



City of Madison
Meeting Minutes
Royster Clark Neighborhood
Planning Team Meeting

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

Wednesday, November 28, 2007

6:30 PM

East District Police Station Community Room
809 South Thompson Drive

The East District police station is located just off Cottage Grove Road and just West of the Interstate at 809 South Thompson Dr, Madison, WI 53716 (608) 266-4887.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Royster Clark Neighborhood Planning Team Members Present:

Neighborhood Representatives:

Sheila Guilfoyle, Chair RCNPT, Neighborhood Resident-at-large
John Martens, Vice Chair RCNPT, Neighborhood Resident-at-large
Kris Whitman, East Moreland Neighborhood Representative
Jacky DaWalt, Lake Edge Neighborhood Representative

Neighborhood Representative Alternates:

BJ Obermeyer, Lake Edge Neighborhood Alternate

Business Representatives:

Jim Mohrbacher, MG&E Representative
Ken Bowers, Bower Family Chiropractic, (Not in attendance)

Elected Officials

Larry Palm, City Alderperson
Tom Stoebig, County Board Supervisor

Others in Attendance:

Mike Hershberger, Urban Solutions, Inc.
Brian Munson, Vandewalle & Associates

City Planning Staff:

Michael Waidelich, Planning Division
Rebecca Cnare, Planning Division

2. Public Comment Period – no public comments received

3. Discussion of Market Analysis Consultant Selection Committee

Jim Mohrbacher, and Sup. Tom Stoebig have volunteered to be on the Market Analysis RFP Selection Team. The first meeting of the Selection Team will be Monday, December 17th at 4pm at the Pinney Branch Library.

Ald. Larry Palm and John Martens would also like to see copies of the proposals.

4. Discussion of Comments Received at November 5th Public Meeting

There was general discussion among the RCNPT about the results of the November 5th public meeting held at the Schenk /Whitehorse School Cafeteria. RCNPT members noted that there was a lot of really good information that should help the process move forward. There was discussion about both positive and negative comments received. The RCNPT acknowledged that part of this process will include the education of residents to the potential impacts of different types of redevelopment scenarios.

It was suggested that a compilation of comments in an 11x17 format with columns may be a good way to combine all of the varied responses from the Nov 5th meeting.

5. Discussion about Potential Demolition of Existing Buildings

As per Agrium's request, Ald. Larry Palm had asked staff to look into different scenarios that would allow the demolition of the buildings without losing the leverage or opportunity that requirement for a demolition permit gives to the community regarding future re-use of the site.

Staff responded by describing two possible scenarios:

1. Conditional Use Deed Restriction: Agrium could voluntarily place a deed restriction on the property. This process would require that any future development must meet the Conditional Use standards, and be approved by the Plan Commission. This provides a layer of quasi-judicial review to the process, but would not necessarily prevent uses to the property that meet M-1 zoning conditional use standards, but may not be uses desired by the community. M-1 zoning does not allow residential uses or most retail uses, for example.
2. Required Re-zoning Deed Restriction: Agrium could voluntarily place a 'stronger' deed restriction on the property. This process would require that any future development must undergo a rezoning of the property before any development is approved. Both the Plan Commission, and the Madison Common Council would have to approve the rezoning and development. This option provides a layer of both quasi-judicial and legislative review to the process.

It was also noted that either accidental fire or significant structural damage would require the demolition of the building due to safety concerns and minimum building standards.

After the topic of fire was raised, Kris Whitman asked if there were any harmful materials that would be dangerous if the structure caught on fire? (RCNPT members were reminded of the Central Storage Warehouse fire from 15 years ago.)

A question was raised about how demolition might affect the MGE site training and other uses and activities?

Brian Munson, from Vandewalle Associates, added that environmental clean-up grants are often time-sensitive, and the demolition of the existing plant may be needed before planning for the re-use of the property is completed in order to take advantage of those grants.

While the RCNPT discussed the idea that demolition of the building may be a positive step that will remove a blighting influence in the neighborhood, they also discussed the negatives of tearing the existing structures down. The RCNPT also discussed that if the buildings remain, residents will tend to compare development proposals against the existing 5-story fertilizer plant. However, if the plant is demolished, and the 26 acres are left open for any significant period of time, new development proposals will be weighed against a nice open field, instead of a rusting manufacturing plant.

The RCNPT agreed to continue to think about potential demolition scenarios, and agreed that a scenario that maintains continued leverage over future development, while also making sure that the site is secure and safe will be beneficial to the neighborhoods.

6. Developer Update

Brian Munson noted that the prospective purchasers are engaged in ongoing discussion with the State, Agrium etc about potential Grants and Environmental clean-up funding sources.

7. Neighborhood Planning Team Members Update

There was discussion about the proposed neighborhood survey, regarding the Royster Site, and whether or not to hand deliver or mail the survey. RCNPT members suggested that the survey should build on the responses generated at the November 5th public meeting. There was some discussion about how the survey could be funded. Larry Palm mentioned that there is a dedicated group of individuals working on the survey; the RCNPT should let them complete their work, and then the RCNPT will use the survey results to help bolster all of the other public meeting results, market analysis, and other work.

There was a recognition by the RCNPT Members that in the case of both surveys and public meeting, the findings often result in only the “best” and the “worst “ comments; the lightning rod issues are brought to the forefront. The RCNPT will need understand this going forward, and that the end results of the planning process may not be able to please everybody on all issues

8. Other Staff Updates

Other than the status of the RFP and the formation of the RFP Selection Team discussed earlier, there are no other staff updates at this time.

9. Next Meeting Agenda items

The RCNPT would like to see a flow chart of the planning process – what happens next?

The RCNPT would like to see photos, and other information added to the website.

Update on the Market Study from the selection team

The RCNPT would like to see examples of other 26-acre developments, in order to get an idea of what type of scale; design and density look like at that size.

10. Next Meeting scheduling / Future Meeting Scheduling

The next meeting of the RCNPT will be December 17th, 6:30 pm at the Pinney Branch Library Meeting Room.

Future meeting have been tentatively scheduled for:

January 23rd, 6:30 pm, Pinney Branch Library

February 27th, 6:30 pm, Pinney Branch Library

March 26th, 6:30 pm, Pinney Branch Library

April 23rd, 6:30 pm, Pinney Branch Library

The RCNPT also 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.

11. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm.