their primary importance as places to live. To help remedy this common form of myopia, our report includes a description of what physical attributes contribute to the viability of older neighborhoods. Understanding these physical attributes will help us apply the same sensitivity to other people's neighborhoods that we intuitively apply to our own.

All will benefit if we can do a better job of clarifying what qualities we want to preserve and enhance in Isthmus neighborhoods. New Urbanists have helped us understand what these qualities are. These traditional neighborhood attributes and our recommendations for reinforcing them follow.
The Physical Attributes of Traditional Neighborhoods

Walkable Size and Density: The central feature of traditional neighborhoods is their walkable size and pedestrian character. Architectural character, parks, gateways, defining views and neighborhood "main streets" all contribute to walkability.

Neighborhoods should be compact, pedestrian-friendly, and include mixed-use areas. Many activities of daily living should occur within walking distance, allowing independence for those who do not drive, especially people with disabilities, the elderly and young. Pedestrian character has a positive impact on transit use making it easier and more pleasant to get to the bus stop and to wait for the bus.

Density is measured in dwelling units per acre. Density and neighborhood character together determine the walkability of a neighborhood. Appendix E attempts to convey the general concept of density; it contains examples of residential densities throughout the Isthmus.

Neighborhood Boundaries, Edges, and Gateways: Boundaries are fundamental to any geographic place. What is a neighborhood without boundaries? Boundaries are more than lines on a map. They are defined by our ability to perceive that we are moving from one distinct place to another.

Clear edges between residential and non-residential uses within a neighborhood can give a sense of stability to a neighborhood with a mix of uses. For example, residential neighborhoods adjacent to major institutions will be more stable if there is a clear edge between the different uses. Mixed-use areas, such as the Williamson Street and Monroe Street commercial areas, need to be clearly defined in relation to residential areas. Commercial uses benefit from being clustered. Homebuyers don't want the duplex next door to suddenly become a carryout or an active office use, but many people want to live near attractive commercial uses. Few want to own a house next door to an isolated commercial use.

Gateways, like boundaries, also make for a well defined place and they enhance the perception of transition from one place to another. "A gateway can have many forms: a literal gate, a bridge, a passage between narrowly separated buildings, an avenue of trees, a gateway through a building." (Christopher Alexander, A Pattern Language, p. 277.)

Street Grid Patterns and Narrow Streets: Street grid patterns provide a connected network providing a variety of routes. This helps disperse neighborhood traffic so no single street carries heavy traffic. Alternate routes are available for pedestrians and automobiles. Narrow streets with shade trees slow down traffic.

Mix of Uses and Neighborhood Main Streets: Isthmus neighborhoods ideally mix the full range of human activities: living, learning, working, playing, creating, and worshipping. Many non-residential uses may be clustered in a neighborhood center or on neighborhood "main streets." Mixed-use areas tend to be on the edge or at the center of neighborhoods. They provide nearby goods, services, and employment consistent with a neighborhood main street character. Typically, most housing is in a residential district adjacent to the main street area with its mix of uses. Multi-family housing may be on top of commercial uses in a main street area, adjacent to a main street area, on the neighborhood edge, on arterial streets, or mixed with single-family housing in a neighborhood with multi-family zoning.

Diversity of Housing: Traditional neighborhoods show us how it is possible for neighborhoods to be designed in a way that encourages different types of people to live in close proximity. Isthmus neighborhoods often have a range of housing types: small and large single-family homes and two-flats, multiple unit buildings, and businesses with apartments above. This mix of housing types
creates a natural setting for income diversity. A broad range of housing types and price levels can bring people of diverse ages, races, and incomes into daily interaction, strengthening the personal and civic bonds essential to an authentic community. In Madison, lakeshores and historic houses attract more affluent residents. Neighborhood "main streets" often have relatively affordable apartments above retail uses and nearby.

Parks and Community Places: Common places, where neighbors can meet, help define the character of a neighborhood. They may include neighborhood schools, neighborhood grocery stores, restaurants, community centers, places of worship, bike paths, parks, community vegetable gardens, or sidewalks.

Defining Views: These are key visual references at the heart of a neighborhood's identity and character. A defining view can be almost any physical feature of a neighborhood that is special: a beautiful bridge, a favorite streetscape, a cluster of historic buildings, a park and pleasure drive, or a picturesque park.

Historic Character and Design: With the physical proximity of buildings, traditional neighborhoods rely on architectural continuity to create a pleasing environment. Historic character can provide the necessary continuity. Where there is not a historic architectural character, there is still a need for elements of architectural character to knit the neighborhood together.

The Isthmus As A Good Place to Work

There are many positive aspects to working in the Isthmus. The choice of jobs is diverse, the transportation options are varied, and the amenities for noontime and after-work entertainment and cultural activities are numerous.

Employment growth in the Isthmus should be broadly based to attract a wide variety of business enterprises with varying scales of operations and employment situations. Many of the historical reasons that employment was concentrated in the downtown and in the nearby rail corridors no longer apply. Yet some of those reasons, such as major transportation linkages and location in proximity to major institutions like State government and the University, still remain.

Businesses will locate and grow in the Isthmus because they choose to do so. Prompting the choice are its attractive setting near the lakes, its easy walkability, unique and interesting shopping, a wide range of professional services, entertainment and recreational options, dramatic public spaces, attractive neighborhoods, and efficient multi-modal transportation.

One of the good things about working in the Isthmus for many individuals is the relative ease with which people can walk or ride
a bike to work. Current and historic design features facilitate the use of multiple modes of transportation. The grid street pattern with extensive sidewalks, bikeways and bus lanes makes easy commuting for the majority of Isthmus residents who choose ways other than driving alone as their primary way to work. Census data show that the Isthmus has the largest number of commuters who ride their bikes to work, and even more people walk to work than those that bike.

Once employees arrive downtown, there should be some sort of efficient means of getting them around the downtown area. Localized downtown circulators, similar to Local Motion and the Monona Terrace Trolley, will be required to get people around if they need to get out and about without an automobile before, during, or after work hours. Madison Metro's Free Fare Zone concept has been quite successful and should be continued and perhaps expanded as new development occurs.

SECTION III: RECOMMENDATIONS

Isthmus 2020 Recommendations for the Isthmus as a Place to Live

1. Planning, zoning, public works, and development in existing and new neighborhoods in the Isthmus should complement and reinforce existing traditional neighborhood features. The Isthmus was platted and built with narrow grid streets and small lots. Earlier street patterns, street widths, lot widths and lot sizes should be permitted and encouraged. Small lots allow for small scale development, small investors, and more affordable housing.

   Full alleys, similar to those in the Vilas neighborhood, and partial alleys, similar to those by the Wilson Bay Apartments, should be encouraged. Alleys increase the supply of off-street parking for residents and use less land for driveways. Garages may be placed at the rear of yards creating a usable backyard with privacy and enclosure rather than one dominated by a driveway and garage.

   A variety of narrow street types should be allowed including smaller courts such as Cantwell Court and Feeney Court. Carriage houses, particularly on alleys, should be allowed.

   There are a wide variety of good examples of traditional Isthmus housing including the Carpenter Building, the Bellevue Apartments, Norris Court, and the Marquette Neighborhood bungalows.

Frontal criveways are neither present nor needed in areas served by alleys, as is shown in this example from the Vilas Neighborhood.
Zoning staff, as a priority, should look at ways that the current zoning text discourages owner occupants in downtown residential neighborhoods. The application of newer lot size, setback, and yard requirements to older, established neighborhoods imposes extra procedural delays and irritations on homeowners trying to do something as straightforward as replacing a back porch or building a garage. As recommended in the City Land Use Plan adopted in November 1985, the zoning text should ‘permit new building’ and changes to existing ones ‘to be regulated by the bulk standards (setbacks, etc.) prevailing in that neighborhood at the time its development was substantially complete, rather than the standards applied in newly-developed areas’.

R2 is the zoning for single-family neighborhoods in the Isthmus today. Many residential lots in the Isthmus are smaller in width and area than are allowed in the R2 district. In many cases, owners need to obtain a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) to add a room.

The ZBA’s State mandated standards are not very useful for determining whether or not renovation is appropriate in Isthmus neighborhoods. For example, State statutes indicate that variances may be granted when "a literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance will result in practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship" and the statutes permit a building "which is reasonably necessary for the public convenience and welfare." At best, these are vague standards. Property owners are frequently frustrated with a process that is unpredictable and doesn’t suit their needs. Often homeowners must hire experienced professionals to navigate the ZBA process. Unfortunately, this expense is most burdensome for those homeowners with the least resources.

