

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE
OCTOBER 2005 PUBLIC HEARING DRAFT
CITY OF MADISON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

- I. Reports from the Reviewing Boards, Commissions and Committees
- II. Written Comments from the Public
- III. Summary Compilation of Reviewing Body Comments with Planning Staff Recommendations

Department of Planning & Development
Planning Unit

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Reports from Reviewing Boards, Commissions and Committees.....	3
Committee and Commission Review Meeting Schedule and Results.....	4
Landmarks Commission Minutes.....	5
Housing Committee Letter	9
Pedestrian/Bike/Motor Vehicle Meeting Minutes.....	10
Transit/Parking Meeting Minutes.....	11
Park Commission Minutes	14
Urban Design Commission Minutes	17
Board of Estimates Minutes	19
Economic Development Commission Minutes	20
II. Written Comments from the Public.....	21
III. Summary Compilation of Reviewing Body Comments with Planning Staff Recommendations	23
Park Commission Comments and Staff Recommendations	24
Transportation Commission Comments and Staff Recommendations.....	25
Urban Design Commission Comments and Staff Recommendations	38

I. Reports from the Reviewing City Boards, Commissions and Committees

The ordinance to adopt the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan was referred to nine City boards, commissions and committees plus two sub-committees, with the Plan Commission as lead. This section presents the reports of the first eight referral bodies in both excerpts and original formats.

Committee and Commission Review Meeting Schedule and Results		
Commission/Committee	Meeting Date	Meeting Results
Landmarks Commission	August 22 nd	Passed motion to recommend to the Common Council adoption of the Comprehensive Plan (May Discussion Draft).
Housing Commission	November 2 nd	Passed motion to recommend to the Common Council adoption of Section 4, Housing without modification.
Park Commission	November 9 th	Passed motion to recommend to the Common Council adoption of the Plan with modifications.
Transit/Parking Commission	November 10 th	Passed motion to recommend to Common Council adoption of the Plan with modifications discussed at the joint transportation committee meeting of October 25 th .
Urban Design Commission	November 16 th	Passed motion to recommend to the Common Council adoption of the Plan with modifications.
LRTPC	November 17 th	Passed motion to recommend to the Common Council adoption of the Plan with modifications discussed at the joint October 25 th transportation committee meeting.
Board of Estimates	November 21 st	Passed motion to adopt the Plan without any modifications.
Pedestrian/Bike/Motor Vehicle Commission	November 22 nd	Passed motion to adopt the Plan with modifications discussed at the joint October 25 th transportation committee meeting.
Common Council Briefing	November 29 th	Presentation and questions and answers.
Common Council Briefing	November 30 th	Display and questions and answers.
Economic Development Commission	December 1 st	Passed motion to adopt the Plan.
Plan Commission	December 5 th	Presentation to Plan Commission of comments from the public and Committees and Commissions followed by staff responses.

**October 2005 Public Hearing Draft – City of Madison Comprehensive Plan
LANDMARKS COMMISSION MINUTES**

MINUTES

MADISON LANDMARKS COMMISSION

4:30 p.m., Monday, August 22, 2005
Room LL-130, Madison Municipal Building

I. ROLL CALL

Members present: Ms. Crocker, Ald. Olson, Mr. Page (acting chairperson), Mr. Rosenblum, Mr. Stephans, Ms. Taylor

Guests: Mr. John Freiburger, Ms. Ellen Montei, Mr. Ted Schmidt, Ms. Alice Honeywell, Mr. Ed Sue, Ms. Wendi Sue, Mr. William Patterson, Mr. Trent Nichols. Ms. Ledell Zellers

II. MINUTES

Ms. Taylor noted that she was not at the last meeting. With this correction, the minutes of the August 8, 2005 meeting were ordered approved as written.

III. CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

A. 1920 Arlington Place, University Heights historic district – consideration of issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for replacing side deck

Mr. John Freiburger, the construction consultant, said that they proposed to replace an old narrow deck, last remodeled in the 1980s, and add a new deck with design details that will match the details that were recently built on the second floor sleeping porch. Mr. Stephans said that he thought the plans were an excellent improvement over the old remodeled deck. Mr. Rosenblum said that he thought echoing the other porch was a good idea. Mr. Stephans then moved that the Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for this project, seconded by Ald. Olson and passed unanimously.

B. Pres House, 731 State Street, designated Landmark - consideration of issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for new lower level restaurant and consideration of advisory opinion to Plan Commission for proposed building adjacent to a Landmark

Ms. Rankin passed out revised drawings that were submitted after the packets were mailed out. One of the architects for this project, Ed Sue, described the major parameters of the design. He noted that an important goal of the clients was to reflect in the new building its spiritual connection with the old. The Pres House organization has reenergized after being nearly defunct in recent years.

They are planning to open the apartment house to students of all faiths, but they hope to have some of the students of their faith come together as a community in the new building. As a result, the design charge includes echoing some of the symbolism of their faith, including verticality, symmetry, a large center window and a roof pitch that would draw the eye upward.

