



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved ZONING CODE REWRITE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, January 27, 2009

5:30 PM

Madison Senior Center
330 West Mifflin Street
Rooms 1 & 2 (2nd floor)

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 21 -

Tim Gruber; Satya V. Rhodes Conway; Julia S. Kerr; Lauren Cnare; Nan Fey; Daniel J. Stephans; Diane L. Milligan; Randall L. Glysch; Lisa M. MacKinnon; Ledell Zellers; Janis G. Reek; Carole J. Schaeffer; Michael A. Slavney; Kevin R. Pomeroy; D. Ken Saiki; Gary A. Brown; Amy E. Rountree; Steve C. Steinhoff; Janet P. Loewi; Lance T. McGrath and Craig P. Stanley

Excused: 3 -

Sheri Carter; Susan M. Schmitz and David C. Porterfield

Staff Present: Rick Roll, Matt Tucker

Consultants Present: Suzanne Rhees, Mike Lamb

The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m. Steve Steinhoff ended his teleconference at 8:05 p.m. Ken Saiki left the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF January 14, 2009 MINUTES

A motion was made by Stephans, seconded by Ald Gruber, to Approve the January 14, 2009 Minutes. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Two members of the public made comments:

Kurt Welton:

- Don't make development easier. Make our community the best.
- Commercial and mixed districts: Don't make random rules on window and glass.
- Size limits on commercial - generate more sprawl.
- Parking in front of buildings? Some handicap parking; flexibility. Loading will still need to be in front.
- FAR should be as high as possible to promote sustainability.

Ed Bloom:

- Distributed press release from Rep. Sensenbrenner.
- Code require small dimension parallel to the street; maybe be flexible for better sun orientation.

- Roof top equipment should be screened - but not solar panels.

4. [11122](#)

Administrative Matters

Rick Roll discussed proposed administrative changes to schedule and budget.

- Questions about number of meetings.
- Question about better communication with neighborhoods.
- Concerned about timing and information to neighborhoods and adequate time to respond.
- Concern about community-wide summits vs. just neighborhood meetings.
- How do communications work to get it all out to the public and the neighborhoods?
- When will issues such as lakeshores be addressed?
- What to do about the lag in timing for downtown districts vis-à-vis completion of Downtown Plan?
- Need to “unfurl” the code to general public for political reasons.
- More meetings may be needed for the map review vs. the code draft.
- Question about timing to complete review of the draft and what are the outstanding issues?
- Will the committee ‘vote’ to send draft to the Council?
- Answer is to assume that this committee will reach a consensus and that any larger outstanding issues will be forwarded to Plan Commission and Council.
- Continued discussion about reviewed schedule.
- Regret the loss of the ‘summits.’ Should have them - opportunity to hear what other neighborhoods are saying.
- Should have a community-wide summit as introduction of the map.
- The map will dominate the process and take the focus off the Code.
- Discussion about whether the map or the Code is the best opportunity for ‘airing’ public comments.
- Should be a PR strategy and plan to advertise.
- Request consultant/staff come up with recommendation for future community and neighborhood meetings.
- How do we get people “excited” to attend and participate?

5. [12186](#)

Draft Zoning Code

Suzanne Rhees presented the Employment Districts, Special Districts. The Advisory Committee members asked questions and offered comments.

Topics discussed included:

Review of Employment Districts:

- Environmental protection standards: state that Code will meet and exceed state and federal requirements?
- Employment districts should promote shared parking and support mixed uses.
- Potential mixed-use areas; what makes a “good” employment district (types of services & retail)?
- Residential family living - why are some conditional rather than permitted?
- Remember that these are still employment districts.
- Regarding veterinary clinic - Does it include boarding functions or ‘doggy day care?’
- University has a large-animal clinic; will this be addressed by the veterinary clinic use/definition?
- Does “hotel” include bed and breakfast? Could be in the district but don’t typically

locate in these districts.

- Farmers market - Can we add to the EC District 3?
- Adult daycare part of daycare? Probably can include as a standard.
- Noxious uses - Can we approve residential next to quarries? (There are quarries in multiple locations)
- Question about agriculture and should some quarries be allowed in this district.
- Comment about uses in towns of Blooming Grove and Burke, to be absorbed into City.
- Difference in scale of wind energy devices.
- Outdoor sales - limited number per year? Yard sales or outdoor business sales.
- Structured parking height bonus - discussed at last ZRAC meeting - may not always be applicable or appropriate.
- TW, SE & EC Districts; what about “nuances” of uses as P or C - Why not allow all uses in each of these districts? How and why are we distinguishing among them?
- For example, East Rail Corridor may include a more diverse variety of mixed-use vs. more single uses in a general industrial district.
- Should EC and SE Districts ‘evolve’ over time?
- Code doing a good job on the isthmus but we need help with the suburban pattern.
- Can we raise the bar for all suburban districts?
- Some uses, such as larger assembly and gathering places and recreation uses, need to be conditional.
- General comment about SE, EC is to try to achieve a more ‘place-based,’ pedestrian and sustainable pattern using building standards - intent is for evolution.
- Purpose statements should include comments about stormwater.
- How about specific parking requirements?
- Parking will be a separate section of the code except in districts such as TOD (more specific).
- Should we have different standards for different areas?
- Lot width 40 vs. 50 technically & side yards.
- Follow-up on mixed-use discussion - suggest we allow residential in EC & SE, and some retail sales and services (conditional vs. permitted).
- Why have any Conditional uses in the TW district?
- Goals for SE district - seems additional residential could be allowed.
- Where uses are compatible then residential uses should be permitted; would rather it be conditional just to provide some measure of review.
- Make sure staff understands intensity and development requirements.
- Much of what we are discussing is very related to the map; the market will determine what gets built (re, Old Sauk Trails)
- Question on design review in Employment Campus district, has plan commission reviewed all past guidelines?
- Should plan commission review all guidelines? Should come back to the committee (distinction between building design review versus master plan documents) - maybe a UDC role.
- Policy decisions re nonconforming uses - we have not had a chance to have this discussion from a larger picture via state statutes, nonconforming structures, lots, development.

Special Districts Discussion

Campus Institutional:

- Note: UW pulled together an ad hoc group that included Edgewood, St. Mary’s, MATC.

- Medical campus - part of this too. Not initially intended because a different set of uses.
- St. Mary's is a PUD.
- Uses in the CI district - Should day care be included in public safety; banking as part of a mixed building, vet clinics? Parks and playgrounds? Temporary uses? Accessory uses; wind generators, libraries.
- Temporary uses are very important to the code.
- Activities such as tailgating - private vs. public areas - how do we address?
- Regarding memo of understanding between UW and surrounding neighborhood around Camp Randall.
- What about CI vs. EC - why treat it differently from other "campus areas?"
- Discussion about specifics of a campus master plan vs. conditional uses in the existing code.
- UW would prefer not to have review of campus plans by UDC; maybe an architectural review board with campus and City and neighborhood representatives.
- Need to identify the process in the code.
- Can various institutions, staff, discuss Campus Institutional issues?
- Need to have an appeal process for neighborhood and university disputes.
- Major modifications to master plan - what does the term "specific category" mean? Uses like recreation, medical, etc.
- What would prompt an application for a major modification? Why would plan commission or common council initiate?

Agricultural District

- How are uses defined? (re. Village of Oregon code)
 - Cultivation - field crops.
 - Community garden - urban application.
 - Market garden - farm stand is an accessory use.
- Make community gardens permitted - disagree that urban agriculture is a permitted use.
- Need for a specific urban agriculture district (like the Cleveland ordinance)
- Looking for a more permanent definition for urban agriculture - urban ag. vs. rural ag.
- Maybe we need a better 'temporary' zoning "holding" district, rather than "agricultural."
- Need to carefully define what is permitted by right in agricultural districts.
- Treatment of agriculture in the comp plan is different than the intent of this district.

Conservancy District

- What about uses such as greenhouses, community garden or nurseries? District includes wetlands - should be conditional use.
- Parking - why permitted use? Should be always a conditional use.
- Why temporary building as permitted - should be standards for how long a construction trailer, etc.
- Golf courses as conditional use in conservancy with standards.
- Make emergency power generation a conditional use in the Conservancy District.

6. [10737](#)

Meetings and Other Feedback

No discussion

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.