2. Zoning ordinances should be changed to allow building setback requirements similar to those in place for each Isthmus neighborhood when it was built. Some of Madison's oldest neighborhoods were built without setback requirements and in these cases requirements should resemble the historic built environment.

Establishing new and appropriate setback requirements will be a challenge. Different neighborhoods may need different setbacks. Within neighborhoods, there is likely to be substantial disagreement about the right solution. Complex new regulations may require scarce staff resources.

This recommendation is not a new one. The 1988 Report of the Owner-Occupied Housing Task Force included the following recommendation:
An assumption is sometimes made that it is good if building additions in older neighborhoods are difficult because it keeps housing in these neighborhoods more affordable. This idea may be rooted in the common assumption that it is inevitable and even useful for housing quality and values in older neighborhoods to decline.

The City should not discourage investment in neighborhoods with smaller lots and older, more affordable housing. Turn-of-the-century housing needs reinvestment to extend its life. It is expensive to maintain and heat unless it has been renovated. The large amount of rental housing in most Isthmus neighborhoods ensures a mix of incomes. Investment in run-down housing builds confidence in low-income and mixed-income neighborhoods where affordable housing is most likely to be found.

Permissible building additions should be determined by neighborhood character, not by a plan to discourage investment in certain types of housing stock. Reasonable limits for lot coverage should exist for all properties regardless of value. This is fair and equitable treatment of different property owners and types of neighborhoods. Rather than arbitrarily limiting investment in certain neighborhoods or certain types of houses, we should try to expand the supply of small, single-family housing units. For example, our report recommends extensive development of townhouses in the Isthmus. This can be one way to build relatively small, affordable housing units.

In this regard, our review of the new R2S zoning district indicates that this district would not be compatible with single-family neighborhoods in the Isthmus because it permits too much lot coverage in rear yards. Single-family neighborhoods in the Isthmus typically have larger rear yards than R2S zoning requires. We would expect any adjustments for Isthmus zoning to require larger rear yards than the R2S zoning district. This incompatibility raises a question about the suitability of R2S zoning for new neighborhoods as well. Appendix F provides an illustrative comparison of the allowable buildable area on lots in three different zoning districts: the residential districts from 1922 and the current R2 and R2S districts.

There are at least two different ways to solve the problem posed by setbacks required in the R2 zoning district. Both require changes to the zoning code. One would be to create a new zoning district or districts which precisely define reduced building setback requirements. This one size fits all approach has potential drawbacks. Could neighborhoods agree on the size?

Some things which intuitively seem acceptable at a given location would most likely still not be permitted in the interests of preventing problems at other locations. For example, building very close to a lot line may be acceptable in some cases and clearly unacceptable in others. The big advantage to simply requiring narrower setbacks is that only a building permit would be needed.

Another solution would be to set up a process similar to that of the ZBA with appropriate standards written into the zoning code. Many people do not understand why the ZBA cannot make common sense, site-based decisions on setback requirements. (The answer is State law does not authorize them to do this.) It may be feasible to have a different body authorized in the zoning code to do just that. Or it may be possible to have site-based decisions made by administrative review.

Finally, one might consider a combination of these two solutions: Adjust the setbacks to more closely reflect the setbacks in place when individual Isthmus neighborhoods were created and leave a discretionary area where decisions would be made on a case-by-case basis.
The Isthmus 2020 Committee recommends that a committee be created to work with City staff to analyze the approaches described above so that their implications can be understood by the full range of Isthmus neighborhoods and Council members. This committee should recommend a solution for implementation after a study process that includes extensive involvement of Isthmus neighborhoods and Council members.

3. **The City should adopt a neighborhood "main street" approach for key neighborhood commercial streets in the Isthmus.** In small communities and in urban neighborhoods throughout the U.S., main streets are coming back. The Wisconsin State Department of Commerce has a successful Main Street Program geared toward small communities. The national Main Street Program on which the Wisconsin program is based is now being successfully used in urban neighborhoods. The Main Street Program's principles can be adapted to Madison's neighborhood main streets. Appendix G identifies the location of some Isthmus areas that could benefit from a main street approach.

Some Main Street activities require the active support and participation of property owners and businesses in the form of a business association. Others, such as zoning and public parking, are primarily City responsibilities and can be pursued in the absence of a strong business association. We propose that the City develop a comprehensive and systematic main street approach that addresses its own activities in priority commercial areas as well as what the City can do in cooperation with an active business association.

Earlier in this century, main streets served the basic retail and service needs of neighborhoods. People now buy a larger proportion of goods and services outside their neighborhood. Yet a number of Madison's neighborhood commercial main streets, including Williamson Street, Monroe Street, and Atwood Avenue, have strengthened over the last decade. In many cases, the combination of pedestrian-friendly features that made these streets attractive at the turn of the century is still present. Some of these features include stores with entrances directly connected to a complete sidewalk network, buildings built to or near the sidewalk, minimal gaps in the building edge along main streets, and parking along the street.

Today, these neighborhood main streets have been able to capitalize on a combination of neighborhood and out-of-neighborhood traffic to create attractive settings for businesses. By doing this, they have contributed a greater sense of place to their neighborhoods and added an important element of convenience for nearby residents who are not required to drive long distances to take care of their daily shopping needs. Children can run errands and retirees can easily get their exercise.

Beyond these inherent benefits to their neighborhoods, neighborhood main streets offer other advantages to the City and region. They are typically natural transit corridors and good settings for multi-family housing above the stores or nearby. They can reduce the number and length of automobile trips people must make. They contribute to Madison's overall attractiveness as a place to live and to visit. For example, State Street and King Street will be important amenities for out-of-town visitors to Monona Terrace Community and Convention Center. Monroe Street, Old University Avenue and Regent Street create natural boundaries for the Campus area and residential neighborhoods. Monroe Street is a positive experience for visitors attending events at the Stadium and the Field House as it serves nearby residents.

Neighborhood main streets do not have to be perfect or beautiful to be of value to nearby residential neighborhoods. For example, Regent Street from Murray Street to Breese
Terrace, lacks a consistent and attractive main street character, but it provides surrounding neighborhoods with a long list of useful and attractive businesses.

The integration of parking is a difficult but not impossible problem that must be dealt with for neighborhood main streets to be viable. Along Monroe Street, there is on-street parking, two City-owned parking lots, and private parking lots that do not interrupt the integrity of the sidewalk network. At the north end of Monroe Street, many of the businesses have alleys, which provide parking and allow access for deliveries.

Encouraging a traditional main street character whenever opportunities occur will enhance the viability of the street as a commercial area and contribute to a positive neighborhood image. Remarkable main street settings can occur in small areas with a cluster of attractive buildings. As Andres Duany said of one downtown plan: "The minute you have two decent blocks this will become a famous place."

A small, high-quality pedestrian area within a longer commercial main street can transform its sense of place. This has occurred on Williamson Street by the Willy Street Coop and Coyote Capers.

What would it mean for the City to establish policies or a program to encourage strong neighborhood main streets? Here are some general guidelines which, in combination, enhance neighborhood main streets.

This Monroe Street commercial area exemplifies some of the primary characteristics of neighborhood main streets.

**General Guidelines for Neighborhood Main Streets**

*Maintain and enhance the pedestrian-friendly environment:*

- Four-lane streets with the two outer lanes used for parking to insulate pedestrians from noise and moving cars.
- Consistent building lines at the sidewalk.
- Street trees and awnings.
- Windows at street level for pedestrian interest.
- Building entrances off sidewalks.
• Balanced building height and street size.
• Common architectural qualities (scale, proportion) for building facades.
• Enhancement of historic identity.
• Attractive design and location for transit stops.

Provide parking without allowing cars to dominate the street:

• Off-street parking located to the side of or behind buildings off an alley.
• Off-street parking, preferably shared parking.
• Proximate, shared parking to meet parking requirements.
• Reduction or elimination of parking requirements.
• Financing mechanisms for shared parking.

Adopt appropriate zoning:

• Elimination of yard requirements.
• Zoning that permits mixed-use development such as housing or offices above or behind storefront retail uses.
• Zoning that legitimizes the built environment and land use we want to maintain and expand.

