

## East Wilson Street / Schley Pass / Dewey Court Neighborhood Conservation Study Neighborhood Meeting 1 - Summary

The kick-off meeting for the Neighborhood Conservation Study was held on March 10 at the Luke House. Nine persons participated in the meeting, not including City staff. Following introductions, City staff presented some background information and answered questions about neighborhood conservation districts and the process outlined in Madison General Ordinance Section 28.108 for considering the creation of a district. The neighborhood conservation study is the next step in the process of considering whether or not to create a conservation district in the East Wilson Street/Schley Pass/Dewey Court area. Staff also presented a tentative meeting outline and schedule for conducting the study.

An important goal for the first neighborhood meeting was to begin to focus the study by learning from participants which existing physical characteristics of the study area were most important to them, their concerns about possible future changes in the area, and the types of additional restrictions they would not want placed on properties in the study area.

During the meeting, participants were given three written questions and asked to list on separate "post-it" notes as many answers as they wanted to each question. Responses were then shared with the group and posted on a flipchart. Similar answers were grouped together and categorized (for example, "nice tree canopy", "larger established trees", and "tree cover on E Wilson" were placed in a single category called "tree cover").

After some discussion of the responses to the questions, participants were asked to place "dot stickers" on their three highest-priority grouped responses to each question. All of the individual post-it note responses to the three questions are listed below in Table 1, followed by the "grouped" responses to each question and the results of the informal "dot votes" in Table 2.

**Table 1: Individual Responses to Questions**

<b><i>Question 1 - Please list or describe the specific physical attributes of the study area that you think define its distinctive character.</i></b>
Smaller/non-massive development, mostly privately-owned single-family homes
Historic bungalow district
Larger established trees
Low commercial development and traffic
Building masses are small, not higher than 2 stories
Buildings/footprints are narrower, based on 1/2 lots
No parking lots or multiple use driveways
The small, compact size of the district
Front porches
Front porch
Nice tree canopy
Tree cover on E Wilson
Pedestrian-friendly, buildings interact with the street
Street life
Slow traffic
Bike path pass-through
Bikes
The diverse style of housing
Eclectic mix of structures (sizes, materials, and uses)
Small scale, affordable homes
Front gabled houses with dormers
The district is bookended by a cul de sac and a river
Better upkeep buildings

**Table 1: (continued)**

<b>Question 2 - Please list or describe the types of changes that you hope will <u>not</u> occur within the study area over time.</b>
Construction of large commercial and/or residential buildings (full lots, multiple units, taller than 2 stories)
Purchase/demolition of multiple buildings resulting in larger lots and buildings taller than 2 stories
Zoning change that would allow more non-residential development
Parking lots
Parking lots
No trees
Change of overall mix (ratio) of residential and commercial
Large industry
Large retail areas with chain stores
Overgrowth of huge high rise buildings
No buildings taller than the current tallest structure on Dewey/Schley/E Wilson
3-4 story buildings abutting adjacent homes
Multistory buildings
High density housing
Chicago-style aggregation and tear downs for larger homes
Bright street lights shining in windows
Wider streets
Suburban-style houses with garages in front of them.

<b>Question 3 - Please list or describe any constraints or restrictions that you would <u>not</u> want to see placed on properties within the study area.</b>
Restrictions on the ability to run a home-business
Prevention of tear-down and rebuild
Limits on paint color
Limits on porches, decks, paint color, yard art, gardening
Inhibiting people's tasteful creativity with their homes
Restrictions on materials, colors, or architectural style for remodeling and rebuilds
Vegetable controls on non-invasive plants (e.g. Prairie plants only)
Prefer to see no new zoning restrictions
Restrictions greater than current zoning regarding mass, height, and lot use
No new restrictions (leave as is)
Prohibitions on urban agriculture, community gardening, urban orchards
Prohibitions to changes in building footprints, additions to structures.
Restrictions on additional art, sculptures, and parks
Change in ability to vary or change zoning category for private properties

**Table 2: Summary “Dot Vote” Priorities**

<b>Question 1 - Please list or describe the specific physical attributes of the study area that you think define its distinctive character.</b>	
<b>Grouped Response Categories</b>	<b>"Dot Votes"</b>
Street Life	5
Small-scale affordable homes	5
Eclectic mix of uses and structures	4
Tree cover	2
Small district	1
Front porches	1
Bike friendly	0
Front gabled roofs with dormers	0

<b>Question 2 - Please list or describe the types of changes that you hope will <u>not</u> occur within the study area over time.</b>	
<b>Grouped Response Categories</b>	<b>"Dot Votes"</b>
Tree removal	5
High rises / multistory buildings	5
Change in mix of uses	2
Large retail chains	2
Wider streets	2
Houses with garages in front	1
Parking lots	0
High density housing (size)	0
Aggregation of lots for larger houses	0
Bright street lights	0

<b>Question 3 - Please list or describe any constraints or restrictions that you would <u>not</u> want to see placed on properties within the study area.</b>	
<b>Grouped Response Categories</b>	<b>"Dot Votes"</b>
Restrictions beyond current zoning re: mass, height, use	4
On existing lots, prohibitions to changes in building footprint, additions	3
Restrictions on changes in future use	3
Prohibitions on urban agriculture	2
Prevention of teardown and rebuild	1
Restrictions on vegetation	1
Not sure in favor of concept	1
Limits on paint color	0
Restrictions on style and materials for rebuild	0
Restrictions on art	0

Note that because the number of participants was small and only three “dot-votes” were allowed for each question, a low vote total does not necessarily mean that the response was considered unimportant, only that it may have relatively lower-priority than the other choices to those who were present at the meeting.