



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved ZONING CODE REWRITE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, March 24, 2009

5:30 PM

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

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 16 -

Tim Gruber; Satya V. Rhodes-Conway; Nan Fey; Daniel J. Stephans;
Diane L. Milligan; Lisa M. MacKinnon; Ledell Zellers; Michael A. Slavney;
Kevin R. Pomeroy; D. Ken Saiki; Gary A. Brown; Amy E. Rountree; Janet
P. Loewi; David C. Porterfield; Lance T. McGrath and Craig P. Stanley

Excused: 8 -

Julia S. Kerr; Lauren Cnare; Sheri Carter; Randall L. Glysch; Janis G.
Reek; Carole J. Schaeffer; Susan M. Schmitz and Steve C. Steinhoff

Staff Present: Brad Murphy, Rick Roll, Matt Tucker

Consultants Present: Suzanne Rhees and Mike Lamb participated via videoconference.

Michael Slavney called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF February 26, 2009 MINUTES

**A motion was made by Stephans, seconded by Ald Gruber, to Approve the
February 26, 2009 Minutes. The motion passed by the following vote:**

Excused: 8 -

Julia S. Kerr; Lauren Cnare; Sheri Carter; Randall L. Glysch; Janis G.
Reek; Carole J. Schaeffer; Susan M. Schmitz and Steve C. Steinhoff

Ayes: 14 -

Tim Gruber; Satya V. Rhodes-Conway; Nan Fey; Daniel J. Stephans;
Diane L. Milligan; Lisa M. MacKinnon; Michael A. Slavney; D. Ken Saiki;
Gary A. Brown; Amy E. Rountree; Janet P. Loewi; David C. Porterfield;
Lance T. McGrath and Craig P. Stanley

Abstentions: 2 -

Ledell Zellers and Kevin R. Pomeroy

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments: Eric Sundquist registered to speak about general parking standards and regulations.

4. [11122](#) Administrative Matters

- Mike Slavney asked the Committee to review the meeting agenda. There were no recommended changes.
- Mike Slavney reminded the Committee of upcoming meeting dates, which are April 28th, May 20th and June 22nd, 23rd and 24th.

5. [12186](#) Draft Zoning Code

Staff and consultants provided an overview of the proposed General Regulations. The Advisory Committee members asked questions and offered comments.

Topics discussed included:

Review of General Regulations:

- Staff and consultants provided an overview of the draft Standards and Requirements for Accessory Dwelling units.
- Discussion of overlay district approach to accessory dwelling units. Text will be added to the Overlay District.
- Discussion about whether the proposed accessory dwelling approach will function in a manner similar to a conservation district. Accessory dwelling unit overlay plans could be prepared by staff or consultants.
- Concern about how long the process of drafting an accessory dwelling unit plan would take. Desire to not have a greater number of cases going to the Zoning Board of Appeals.
- Discussion about allowing accessory dwelling units as conditional uses until overlay plans are completed.
- Discussion about the desirability of owner occupancy requirement for accessory dwelling units, and the maximum building size, maximum occupancy and corner lot requirements.
- Discussion about whether the conditional use process or the overlay district process would require more staff time.
- Suggestion that a benefit of the overlay approach is that it creates predictability.
- Suggestion that an intent statement be added to the accessory dwelling unit text. Also, it was noted that accessory dwelling units support the Natural Step.
- Accessory dwelling units could be rented as long as the main unit were owner occupied.
- Discussion of whether building size maximums are really getting at duplex type issues.
- Discussion about in which zoning districts accessory dwelling units would be allowed.
- The Advisory Committee requested a new draft of the Accessory Dwelling Units document.
- Eric Sundquist was asked to summarize the memorandum he provided to the Advisory Committee regarding parking standards. He suggested looking at parking minimums and setting them as low as they can possibly go. Spillover impacts could be dealt with through other measures such as parking permits and meters.
- Discussion about how parking requirements are calculated. Per square foot of building versus per employee. Discussion about how many parking standards to have in each district. One standard could possibly cover several uses.
- Discussion about the potential negative impact on business if parking is restricted too much.
- Discussion of potential negative impacts of no parking requirement on neighborhoods. Need enforcement of parking permits.
- If too many parking spaces are required, we couldn't build neighborhoods like Williamson Street, Monroe Street, Atwood Avenue, etc.
- Suggestion to articulate why we set parking standards for each use, maybe limit the discussion to the higher-level groupings of uses.
- Suggestion that parking standards may need to vary from location to location.
- The Advisory Committee agreed that they want to see a revised draft of the parking standards with no minimum or low minimum standards for certain uses.
- Suggestion that uses such as group living, multi-family dwellings, and restaurants may still need a minimum requirement.

- Draft code allows deferral of construction of parking spaces until these spaces are needed.
- Suggestion to allow a parking reduction if a community car is available.
- Suggestion that parking minimums create the assumption that parking will be required at some time.
- Discussion about the parking utility and whether it makes money now.
- Discussion about the effect of eliminating parking minimums on parking demand for 2-hour on-street zones. Would this be more costly for the city to administer?
- No minimum parking may result in better design.
- Suggestion that people could take advantage of their neighbor's parking if there is a no minimum parking requirement.
- A holistic approach to parking is needed. Need to look at on-street and off-street parking. Would need to talk to the City and neighbors before on-street parking were to be removed.
- Conditional use permits and rezones require a comprehensive parking analysis.
- Discussion about moped parking concerns and state and local laws that regulate them. Suggestion to prohibited parking of mopeds in front yards.
- Discussion about campus master plans.
- Suggestion to add bike parking to the auto services category.
- Suggestion that three parking spaces per classroom are too low. Proposed University parking requirement is too low. Staff should talk to schools about their parking needs.
- Discussion about the permitted locations of parking lots on a lot.
- Discussion about rear yard buffers and screening.
- Discussion about the potential for allowing shared driveways.
- Suggestion to use native species and no mow plants.
- Suggestion to look at parking maximums, possibly make them all the same.
- Discussion about shared loading.
- Discussion about guest parking requirements.
- The Advisory Committee decided to defer discussion of the Planned Development District text review. The Advisory Committee asked that the Plan Commission review it.
- Suggestion that Alder should sign off on Planned Developments. Incorporate neighborhoods into the approval process.
- Discussion of notification requirements for various stages of development, e.g. conditional use permits, minor alterations, etc.
- Suggestion that the code needs to clearly define "objectives", "guidelines", and "criteria".

6. [10737](#) Meetings and Other Feedback

None.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

**A motion was made by Porterfield, seconded by Fey, to Adjourn at 7:49 p.m.
The motion passed by voice vote/other.**