Encourage strong business organizations:

• Synergistic combinations of businesses.
• Main street organizations or business improvement districts to jointly market and advocate for the main street.

Commercial streets that could be strengthened by a main street approach are:

• State Street
• Edges between the Campus and neighborhoods
   • University Avenue at Highland
   • Regent Street from Murray Street to Breese Terrace
• Williamson Street
• East Johnson Street
• Monroe Street
• Intersection of Glenway Street and Speedway Road/Mineral Point Road

The Victorian Hill Condominiums at the intersection of Blount Street and East Johnson Street is one example of a mixed-use development that incorporates a residential use above a ground floor commercial use.

East Washington Avenue at Union Corners, West Johnson Street and University Avenue by the University and Park Street are four to six lane roads that do not fit the conventional main street description; the width of the street and the amount and speed of traffic preclude streets such as these from having a
pedestrian friendly character. However, commercial development in these areas can be connected to adjacent land uses on the same side of the street. They can have more pedestrian connections, landscaped areas along the street, well designed transit stops, and architectural character.

4. **Planning for neighborhoods and additional housing should include real estate market based strategies.** The future viability of older neighborhoods depends on their ability to attract investment in existing and new housing and to attract long-term residents. Realistic and specific market based strategies will build confidence in potentially fragile neighborhoods and set clear expectations for development that will make the development process more predictable.

   a. **Planning for neighborhoods should be focused more on neighborhood character than density.** Focusing primarily on achieving maximum housing density does not ensure we are planning for neighborhoods that will be attractive and functional places to live over time. Nor does it encourage confidence in the compatibility of future development. Discussion about density should be in the context of discussion about the character of neighborhoods and the Isthmus.

   b. **Plans for additional housing should address specific housing market opportunities or market niches.** Neighborhood residents and developers will be better served by considering the specific market and design opportunities at different locations. Clearer expectations will lead to more support and easier project approval. Examples of market niches are:

   (1) **Townhouse character.** A portion of the Yahara River Corridor and the Tobacco Warehouse area are ideal sites for housing with a townhouse character characterized by small, separate lots and attached housing. This is a relatively dense form of housing that accommodates highly valued single-family ownership with small, but usable yards. Duplexes, above garage units, and apartment and condominium buildings of two and three stories can also fit in with single-family attached housing.

   ![The Pinckney Street Townhouses are one example of existing townhouse development in the Isthmus.](image)

This townhouse model for new development assumes that residences would have entrances off the public street and sidewalk and that many would have front and backyard space as well. This is in contrast to multifamily apartment buildings, in which common space is shared by all residents and only the management company has responsibility for maintenance and order. Emphasizing townhouse development recognizes some of the realities of housing preferences in Dane County. A significant portion of the Isthmus housing market, especially for owner occupants, will desire separately owned lots and private entrances. Townhouses can meet this need for many people.
When compact attached townhouses on separate lots have been built, they have sold well, and attracted long-term residents. Hancock Street and Pinckney Street Townhouses are examples. Every effort should be made to produce housing of this type. It could provide a larger number of additional units at a range of densities from approximately 20 to 30 units an acre.

(2) Capitol and Lake Views. Sites with lake and Capitol views offer prime opportunities for higher density housing (four stories and higher). Such locations offer an amenity that can attract long-term residents, be they renters or owner-occupants. Higher density housing may also be appropriate in R5 and R6 zoning districts adjacent to the University. Such housing serves the need of many students to be close to campus.

Higher densities may also work better at corners of blocks, edges of neighborhoods, and in the heart of Downtown adjacent to non-residential uses. Buildings at corners and edges can borrow space and views from the

(3) Loft apartments and condominiums. Lofts as living space are an untapped market in Madison. Lofts can accommodate a wide range of incomes and housing values. A number of buildings, including churches, warehouses, and older commercial buildings, can be converted to attractive loft spaces for apartments and condominiums. Another possibility is new construction of lofts in mixed use areas such as near rail corridors.

(4) Conversion of existing commercial or institutional buildings to a housing use. A possible example is the old Methodist Hospital building on West Washington Avenue. Surplus school buildings have been successfully converted this way in the past.

(5) Small infill sites. Relatively dense, low-rise projects such as Wilson Bay Apartments, Franklin Street condominiums, and recent projects on Williamson Street and Johnson Street fit the neighborhood character and improve it.

(6) Apartment buildings with small, good quality apartments. Such apartment buildings can provide good, relatively affordable housing or convenient second home options for retirees and others. For example, Kennedy Manor (at 1 Langdon Street) is an attractive building with many efficiencies and a relatively stable tenant population.

(7) Housing in neighborhood main street areas. Housing above commercial uses easily fits into the State Street area and neighborhood main street areas.

(8) New housing market trends that will bring more long-term residents to the Downtown and Isthmus
area. These markets include retirees, empty nesters, aging baby boomers, families with children, owners of second homes outside of Madison, first-time homebuyers, and people who prefer to be near the activity of a Downtown, Campus area, or a traditional neighborhood and its main street.

c. **A significant portion of most neighborhoods should be owner-occupant and long-term tenant housing.** The ability to attract owner occupants and long-term tenants is, in itself, a good measure of neighborhood character. They provide stability and important social networks to a neighborhood. Long-term residents invest themselves in the neighborhood as a place to live.

Many people find a lack of off-street parking tolerable for a few years; however, long-term residents need off-street parking. One parking space per unit is standard with recently built housing near the Downtown. Creative parking solutions should be encouraged such as shared cars for condominium buildings, small shared parking lots, and parking spaces which can be bought and sold separately from housing units.

Alleys can accommodate two or more parking spaces per lot and the absence of curb cuts for each house increases the amount of on-street parking.

There are some neighborhoods which will continue to be exceptions to this owner-occupant and long-term residency goal. Student neighborhoods adjacent to Campus serve the short-term needs of their residents very well. Another exception is the Sheboygan Avenue area where rental apartments provide an attractive setting for seniors near the convenience of Hilldale. Many of these residents are long-term although they are not owners. In both cases, these apartment "neighborhoods" are anchored by other uses (the University and Hilldale Shopping Center) that give them a heightened sense of place and a unique ability to serve a particular market.

d. **The Bassett Neighborhood is the Isthmus neighborhood most in need of owner-occupants and long-term tenants.** This area served as a predominantly student neighborhood for several decades. Much of its housing is run down. A number of zero lot line buildings which were built in the 1960's now seem unattractive. Since UW enrollment has declined by 4,500 students over the last decade, demand for student housing in the Bassett Neighborhood has declined. To build confidence in this area, planning and future development should emphasize market niches likely to attract long-term residents including both owner-occupants and tenants. These developments also need to occur in the context of attractive architectural features that are appropriate to the neighborhood, including traditional front porches. In this regard, the Bassett Neighborhood poses a big challenge, but offers excellent opportunities with its premier location near the University, Downtown, and Lake Monona.

e. **Many of the areas offering the greatest opportunity for additional housing units are also those with the least positive neighborhood character.** To meet this challenge, there needs to be a clear planning vision, municipal commitment, and a critical mass of positive changes. Portions of the Yahara River Corridor and the Tobacco Warehouse area are relatively unattractive residential settings at this time. For some people, they may even raise safety and security concerns. The ability to develop these areas depends on confidence that the neighborhood character of these areas will consistently and steadily improve.
f. Renovation of the existing housing stock is a complementary and necessary activity to achieve the 4,500 additional units. Renovation of housing stock isn’t likely to add housing units since houses that were once divided into apartments may be returned to their original state as single-family homes. However, renovation has been, and will continue to be, the primary source of Isthmus rejuvenation. Renovation improves the market for new construction.

Renovators motivated by a historic house are often among the first homeowners in a neglected area. Neighborhood character provides an essential market attraction for Isthmus neighborhoods, regardless of whether prospective residents live in old or new housing. The 1994 Bassett Neighborhood Housing Study found that significant portions of the Downtown housing market prefer older housing. At the same time, there are people who prefer new housing in a Downtown setting but who want it in the midst of older buildings.

Renovation is necessary for the renewal of older housing. Steady, privately financed renovation continues to build confidence in the Isthmus housing market to the point where there is a growing demand for newly constructed housing.

g. Desirable types of development and locations for development need to be defined as clearly as possible. Urban design codes of varying detail can serve as predictable guides for change. Neighborhood plans, historic districts, urban design districts, and the newly proposed neighborhood conservation areas can be effective methods for encouraging appropriate development and renovation.

