



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

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

Wednesday, November 19, 2008

6:30 PM

Pinney Branch Library
204 Cottage Grove Road

1. Welcome and Introductions

Royster Clark Neighborhood Planning Team Members Present:

Neighborhood Representatives:

Sheila Guilfoyle, Chair RCNPT, Member-at-large
Jacky DaWalt, Lake Edge Neighborhood
BJ Obermeyer, Lake Edge Neighborhood Alternate
John Martens, Member-at-large

Business Representatives:

Ken Bowers, Bowers Chiropractic

Elected Officials

Tom Stoebig, County Board Supervisor

City Planning Staff:

Michael Waidelich, Planning Division
Heather Stouder, Planning Division
Rebecca Cnare, Planning Division

Members of the Public:

Linda Karr
Ed Woolsey

2. Approval of October 27, 2008 Minutes

- Motion to approve by BJ Obermeyer, seconded by Jacky DaWalt. Minutes from October 27, 2008 were unanimously approved

3. Public Comment Period

- No comments

4. Staff and Member Updates

- Sheila Guilfoyle noted that the Plan Commission read and paid attention to public comments received regarding Agrium's demolition request. She suggested that it appeared as though Agrium was essentially seeking demolition by neglect, showing disregard for City orders to make repairs.
- Staff explained that Building Inspection is working with Agrium to clear up communication issues with regard to building code violations, and that Agrium indicated they would be making necessary repairs to the fence and building.

5. Discuss Agrium Demolition Permit Application

- John Martens requested an update on involvement of state agencies in the review of the demolition request.
- Staff summarized a recent meeting with DATCP and DNR staff to discuss a response to the "capping" solution being proposed by Agrium for the pits in the main building. DATCP staff that had an opportunity to tour the building noted that there is a nonfunctional drainage system previously used for the pit, and that large wooden planks separate the concrete pit into separate storage areas. DNR staff mentioned that the wood was very likely unusable due to years of exposure to

fertilizer ingredients, and suggested that they would need to tour the site as well to ensure that all regulations pertaining to solid waste disposal and air quality could be met throughout the demolition process. DATCP would require a much more detailed plan including a schedule and timeline for the temporary cap, as well as a plan for monitoring soil and groundwater beneath the pit floor. Staff noted that it is possible that the conditions necessary to approve the "cap" may render it economically unfeasible.

- Sheila asked whether staff thought the Plan Commission would approve the request, and whether they could review documents and decide to condition approval differently, such as requiring full remediation.
- Staff noted that the Plan Commission might approve the request with the recommended conditions, but that Agrium would still have a lot of work to do to demonstrate that all environmental regulations would be met prior to obtaining a permit for demolition of the buildings. Alternatively, the Plan Commission could certainly change the conditions of approval. However, an approval at the Plan Commission level does not mean that Agrium must move forward with a partial demolition.
- John Martens suggested that in current market conditions, the community probably would not want to oppose demolition, when perhaps it would be removing a barrier to future development.
- Sheila Guilfoyle agreed, noting that all public comments submitted from neighborhood associations generally agreed that buildings should come down, but expressed concerns about groundwater contamination.
- Tom Stoebig mentioned that in his conversations with DATCP staff, it appears that they are being very thoughtful with what is an atypical site for their involvement. Noted that the Voluntary Liability Exemption Process (VPLE) is actually overseen by the DNR, and that DNR staff had explained that some property owners in the midst of other VPLE process have decided to back out.
- John Martens asked whether the Plan Commission could add standards pertaining to site beautification (landscaping, screening, etc.) to this approval. Staff said that while this is possible, it is unlikely.
- Ed Woolsey asked how the City might ensure that full remediation is accomplished after two years. Linda Karr suggested that the Plan Commission could require as a condition of approval a bond worth a certain percentage of the value of the company.
- Staff suggested that the Plan Commission could theoretically condition approval on receipt of a bond, but that it would need to be for a specific amount to reflect the work needed on the site. Also noted that another approach would be to place a deed restriction on the property as a condition of approval, but that Agrium had indicated they would not move forward under this condition.
- Tom Stoebig suggested that the City might want to consider simply rezoning the property, if a deed restriction is not agreeable.

6. **Date and Potential Agenda for next Public Meeting**

- RCNPT suggested a February 2009 public meeting, date to be determined based on individual schedules and site availability.
- Tom Stoebig asked whether the narrative would be ready for the next public meeting. Staff suggested that this meeting should likely focus on presenting design principles and draft recommendations and policies for feedback. Would likely need to focus a descriptive narrative for the draft plan on adopted recommendations, policies, and a design alternative.
- Sheila Guilfoyle asked about the relationship between the Plan and future development proposals. Hypothetically, if the Plan recommends a three-story building, but a developer proposes a 1-2 story building, what happens?
- Staff explained that especially in absence of a developer, we should put together an engaging conceptual plan using public input received. The adopted Plan can emphasize the importance of

particular things, yet developers can always make the case that their plan is superior to what is adopted.

- Tom Stoebig asked whether the Plan would be limited to only the Agrium property. Staff noted that it would include the entire planning area (MG&E property, properties along Cottage Grove Rd, etc.)
- Sheila Guilfoyle asked for discussion on whether the Plan should show houses along the east side of Royster Avenue, and street connections to the west. Ken Bowers suggested that housing compatible with the west side of Royster is important to show in the long term plan for the area, and BJ Obermeyer agreed. Kris Whitman noted that while a street connection to the west is important, fewer connections would bring less opposition. Sheila suggested that it is important to show the full long-term potential for the entire planning area. Staff noted that the Plan alternatives would likely show low-density residential development close to Royster Avenue due to both its compatibility with what exists today and market support for it.
- Ed Woolsey asked about open space requirements for development. Staff noted that requirements vary based on the zoning district, but that on this particular site, stormwater management would be an important consideration guiding the location of open spaces throughout the site.
- Staff asked for feedback on the use and design of the building at the corner of Cottage Grove Road and Dempsey Road. Sheila suggested that the corner building should anchor the entire Royster site, with employment as the preferred use. While smaller scale retail in a larger building might be OK, single pad sites would not be acceptable. Noted that a setback from the streets is important to maintain, rather than allowing the building to be right at the sidewalk. Others agreed, noting that height, setbacks, and landscaping all weigh in to the perception of a building.
- Staff asked whether height limits should be included in the Plan. Ed Woolsey recalled that public input did not seem to support heights greater than 3-4 stories. John Martens suggested that the neighborhood is probably more concerned with perceptions rather than actual number of stories. Noted that setbacks can make a big difference to how a building is perceived.
- BJ Obermeyer stressed the importance of bringing jobs to the area, noting that very high buildings would not likely be supported. Ken Bowers suggested that bringing as much as possible to the site was important in order to attract people to the area.
- Sheila suggested that the Plan should show a bicycle path along Dempsey Road, crossing Cottage Grove Road.
- Staff mentioned possibility of burying or screening the high tension lines along Cottage Grove Road, noting that burying them would be very expensive.
- Staff suggested focusing on draft Plan Recommendations and more detailed design alternatives to solicit public input at the next public meeting. Sheila Guilfoyle asked how the design alternatives would differ from what had already been presented. Staff noted that they would likely be similar to Design Concepts 5 and 6, but that they would be more detailed and include the planning area as a whole.

7. Next RCNPT Meeting Date (*Tentatively December 17, 2008*)

- The RCNPT decided to resume after the winter holidays with the regularly scheduled meeting on January 28, 2009.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30

Next meeting scheduled for:
January 28, 2009, 6:30 pm, Pinney Branch Library