



**City of Madison**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Royster Clark Neighborhood**  
**Planning Team Meeting**

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

Wednesday, February 27, 2007

6:30 PM

Pinney Branch Library m  
204 Cottage Grove Road

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

**Royster Clark Neighborhood Planning Team Members Present:**

*Neighborhood Representatives:*

Sheila Guilfoyle, Chair RCNPT, Neighborhood Resident-at-large  
Kris Whitman, Eastmorland Neighborhood Representative  
Jacky Da Walt, Lake Edge Neighborhood Representative  
BJ Obermeyer, Lake Edge Neighborhood Alternate  
Kathy Soukup, Eastmorland Neighborhood Alternate

*Business Representatives:*

Jim Mohrbacher, MG&E Representative  
Ken Bowers, Bower Family Chiropractic

*Elected Officials*

Larry Palm, City Alderperson  
Tom Stoebig, County Board Supervisor

**City Planning Staff:**

Michael Waidelich, Planning Division  
Rebecca Cnare, Planning Division

**2. Public Comment Period** – no public comments were received

**3. Discussion regarding state of development**

**a. Developer situation**

RCNPT agreed to encourage John Stockham to interview the former potential developers of the Royster-Clark site to try and learn more about the factors that caused them to decide not to purchase the property.

**b. Agrium involvement in process**

City Planning staff said that they recently sent Agrium an e-mail again encouraging them to become part of the planning process now that there was no longer a prospective developer that could help to maintain liaison with the company; and also requesting that Agrium designate someone to be the primary contact with City staff regarding the Royster-Clark property. RCNPT requested that City staff also send an additional, more formal, written invitation to Agrium to encourage their participation. RCNPT also requested that staff send Agrium the agendas and minutes from previous RCNPT meetings, along with the results of the November 5<sup>th</sup> Public Meeting.

**c. Demolition issues**

RCNPT continued their previous discussion about the issues surrounding the possible demolition of the existing plant on the property. No new ideas/concerns were raised by the group. Apparently, Agrium hasn't asked City staff any additional questions about possible demolition lately, and it doesn't appear that Agrium is preparing to file an application for demolition permit. Earlier discussion had centered around the fire/safety concerns related to the vacant factory building.

**4. Discussion about last month's presentation by John Stockham**

**a. Questions, concerns, and clarifications**

RCNPT asked about some of the demographic information. Informal observation of the neighborhood by RCNPT members indicates that several families with children have been moving into the neighborhood over the last 2-4 years. While the RCNPT realizes that the Claritas/Census data is the best available, there are still concerns that the data

seems somewhat inconsistent with the anecdotal evidence from the neighborhood. The RCNPT would like to ask Mr. Stockham how his market information will be used in the planning process---how will his work inform our study and affect our decisions? Similarly, City staff are also asked to describe how what we learn from the Market Study will be balanced with other inputs to the planning study and the wishes of the neighborhood.

**b. Anything to request from John Stockham at the next meeting?**

- RCNPT would like to discuss the results and information from the interviews.
- What are Mr. Stockham's next steps?
- How can the market study be used to educate/inform the neighborhood?
- Should we be looking into any specific existing market niches? Health care?
- RCNPT noticed the fairly high income levels in the neighborhood; does that suggest any potential market niches, such as a Restaurant Row, etc?

**5. Neighborhood and Site Analysis Discussion**

**a. Neighborhood and site analysis**

**b. Street, transportation, and transit connections**

**c. Land use discussion**

**d. Land ownership, housing tenure, economic development, open space, community facilities, etc.**

City staff presented and explained some preliminary site and neighborhood analysis maps. These maps included:

- Traffic patterns, traffic generators, road classification and traffic counts
- Existing zoning, land use and housing (dwelling unit) information maps
- Transit information – bus route maps
- Comprehensive Plan recommended land use maps

Discussion by the RCNPT followed. Several RCNPT members pointed out some minor corrections, realizations and interesting anomalies. City Staff should follow up on:

- Commercial use indicated within the residential Eastmorland Neighborhood.
- Check the number of dwelling units indicated on one of the Bower properties
- Indicate which bus routes are commuter routes verses all-day routes.

**6. Preliminary Discussion of Alternative Ideas**

**a. Preferences expressed at public meeting**

City staff distributed several preliminary lists with “sorted” responses to the questions that were asked at the November 5<sup>th</sup> Public Listening Session meeting. These lists combined the responses given by each of the four “groups” to the questions asked at the four “issue stations,” and sorted them into broad subject/issue categories (such as “housing” or “design concerns”) to provide an initial summary of some of the neighborhood’s likes, dislikes, hopes and concerns related to their neighborhood generally, and the future of the Royster-Clark property particularly. Duplication was not eliminated at this stage so that a rough indication of the relative importance of an issue might be seen from the number of times that a similar response was given. Additional analysis of this information will be presented at future meetings.

**b. Size and design comparison of new developments in the City of Madison and surrounding communities**

City staff led an exercise to help visualize the relative scale of the Royster Clark property as compared to other developments located both in the City of Madison and in surrounding communities. Large colored aerial photographs of the planning area were used as a base map upon which RCNPT members overlaid cut-outs aerial photos of other development projects printed at the same map scale. The range of other projects included single-family home subdivisions, mixed-use neighborhood centers like Grandview Commons or Cannery Row in Sun Prairie, strip commercial centers, and even very large commercial developments such as Hilldale Mall. While some of these projects don't necessarily relate to the needs of the neighborhood and probably wouldn't represent a type of development likely to be recommended for the Royster-Clark site, the

exercise helped RCNPT members gauge the relative size of the site that is at the center of the Royster-Clark planning area.

**7. Neighborhood Planning Team Members Updates**

Neighborhood Survey Update: It was reported that over 1700 Eastmorland Neighborhood surveys, and 900 Lake Edge Neighborhood surveys were hand delivered through the Neighborhood Block Capitan system. About 175 surveys have been returned to date. RCNPT expressed thanks to all of the people who have helped out with developing and distributing the questionnaires. Once the surveys have been completed, other volunteers will compile the results---which will provide additional information as the Special Area Planning process continues.

**8. Staff Updates – no additional updates**

**9. Next Meeting Agenda items**

- Continued discussion of Market Study results
- Continued Site Analysis discussion
- RCNPT Scheduling of future meetings

**10. Next Meeting scheduling / Future Meeting Scheduling**

The next meeting of the RCNPT will be March 26<sup>th</sup>, 6:30 pm at the Pinney Branch Library Meeting Room.

**Future meeting have been tentatively scheduled for:**

April 23<sup>rd</sup>, 6:30 pm, Pinney Branch Library

The RCNPT agreed that a few additional meetings might also be necessary once the project gets into the concept-planning mode and begins to consider the results of the market analysis in more detail.

**11. Adjournment**

**The meeting adjourned at 9:00 pm.**