5. More weight should be given to neighborhood impacts when traffic changes or street widenings are considered. A clear process needs to be established for decisions on street widenings and changes in street geometrics. Christopher Alexander and others have written in A New Theory of Urban Design that "...transportation requirements have achieved an entirely unreasonable level of power over the decisions which are made in the city." (p.21) Madison may have escaped the worst of the excess of which Alexander writes. An Isthmus freeway was considered in the 1955 City of Madison Highway Plan, but was rejected. However, the City lacks any clear process for evaluating and considering street widenings, changes in street geometrics, or even new interchanges. Such decisions are often passively made in long range capital budgets and Transportation Improvement Plans that do not allow adequate consideration of their impact on land uses. A process for decisions on street widenings and changes in street geometrics should consider the need to preserve neighborhood main streets, traditional neighborhood character, and pedestrian and bike connections.

This near eastside bicycle path and bridge over the Yahara River is an example of how alternative modes of transportation can be used to connect Madison’s neighborhoods.

6. The Committee supports the efforts of the Pedestrian-Bicycle Committee, Transportation Commission, and Traffic Engineering Division to develop a neighborhood...
traffic management program that will include neighborhood traffic calming. Traffic calming is the name given to a method of traffic management which relies on physical changes to streets to slow down motor vehicles or reduce traffic volumes to make neighborhoods safer and quieter. Successful traffic calming measures often include a combination of roadway barriers and narrowings, including:

- Raised sections of road
- Changes of surface texture or color
- Road and lane narrowing
- Bicycle lanes
- Chicanes (a fixed object that traffic is forced to deviate around in an otherwise straight road)
- Full or partial road closures
- Traffic circles

The City’s traffic plans should support land use and neighborhood plans. Traffic changes have definite impacts on adjacent land uses. The speed of traffic, the volume of traffic and the width of roadway dedicated to traffic all affect land use. For example, consider the effect of Johnson Street and Gorham Street on the housing along it and on the whole Tenney-Lapham and Old Market Neighborhoods. Then consider what the Marquette Neighborhood would be like if Jenifer Street and Spaight Street were a similar one-way pair.

The Bassett Neighborhood Master Plan includes recommendations to consider traffic changes consistent with neighborhood traffic management goals. These include converting Broom Street to two-way traffic flow within the present pavement width and designating South Bassett Street, West Main Street, West Doty Street and West Wilson Street (west of Broom Street) as two-way residential streets.

7. The City needs guidelines for pedestrian and transit-oriented development and public works in the Isthmus. These guidelines can help developers, policy makers, and City staff understand what pedestrian-oriented development is. We need to take advantage of opportunities that emerge for a better pedestrian environment, like the Kohl Center, and not undermine opportunities that exist, like Regent Street from Murray Street to Breese Terrace. The guidelines should include:

- Emphasizing street trees and adequate sidewalks.
- Keeping narrower streets in residential and main street settings with sharper curb radii. This narrows the street width a pedestrian must cross and slows the speed of turning traffic. (Appendix H)
- Avoiding free-flow lanes (Appendix I) which allow automobiles to turn at a high speed. Free-flow lanes make the pedestrian crossing much longer. Free-flow lanes also take the curb position away from bicyclists who can find themselves wedged between two cars. For example, the free-flow lane at the corner of eastbound West Washington Avenue as it turns South onto Proudfit Street poses a serious hazard for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing Proudfit Street at West Main Street. Cars using the free-flow lane come around the corner at a high speed aimed directly at pedestrians and bicyclists in the process of crossing Proudfit Street.
- Reinforcing main street character in commercial areas. A different approach will be needed on streets such as Park Street or East Washington Avenue. We need more models for attractive commercial development along four and six lane traffic corridors. These models can emphasize commercial development on one-side of the street and its
connection to neighborhoods behind it. For example, Lanes Bakery on Park Street has a positive connection to Park Street and the residential neighborhood behind it.

• Integrating transit stops into a pedestrian-oriented environment.

8. **Our Committee has concluded that future rail transit corridors should be located in existing rail corridors rather than in existing road right-of-ways.** This recommendation differs from the Cambridge Systematics transit corridor study which assumed the corridor would be in the East Washington Avenue median. The Committee finds that an existing rail corridor offers many advantages: less disruption of traffic, fewer road crossings and greater speed while serving a comparable work force and resident population. Any final corridor selection would occur only after completion of a major investment study that would include an extensive public participation process.

9. **Priority should be given to increasing knowledge about good design and sensitive rehabilitation and its economic benefits for property owners and neighborhoods.** Renovation choices can increase or decrease the value of property. In many cases, renovation that improves property values may cost little more or the same as renovation that decreases property values. Many poor renovation decisions in a neighborhood eventually decrease the likelihood that long-term renters and owner-occupants will choose to live there.

Inexpensive publications and photographs illustrating renovation choices should be available to property owners when they come to the Planning and Development Department to consider building projects or to take out building permits. Lending libraries should be available for developers. An example of inappropriate renovation is the modern kit porches being used in the Bassett Neighborhood to replace traditional porches. Another example is the choice to cover narrow wood siding with wide rather than narrow aluminum siding.

10. **The Committee endorses the City's ambitious plans to expand and connect green space in the Isthmus.** These plans represent major improvements that should be recognized, supported, and completed. We also want to emphasize that small, high-quality parks can make a big difference in park deficient neighborhoods. Two examples are Period Park in Mansion Hill and the Vilas Circle effigy mound park in the 1400 Block of Vilas Avenue.

Major park improvements planned and underway include:

• Yahara River Corridor Parkway and Bikeway
• Wingra Creek Corridor Parkway and Bikeway
• Starkweather Creek bike paths and connections
• Olbrich Gardens expansion
• Park development of the State Medical Society property and improvements to the Monona Basin
• Blackhawk Bikeway (between University Avenue and Shorewood Hills)
• The possibility of a bike path through the Wisconsin and Calumet Rail Line Corridor (parallel to Monroe Street)
• Completion of Klief Park in the Greenbush Neighborhood
An Isthmus Plan

Every project must first be experienced, and then expressed, as a vision which can be seen in the inner eye (literally). It must have this quality so strongly that it can also be communicated to others, and felt by others, as a vision.

Christopher Alexander et al., p.50

An Isthmus plan is needed to present a coherent picture of how and where we want the Isthmus to grow. Building 4,500 additional housing units will require a clear vision and common set of assumptions about how to get from here to there. Our report is one step towards defining a vision and common assumptions.

Recent institutional master plans, such as those for Edgewood College and the University of Wisconsin-Madison, illustrate the need for the City to have plans and policies in place to provide clear guidance to major institutions as they go about their own planning.


The Downtown Historic Preservation Plan should help resolve many of the on-going conflicts between preservation and demolition of older buildings in the Downtown. Areas with unique, historic features have been identified for preservation. Areas where demolition is not a concern have also been identified. This should create a more predictable process for developers who can plan development appropriately.

What can an Isthmus plan do that these other plans have not? It can describe the patterns that tie the Isthmus together as a place. It can enable residents and employers to look beyond their neighborhood and campus boundaries and their businesses to understand the Isthmus as a whole. It can help us think of the Isthmus as a system with different functions that can complement each other. It can combine elements of relevant existing plans. The plan can convey graphic physical images that can be readily comprehended similar to John Nolen's 1911 plan "Madison: A Model City."

An Isthmus Master Plan could include:

- A focus on edges between institutions, businesses, and neighborhoods.
- Identification of neighborhood main streets.
- A description of how housing development and employment growth can be achieved.
- Future plans for transportation, transit, and parking to respond to expected growth.
- Identification of transit corridors and strategies for moving buses more quickly through the Isthmus.
- Identification of redevelopment sites such as the Tobacco Warehouse District and the Yahara River District.
- Elements of existing neighborhood, parks, and other plans.
- Continuity and resolution of conflict among existing plans.
• How to achieve redevelopment and provide predictability for developers with a minimum of public financial assistance.
• Opportunities for transit-oriented development.
• Use of market data to define the character of projected housing development.

Elements of the Master Plan could be done independently and consecutively over a number of years with the goal of concluding with a comprehensive product.

SECTION IV: CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Other portions of the City may benefit from a planning process similar to Isthmus 2020. There are two aspects of our planning process that have been particularly valuable and should be repeated in the future: (1) studying an area of the City with common characteristics and (2) having the advantage that major citizen learning and participation in events occurred during our planning process.

1. It has been useful to step back from plans which focus on a single neighborhood or a single topic and to look broadly at the Isthmus as a place. The City frequently looks at the Downtown as a place or individual neighborhoods, but planning for a section of the City with an emphasis on the quality of City neighborhoods as places to live is too rare. This experience has allowed us to see the big picture and judge whether or not we are heading in the right direction. It is important for many of the Committee members to know the area well so planning is not an abstract experience. People who are most familiar with the neighborhoods, businesses, and traffic patterns will actually learn the most. If the South Metropolitan Madison Planning Council makes a priority of neighborhoods and physical planning issues, it could be a comparable committee.

2. High quality events to inform and engage the public have been necessary for our Committee work. The widespread cynicism with government today requires that we have more meaningful citizen participation in government. It is not only the citizenry who learn from citizen participation. It is part of an essential two-way dialogue that informs public decision making. Elected officials and staff learn things they need to know from the public. Regular, public events for two-way sharing of information are essential parts of the City government's program.

An important part of the Committee's charge was to involve the public in our planning process. In this regard, the Committee was fortunate its work coincided with a growing public interest in the quality of the urban environment. Elected officials, neighborhood activists, professionals, and many others want to find better ways to engage the public in planning for neighborhoods and communities. Through the collective efforts of many people, a series of high quality public events were held over the last two years. These events have broken new ground in our community on how to involve the public in planning issues through meaningful learning opportunities and dialogue. Among these well attended public events were:

• The Future Search Conference: Discovering Common Ground - A Community Vision for Central Madison, the Isthmus and Downtown. In April, 1995, a diverse group of over 160 Madison and Dane County residents came together to discuss the future and to identify important areas of agreement about the critical issues facing the area. Downtown Madison Inc. and the Isthmus 2020 Committee were major sponsors of this event.

• Isthmus 2020 Workshop. In June, 1996, 250 people attended the Isthmus 2020 Committee’s one-day charrette of choices. Interactive workshops were presented at a series
of stations relating to the regional context, transportation, land use, connectivity, neighborhood design, the Downtown, and the Bassett Neighborhood.

- **Neighborhoods '96 Conference: Building Partnerships, Building Community.** In October, 1996, the City of Madison sponsored this neighborhood conference with over forty workshops on neighborhoods by design, planning and projects, leadership, and advocacy. 300 people attended. Several workshops were videotaped by the City Channel.

- **Nolen in the '90s: In June, 1995, a broad based group of sponsors including Isthmus and the City of Madison organized a symposium examining the modern-day relevance of John Nolen's Classic Urban Designs. This conference also focused on the New Urbanism and its future in Dane County. 300 people attended. The videotape of this conference is available at the Madison Public Library.

Through these events, hundreds of citizens and community leaders have gained knowledge they need to make good decisions about their neighborhoods and communities. Many more people are able to learn from videotapes of speakers and workshops. The public's positive response demonstrates the need for frequent, high-quality events like these at which the public can become better informed and share opinions and ideas with policy makers and staff. We recommend that such events become an integral part of the City's planning program.
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### APPENDIX A

#### FIGURE 2

**RESIDENTIAL INVESTMENT IN THE ISTMUS BY PLAN DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING UNITS**

1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN DISTRICT</th>
<th>TOTAL IMPROVEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>W05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near West</td>
<td>W01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette</td>
<td>E02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Oaks</td>
<td>E03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingra Park</td>
<td>W02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td>W03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenney Park</td>
<td>E01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lawn</td>
<td>W06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Square</td>
<td>E05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Square</td>
<td>C00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Campus</td>
<td>W04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Heights</td>
<td>W29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**                                                    **$7,791,430**

---

#### DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICAL SUMMARY

OF APPENDIX A, FIGURE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATISTICAL MEASURE</th>
<th>AMT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$649,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$616,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>$437,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>$1,451,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>$1,453,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>$7,791,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Source: 1995 Building Permit Data by Plan District, City of Madison, Department of Planning and Development.

---

1. "Improvements" are defined by three building permit categories: additions, alterations, and repairs. Additions and alterations are physical improvements that are above and beyond general maintenance of a property and that act to increase its assessed value. An addition will increase the gross square footage of a property, while an alteration typically will not. Repairs are typically investments that maintain a property and its value and keep a property up to code.

2. It is important to note that there is a possible tendency or incentive for persons making the improvements to underestimate the cost of an improvement project in order to keep property assessments and the associated property taxes lower. As a result, the estimated amount of residential investment in existing Isthmus units as indicated in this table may be lower than is actually occurring.
### APPENDIX A

#### FIGURE 3

**RESIDENTIAL INVESTMENT IN THE ISTMUS BY PLAN DISTRICT**

**NEW UNITS**

1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN DISTRICTS</th>
<th>PROJECT TYPE(S)</th>
<th>ADDRESS(ES)</th>
<th>NO. OF NEW UNITS</th>
<th>EST. PROJ. COST</th>
<th>TOTAL LOT AREA (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>DENSITY (DUs/Ac)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenney Park</td>
<td>E01</td>
<td>Townhouses (Dayton Row)</td>
<td>101 through 159 Dayton Row</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$1,190,000</td>
<td>28,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>2815 &amp; 2819 Hauk St.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$1,099,999</td>
<td>78,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Family House</td>
<td>2917 Sachs St.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>3118 Thorp St.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$114,675</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td>W03</td>
<td>Single-Family House</td>
<td>226 Van Deuse St.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>5,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Campus</td>
<td>W04</td>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>912 Fahrenbrook Ct., 36 N. Park St., &amp; 911 Spring St.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$2,848,294</td>
<td>33,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>41 N. Mills St.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>12,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>117 N. Randall Ave.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>9,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>W05</td>
<td>Single-Family House</td>
<td>2215 Kendall Ave.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td>1909 University Ave.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lawn</td>
<td>W06</td>
<td>Dormitory</td>
<td>2209 Monroe St.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>_4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>$9,302,968</td>
<td>195,981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS (Including Residence Halls and Dormitories)**

111 | $6,802,968 | 189,381 | 25.5 |

Source: 1994 Building Permit Data by Plan District and 1997 Geo Database, City of Madison, Department of Planning and Development.

---

1 The residential developments in this table are all of the new units created from projects for which building permits were issued in 1994. The number of new units created does not portray the net change in housing units (i.e. existing units - units razed + new units = net change in units). Net dwelling unit changes in Isthmus plan districts are shown in Figure 4 of this appendix (Appendix A).

2 The year 1994 was selected for this analysis because the number of new units generated in the Isthmus during this year (94 units) most closely matched the average net number generated in the Isthmus for the 10 year period between 1986 and 1995 (93 units). This was done in an attempt to exemplify the type and variety of residential development that may have occurred in any given year over the past ten years.

3 There are 12 plan districts in the Isthmus. There are only six (6) listed here. Based on the building permit data reviewed, there were no building permits issued in 1994 for construction of new residential units in the other six plan districts: Capitol Square (C00); Marquette (E02); Madison Square (E05); Near West (W01); Wingra Park (W02); and Eagle Heights (W29).

4 These 42 dormitory units were built on the Edgewood Campus parcel, which is 2,818,400 sf (about 65 acres). The dormitory structure(s) only comprised a small, unspecified portion of this larger parcel. The density cannot be determined accurately based solely on the area of the larger campus parcel. These last two densities are the densities resulting from the total number of new units and the total area on which those new units were to be developed.

The lot area and density calculations for the second to the last row of the table do not include the 42 units created on the Edgewood Campus in West Lawn.
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FIGURE 4

NET CHANGES IN RESIDENTIAL UNITS IN THE Isthmus by Plan District
(Nota: "MF" stands for Multi-Family and "SF" stands for Single-Family)
1986 through 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near West</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Campus</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenney Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Square</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Oaks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Square</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingra Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lawn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Heights</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Building Permit Data, City of Madison, Department of Planning and Development.
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Figure 5
ISTHMUS RESIDENTIAL ASSESSMENT DISTRICTS

(Single-Family Units, Two Units, and Condos)
The Assessment Districts in this table are ranked in descending order by the "% Change" between 1985 and 1995.
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#### FIGURE 6

**CHANGES IN AVERAGE ASSESSED VALUE OF SINGLE-FAMILY PROPERTIES IN ISTHMUS ASSESSMENT DISTRICTS**

1985 to 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISTMUS ASSESSMENT DISTRICTS¹</th>
<th>AVERAGE ASSESSED VALUE OF SINGLE-FAMILY PROPERTY</th>
<th>1/1/85</th>
<th>1/1/90</th>
<th>1/1/95</th>
<th>% CHANGE ('85 to '95)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Langdon</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>$76,800</td>
<td>$115,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orton Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$53,500</td>
<td>$62,600</td>
<td>$125,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore/Isthmus</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>$126,500</td>
<td>$159,700</td>
<td>$291,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$101,000</td>
<td>$126,500</td>
<td>$230,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$40,800</td>
<td>$54,200</td>
<td>$92,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenney Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$54,100</td>
<td>$61,100</td>
<td>$119,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilas - Edgewood Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$79,100</td>
<td>$97,700</td>
<td>$165,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmside - Oakridge</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>$58,500</td>
<td>$69,300</td>
<td>$113,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilas - Longfellow School</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$54,700</td>
<td>$66,900</td>
<td>$105,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westlawn - Randall School</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$76,100</td>
<td>$90,600</td>
<td>$146,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapham School - Breese Stevens</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$51,700</td>
<td>$87,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West High - Hoyt Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$74,600</td>
<td>$86,500</td>
<td>$140,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wil-Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$40,100</td>
<td>$43,600</td>
<td>$75,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Madison</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$42,300</td>
<td>$51,300</td>
<td>$78,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University - Breese Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$75,600</td>
<td>$86,000</td>
<td>$139,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudgeon - Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$63,100</td>
<td>$70,800</td>
<td>$115,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atwood - Winnebago</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$44,500</td>
<td>$48,400</td>
<td>$78,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East Square</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$49,100</td>
<td>$51,400</td>
<td>$86,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near West Square</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$52,700</td>
<td>$60,500</td>
<td>$89,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northgate - Aberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$42,100</td>
<td>$45,300</td>
<td>$70,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East High</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$46,100</td>
<td>$49,200</td>
<td>$76,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Oaks - Worthington Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$40,600</td>
<td>$43,800</td>
<td>$65,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittingham Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$43,800</td>
<td>$46,600</td>
<td>$69,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITY OF MADISON</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$66,696</td>
<td>$77,870</td>
<td>$120,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


¹ The residential assessment districts that appear here are only those that are either entirely within the boundaries of the Isthmus or those districts with over 50% of their single-family residential lots in the Isthmus. Also, these are only the assessment districts for single-family units; the average values shown are only those for single-family units.
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### FIGURE 7
**CHANGES IN TOTAL ASSESSED VALUE OF RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY IN Isthmus Assessment Districts**
1995 and 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wil-Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$13,453,900</td>
<td>$16,017,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East Square</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$4,897,400</td>
<td>$5,730,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langdon</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$3,029,200</td>
<td>$3,501,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near West Square</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$6,864,000</td>
<td>$7,864,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$3,266,400</td>
<td>$3,708,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brattingham Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$5,212,600</td>
<td>$5,879,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Madison</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$54,784,700</td>
<td>$60,483,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilas - Edgewood Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$64,048,900</td>
<td>$70,539,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilas - Longfellow School</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$65,157,200</td>
<td>$71,629,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orton Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$19,508,900</td>
<td>$21,418,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Oaks - Worthington Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$20,671,300</td>
<td>$22,560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudgeon - Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$75,239,110</td>
<td>$79,521,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westlawn - Randall School</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$113,543,000</td>
<td>$123,200,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmside - Oakridge</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>$84,085,600</td>
<td>$91,052,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East High</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$72,382,200</td>
<td>$78,301,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University - Breese Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$8,484,700</td>
<td>$9,102,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atwood - Winnebago</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$64,485,900</td>
<td>$69,126,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West High - Hoyt Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$66,587,100</td>
<td>$71,256,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$67,688,500</td>
<td>$72,361,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northgate - Aberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$30,091,200</td>
<td>$32,135,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapham School - Breese Stevens</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$27,342,000</td>
<td>$29,043,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teanevi Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$24,780,500</td>
<td>$26,231,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore Isthmus</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>$27,676,300</td>
<td>$28,786,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isthmus Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$921,339,700</td>
<td>$999,363,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Madison Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,494,000,000</td>
<td>$4,831,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isthmus as a % of City</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Madison, Department of Revenue, Office of the Assessor, *Assessed Values of Residential Properties by Area and Type, 1995 and 1996*.

1 The residential assessment districts that appear here are only those that are either entirely within the boundaries of the Isthmus or those districts with over 50% of their single-family residential lots in the Isthmus. Also, these are only the assessment districts for single-family units.
Appendix B
GENERAL AREAS WITH POTENTIAL FOR NEW ISTMUS HOUSING

Please note that the boundaries of these areas are dashed lines; these areas are not definite, parcel-specific designations. They are very generalized locations, and they should not be construed as otherwise.

Prepared for the Isthmus 2020 Citizens' Advisory Committee by the City of Madison Department of Planning and Development, TAV, April, 1997.
Appendix C

ISTHMUS NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION BOUNDARIES

Neighborhood association boundaries do not match plan district boundaries. Plan districts are essentially based on Census tracts, while neighborhood association boundaries are based on the organizing residents' definition of their neighborhood.

ISTHMUS NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS

1. Eagle Heights
2. Regent
3. Dudgeon - Monroe
4. Vilas
5. Greenbush
6. Bay Creek
7. Bayview
8. Brittingham [Apartments Association]
9. Capitol (This neighborhood is broken down into four districts: Capitol Centre, Bassett, Mansion Hill, and First Settlement.)
10. Langdon Street
11. Old Market Place
12. Tenney - Lapham
13. Marquette
14. This is an "overlap" area shared by both 13 and 15.
15. Schenk's - Atwood
16. Sherman Terrace [Condos Association]
17. Emerson East
18. Eken Park
19. Sherman (partially)
20. Worthington Park (partially)
21. Hawthorne (partially)

Prepared for the Isthmus 2020 Citizens Advisory Committee by the City of Madison, Department of Planning and Development, TAV, April, 1997.
### APPENDIX D

#### FIGURE 1

**JOURNEY TO WORK BY MODE**

**1990**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN DISTRICT</th>
<th>CENSUS TRACTS</th>
<th>TOT. NO. WORKERS</th>
<th>CAR, TRUCK, VAN DROVE ALONE</th>
<th>CARPOOL</th>
<th>PUB. TRANSPORTATION BUS</th>
<th>TAXICAB</th>
<th>MOTORCYCLE</th>
<th>BICYCLE</th>
<th>WALK</th>
<th>OTHER MEANS</th>
<th>WORKED AT HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Campus</td>
<td>W04</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near West</td>
<td>W01</td>
<td>16.01 &amp; 16.02</td>
<td>7,136</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Heights</td>
<td>W29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Square</td>
<td>C00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3,185</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingra Park</td>
<td>W02</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td>3,795</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>W05</td>
<td>9 &amp; 10.97</td>
<td>4,174</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenney Park</td>
<td>E01</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3,701</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette</td>
<td>E02</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3,825</td>
<td>1,779</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lawn</td>
<td>W06</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td>W03</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Oaks</td>
<td>E03</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3,124</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Square</td>
<td>E05</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,011</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ISTHMUS TOTALS**

- 38,857 15,298 39.4 3,298 8.5 4,352 11.2 102 0.3 226 0.6 2,829 7.3 11,354 29.2 234 0.6 1,129 2.9

**CITY OF MADISON TOTALS**

- 105,884 64,787 61.2 12,275 11.6 7,877 7.4 211 0.2 392 0.4 3,547 3.3 13,447 12.7 464 0.4 2,844 2.7

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Summary Tape File 3A, 1990 Census Tracts, Madison, WI, SMSA.
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Figure 1
Existing, Site-Specific Residential Density Examples in the Isthmus

A. Marquette Bungalow (Single-Family)
8.3 dus/ac

B. Marquette Bungalow (Duplex)
16.5 dus/ac

C. Dayton Row Townhouses
26.1 dus/ac

D. Doty School Condominiums
26.6 dus/ac

E. Hancock Street Townhouses
26.6 dus/ac

F. Pinckney Street Townhouses
30.8 dus/ac

Prepared for the Isthmus 2020 Citizens' Advisory Committee by the City of Madison Department of Planning and Development, March, 1997.
Appendix E
Figure 1 (cont’d)
Existing, Site-Specific Residential Density Examples in the Isthmus

G. Franklin Street Condominiums
43.3 dus/ac

H. Victorian Hill Condominiums
45.0 dus/ac

I. Wilson Bay Apartments
61.2 dus/ac

J. Das Kronenberg Apartments
69.6 dus/ac

K. Hamilton Point Apartments
73.1 dus/ac

L. 1st Time Square Apartments
214.5 dus/ac

Prepared for the Isthmus 2020 Citizens’ Advisory Committee by the City of Madison Department of Planning and Development, March, 1997.
### Appendix E

#### Figure 2

**Existing, Site-Specific Residential Density Examples in the Isthmus (Examples A-L) 1997**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP ID</th>
<th>Housing Example</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>ZON. Type</th>
<th>Lot Area (sf)</th>
<th>No. Units</th>
<th>Density (DUs/Ac)</th>
<th>Bldg. Gross Flr. Area (sf)</th>
<th>Avg. Flr. Area/Unit (sf)</th>
<th>Grnd. Flr. Area (sf)</th>
<th>Lot Cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Marquette Bungalow</td>
<td>1515 Spaight St.</td>
<td>R4A SF</td>
<td>5,280</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Marquette Bungalow</td>
<td>1509-1511 Spaight St.</td>
<td>R4A MF</td>
<td>5,280</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Dayton Row Townhouses</td>
<td>101-152 Dayton Row</td>
<td>PUD MF</td>
<td>28,390</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>11,116</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Doty School Condominiums</td>
<td>351 W. Wilson St.</td>
<td>PUD MF</td>
<td>27,868</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>16,259</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>3,936</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Hancock Street Townhouses</td>
<td>132-138 S. Hancock</td>
<td>PUD MF</td>
<td>6,540</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>5,828</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>2,882</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Pinckney Street Townhouses</td>
<td>302-310 N. Pinckney St.</td>
<td>PUD MF</td>
<td>9,913</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>10,668</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>5,067</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Franklin Street Condominiums</td>
<td>115 S. Franklin St.</td>
<td>PUD MF</td>
<td>13,068</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>17,234</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Victorian Hill Condominiums</td>
<td>301-309 N. Blount St.</td>
<td>PUD MF</td>
<td>8,712</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>11,448</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>5,040</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Wilson Bay Apartments</td>
<td>446 W. Wilson St.</td>
<td>PUD MF</td>
<td>24,928</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>34,569</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>11,523</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Das-Kronenberg Apartments</td>
<td>721 E. Dayton St.</td>
<td>PUD MF</td>
<td>28,771</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>45,560</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>7,830</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Hamilton Point Apartments</td>
<td>325 S. Hamilton St.</td>
<td>PUD MF</td>
<td>19,658</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>27,789</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>9,882</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>1st Time Square Apartments</td>
<td>206 N. Broom St.</td>
<td>PUD MF</td>
<td>10,560</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>214.5</td>
<td>29,508</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>7,377</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Madison, Department of Planning and Development; Geographic Database; PUD Files; City of Madison GIS (build.dbf), 1996; and 1995 City Directory.

1 The "Bldg. Gross Flr. Area (sf)" and the "Grnd Flr. Area (sf)" for these three housing examples were derived from the sum of the areas of the individual condo units that comprised the areas. Building hallways and other common spaces were not included in the calculations. Consequently, the "Avg. Flr. Area/Unit (sf)" is a little more of an accurate representation of the actual average unit size in these three examples, but the resulting "Lot Cover" estimation for the same three is probably a little bit low.

2 This is a mixed-use development that includes about 1,500 sf of commercial space on the street level of 702 E. Johnson St.
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Figure 3

Single-Family Residential Area Density Examples

M. Jenifer St. Market Area
10.2 dus/ac

N. Knickerbocker St. / Crandall St.
9.3 dus/ac

O. University Heights
5.5 dus/ac

P. Marquette Bungalows
8.9 dus/ac

Q. Sidney St. / N. Baldwin St.
10.1 dus/ac

R. Jefferson St.
9.1 dus/ac
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## FIGURE 4

**SINGLE-FAMILY (SF) RESIDENTIAL AREA DENSITY EXAMPLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP ID</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL SAMPLE AREA</th>
<th>TOTAL DWELLING UNITS</th>
<th>TOTAL RES. ACRES</th>
<th>SAMPLE DENSITY (dus/ac)</th>
<th>AVG. SF LOT AREA (sf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Jenifer St. Market Area</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>4,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Knickerbocker St./Crandall St.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>University Heights</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Marquette Bungalows</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Sidney St./N. Baldwin St.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jefferson St.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4,792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Madison, Department of Planning and Development, GIS (isthmus.dbf), 1996.

The Plan Districts (PDs) in this column are ranked in descending order by the "Overall PD Res. Density."
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## FIGURE 5

**ISTICMUS PLAN DISTRICT OVERALL RESIDENTIAL DENSITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN DISTRICT (PD)</th>
<th>TOTAL RES. ACRES</th>
<th>TOTAL DWELLING UNITS</th>
<th>PD RES. DENSITY (dus/ac)</th>
<th>AVERAGE SF LOT AREA (sf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near West</td>
<td>W01</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4,755</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Campus</td>
<td>W04</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Square</td>
<td>C00</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2,572</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Heights</td>
<td>W29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenney Park</td>
<td>E01</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2,713</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette</td>
<td>E02</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2,937</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingra Park</td>
<td>W02</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2,605</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>W05</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>3,088</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Oaks</td>
<td>E03</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Square</td>
<td>E05</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>2,540</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td>W03</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lawn</td>
<td>W06</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENTIRE ISTHMUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL RES. ACRES</th>
<th>TOTAL DWELLING UNITS</th>
<th>PD RES. DENSITY (dus/ac)</th>
<th>AVERAGE SF LOT AREA (sf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>28,081</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>5,252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Madison, Department of Planning and Development, GIS (isthmus.dbf), 1996.
## Appendix F
### Residential Zoning District Comparison of Allowable Buildable Area:
**1922 Residential Zoning Districts, Current R2 District, and Current R2S District**

### Diagram
![Diagram showing Residential Zoning Districts](image)

### Table: Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>1922 Res. Districts</th>
<th>Current R2</th>
<th>Current R2S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yard Setbacks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>15 - 25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Side Yard</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>6 - 7'</td>
<td>5 - 6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Area</td>
<td>40% of lot area</td>
<td>1,000 sf UOS</td>
<td>800 sf UOS/DU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Lot Area</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6,000 sf</td>
<td>4,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Lot Width</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>50'</td>
<td>40'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Buildable Area Based on Setback Requirements</td>
<td>2,550 sf</td>
<td>1,200 sf</td>
<td>2,465 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Buildable Area Based on Building Area Requirements</td>
<td>1,920 sf</td>
<td>3,800 sf</td>
<td>4,000 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
1. If 25% or more of all frontage on one side of a street between two intersecting streets has been built up having a minimum setback line of more or less than 20' from the street line, no building shall be erected or altered to project beyond the minimum setback line so established. In no case shall the setback be required to be more than 40' on an interior lot.

2. One story buildings -- a least side yard of six (6) feet and a combined total of both yards of fourteen (14) feet; two story buildings -- a least side yard of seven (7) feet and a combined total of both side yards of eighteen (18) feet.

3. UOS stands for Usable Open Space; front yards and parking areas do not count toward the UOS requirement.

4. Front yard setbacks can range from a minimum of fifteen (15) feet to a maximum of twenty-five (25) feet except that front porches (open and enclosed), bays and balconies can project into the front yard by up to five (5) feet. In no event can the front yard setback be less than ten (10) feet.

5. One story buildings -- each side five (5) feet; two story buildings -- each side six (6) feet.

### Source:
City of Madison, Department of Planning and Development, 1922 and 1997 Zoning Code Text.

The 14 lots presented here are all 40' x 120' and are 4,800 square feet (sf) in area. The shaded areas on the lots are the effective buildable areas resulting from the various lot requirements for each respective zoning district. In the five 1922 Zoning lots, the additional 18.5 feet of rear yard setback is what would be required in addition to the 25 feet rear yard setback to comply with the "40% of lot area" Building Area requirement.

The highlighted cells in these last two rows indicate the effective buildable area under each of the three different residential zoning districts. The effective buildable area is the area resulting from the more restrictive requirement.
Appendix G
ISTHMUS "MAIN STREET" EXAMPLES

Prepared for the Isthmus 2020 Citizens’ Advisory Committee by the City of Madison Department of Planning and Development, TAV, April, 1997.
Curb radii in older traditional neighborhoods are usually in the range of 10 to 15 ft. They depend on the types of vehicles that most often use the street, not the largest expected vehicle. The impacts on pedestrians, parking spaces and turning space for larger vehicles are also considered. The smaller the curb radii, the less crossing distance exposure to vehicles a crossing pedestrian has.

Curb radii in contemporary suburban neighborhoods match expected vehicle type, turning radius and speed to help ensure in-lane turning movements if possible. In order to accommodate the right-hand turning movements of tractor trailer (WB 40) and larger vehicles, no matter what their frequency of street use is, suburban streets typically have minimum intersection curb radii of 25 to 35 ft. with some jurisdictions requiring 50 ft. or more. Such large curb radii encourage rolling stops and higher turning speeds for smaller, more predominant vehicles. These conditions increase the hazards for crossing pedestrians. The large curb radii effectively increase the width of the street, the pedestrian crossing time and the exposure of pedestrians to vehicles.

Sources: 1. R. K. Untermann, Public Streets for Public Use, by Anne Vernez Mondan. 2. Traffic Engineering for Neo-Traditional Neighborhood Design, Inst. of Transportation Engineers.
Pedestrians, Bicyclists, and Free-Flow Lanes

HOW DO PEDESTRIANS & BICYCLISTS NEGOTIATE FREE FLOW RIGHT TURN LANES

Turning roadways and their larger radii can pose problems to pedestrians since they promote faster traffic speeds and usually accommodate higher traffic volumes. Finding adequate gaps in traffic to cross the street can also be a problem because the traffic stream is essentially free-flow and uninterrupted.

At intersections, bicyclists proceeding straight through and motorists turning right must cross paths. Because bicyclists typically keep to the right and motorists to the left, both vehicles attempt to merge. In this situation, the bicyclist may face exposure to high speeds, high volumes, conflict points, and a generally uncomfortable experience of being in the middle of two motor vehicle traffic streams. The hazard to bicyclists is also raised because of the significant difference in the speeds of the two vehicles.

Ped never has a safe crossing time.
Conflict for bikes
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AGENDA ITEM #

Copy Mailed To Alderperson

City of Madison, Wisconsin

Presented April 7, 1998
Referred Plan Commission: Long-Range Transportation Planning Committee; Ped/Bike/Motor Vehicle Commission; Transit/Parking Commission; Board of Public Works; and Urban Design Commission
Rereferred PC(5-10)


Adopted POF
Rules Suspended
Public Hearing

WHEREAS, the Dane 2020 Task Force’s Final Report was completed in November of 1992, and it recommended that the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Dane County, and the City of Madison sponsor an analysis of alternative future development scenarios, which ultimately resulted in Vision 2020, the Dane County Land Use and Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Vision 2020 planning process included a detailed examination of central area multi-modal alternatives, the impetus for which was described in the Dane 2020 Task Force’s Final Report as follows:

“The transportation needs of the central area and Isthmus of Madison are unique in the extent to which they are multi-modal. The concentration of people and businesses along an axis increases the potential for effective transit options that can move large numbers of people more efficiently than autos. Significant changes in density, transportation modes, and transportation corridors may affect many existing neighborhoods. Specific impacts on neighborhoods, businesses, and transportation corridors must be clearly described and understood in order to realistically consider alternative land use/transportation scenarios. To respond to this need, the City should conduct a broad study to examine ways of meeting travel needs in, and through, the central area. This study will include an examination of the major arterials feeding into, and through, the central area. Representatives of affected areas will be included in development of the alternatives. The alternatives developed will be included in the Vision 2020 alternative scenarios. The Vision 2020 sponsors and the consultant will participate in this study;” and
WHEREAS, the Mayor and Common Council of the City of Madison established a Central Area Citizens’ Advisory Committee, which became known as Isthmus 2020, which was charged with looking at the transportation needs and land use patterns of Madison’s Isthmus (defined as approximately from Aberg Avenue/Starkweather Creek on the east to Glenway Street/Wingra Creek on the west) as they relate to the development of Dane County over the next two decades; and

WHEREAS, Isthmus 2020 met over a three-year period to examine central area growth and its impact on the quality of life in the Isthmus and has completed a report with recommendations as to how the Committee recommends the Isthmus should develop over the next two decades; and

WHEREAS, the Committee’s recommendations were based on a careful examination of the Vision 2020 land use and transportation scenarios for Dane County and its conclusion on how these would impact Madison’s Isthmus with regard to housing and employment; and

WHEREAS, the Committee approved its report and adjourned sine die on April 10, 1997; and

WHEREAS, Vision 2020, the Dane County Land Use and Transportation Plan, was approved by the Dane County Regional Planning Commission on June 26, 1997 and incorporated many of the recommendations made by the Isthmus 2020 Committee.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Common Council does hereby approve the Isthmus 2020 Committee Report: A Guidebook for a Model Isthmus as the Committee’s final report.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Department of Planning and Development, the Transportation Agencies, and the Public Works Agencies are directed to review the Committee Report and present to the Plan Commission and Long-Range Transportation Planning Committee within 90 days of the adoption date of this resolution their respective comments and recommended activities to begin to implement the Committee’s recommendations listed below:

1. Planning, zoning, public works, and development in Isthmus Neighborhoods should complement, reinforce, and restore existing traditional neighborhood features.

2. Zoning Ordinances should be changed to allow building setback requirements similar to those in place for each Isthmus neighborhood when it was built. Some of Madison’s oldest neighborhoods were built without setback requirements, and in these cases, requirements should resemble the historic built environment.

3. The City should adopt a neighborhood “main street” approach for key neighborhood commercial streets in the Isthmus.

   A “main street” approach would apply the principles of the Wisconsin State Department of Commerce’s Main Street Program to urban neighborhood-serving commercial districts. The tenets of such a program include pedestrian orientation and strong business organizations. Examples of such urban commercial districts that could be enhanced by a “main street” approach are those along Monroe Street in the Dudgeon-Monroe and Vilas Neighborhoods and the one along East Johnson Street in the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood.

4. Planning for neighborhoods and additional housing should include real estate market based strategies:
   a. Planning for neighborhoods should be focused on neighborhood character more than simply seeking higher density.
b. Plans for additional housing should address specific housing market opportunities or market niches.

c. A significant portion of most neighborhoods should be owner-occupied and long-term tenant housing.

d. The Bassett Neighborhood is the Isthmus neighborhood where increases in owner occupants and long-term tenants might have the greatest impact.

e. Many of the areas offering the greatest opportunity for additional housing units are also those with the least positive neighborhood character. To meet this challenge, there needs to be a clear planning vision, municipal commitment, and a critical mass of positive changes.

f. Renovation of the existing housing stock is a complementary and necessary activity to achieve additional housing units.

g. Desirable types of development and locations for development need to be defined as clearly as possible.

5. More weight should be given to neighborhood impacts when traffic changes and street widenings are considered. A clear process needs to be established for decisions on street widenings and changes in street geometrics.

6. The Committee supports the achievements of the Pedestrian-Bicycle Committee, Transportation Commission, and Traffic Engineering Division in developing a neighborhood traffic management program that includes traffic calming.

7. The City needs guidelines for pedestrian and transit-oriented development and public works in the Isthmus.

8. Future rail transit corridors should be located in existing rail corridors rather than in existing road right-of-ways.

9. Priority should be given to increasing knowledge about good design and sensitive rehabilitation and its economic benefits for property owners and neighborhoods. Inexpensive publications and photographs illustrating renovation choices should be available to property owners when they come to the Department of Planning and Development to consider building projects or to take out building permits.

10. The Committee endorses the City’s currently adopted plans to expand and connect green space in the Isthmus.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the Department of Planning and Development shall recommend to the Plan Commission and Long-Range Transportation Planning Committee regarding a schedule and the scope of activities required to prepare an Isthmus Plan. An Isthmus Plan shall present a picture of how and where the Isthmus should grow and develop in light of the recommendations of the Isthmus 2020 Committee.
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