Mr. Sue said that they had worked closely with the UW to fit into its land use and landscape plans and fit in with the scale of nearby university buildings. Mr. Schmidt of the Pres House asked, for the benefit of some of its board members, the rationale behind the original staff recommendation to reduce the Gothic features in the new design. Ms. Rankin explained that the City in general prefers to have modern buildings blend with their surroundings, but not necessarily duplicate older styles, but rather be an architectural statement of its own day. She noted that a large Gothic-arched window in the upper stories of the new building would detract from the beauty and uniqueness of the one in the church since such windows are typically only seen in ecclesiastical structures, not residential ones. To use too many of the major elements of church design would look out of place on a modern residential building. She said that retention of the main gable shape would work to tie the two designs together without actually creating too much duplication in the design of the new building.

Ms. Sue then described the changes to the Pres House, the major changes of which are relandscaping the front corner of the lot with a curvilinear design with improved accessibility. Between State Street and the building, an outdoor eating area would be created at basement level for the current cafe located in the basement. The outdoor cafe would be screened somewhat from the street by a raised planter.

Then Ms. Sue discussed the design of the new building, noting that it was to be all glass on the first level to enhance the sense of life and to create a friendly, open feeling. She showed a color rendering in red brick, which she said was suggested as a good material by the Urban Design staff. She also showed alternate brick colors and the Commission said that they would prefer that the building be in a lighter brick to blend better with the colors of the church building. To a question by Mr. Page, Mr. Sue stated that the patio paving would be concrete, noting that the adjoining building to the east is concrete.

Mr. Stephans said that he was concerned that the anchors into the stonework for the canvas canopy might be a site for movement and harm to the historic stonework. Ms. Montei noted that they were not committed to the canopy and would not be unhappy if it were rejected. Commission members noted that unattached sun protection for the tables, such as umbrellas, might work well in

that location. Mr. Stephans also said that he liked the way they have opened up the basement and said that the grading and landscaping plan would soften the appearance of the building and would work very well.

To a question about signage for the restaurant, the architects said that the signage has not yet been worked on. The Commission members noted that signage will have to come back to the Commission at a later date. Mr. Page noted that the fair amount of detail on the side facing the Catholic Church was initially troubling to him, but the fact that there was a ten foot setback and a courtyard for the Catholic Church in that area were points in favor of more detail. Mr. Page said that he saw the apartment building as a sort of frame for the piece of art that is the church. He and Mr. Stephans said that the design presented was simpler but blended elegantly with the church design without articulating all of its details.

Mr. Stephans then moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness for the remodeling of the church building was approved on the condition that signage come back to the Commission at a later date, that the canopy be omitted from the plans, that the version of the design that shows windows flanking the two basement French doors is the scheme that is approved, and that Ms. Rankin is authorized to approve minor changes that might occur before the building permit is issued. Mr. Rosenblum seconded the motion, which was passed unanimously.

The Commission then considered their advisory opinion to the Plan Commission on the development adjacent to the Landmark. Ms. Taylor noted that the original roof design was too busy and the one submitted for the meeting was less competitive with the design of the church. Mr. Rosenblum said that a simpler design such as the one submitted for the meeting was a better solution. Mr. Stephans moved that the Landmarks Commission recommend to the Plan Commission that the scale of the proposed building and its design are compatible with the historic character of the adjacent Landmark, the Pres House. Ms. Taylor seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

IV. DISCUSSION

- A. 122 Bascom Place, University Heights historic district – discussion of work undertaken that did not comply with conditions of Certificate of Appropriateness

Ms. Rankin showed Commission members photos of the project as completed, noting that there was no window on the front as was shown in the plans, nor was there a pent roof over the garage. The Commission agreed to schedule the

Minutes, Landmarks Commission, August 22, 2005 – page 4

issue for the next Landmarks Commission meeting and invite the owner to attend.

B. Madison Comprehensive Plan – consideration of recommendations to Plan Commission

Mr. Stephans moved that the Landmarks Commission recommend adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, second by Mr. Rosenblum. Ald. Olson said that she was not personally ready to endorse the plan, because she wants to see the Conservation District idea given more prominence. The motion to recommend adoption passed unanimously, with one abstention.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Katherine H. Rankin
Secretary

**October 2005 Public Hearing Draft – City of Madison Comprehensive Plan
HOUSING COMMITTEE LETTER**

2 November 2005

To: Mark Olinger, Director
Department of Planning & Development

From: Thomas Hirsch, AIA, Chair
Housing Committee

Re: Comprehensive Plan Comments

The Housing and Land Use sections of the draft Comprehensive Plan were referred to the Housing Committee and considered first by the Affordability Subcommittee in some detail, and then the full Committee. Tonight, I am pleased to say, the full Committee took on the subject and without dissent passed a recommendation to report it out:

“Motion to recommend to the Common Council adoption of Section 4, Housing without modification.”

Members present were Brink, Ejercito, Hassel, Kerr, LeTourneau, Mandeville, Merrill, Sparer, Verveer, Wilcox, and myself. The motion passed unanimously with Kerr abstaining.

The Committee commented favorably on its inclusiveness, emphasis on neighborhood plans for detailed decision-making, and the attention to existing housing stock preservation and improvement. Congratulations on a job well done.

If we can be of further service to you, please let me know.

c: Mayor Cieslewicz
Brad Murphy, CED
Hickory Hurie, CDBG

October 2005 Public Hearing Draft – City of Madison Comprehensive Plan PEDESTRIAN/BIKE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION MINUTES

Excerpt from 11/22/05 PBMVC Minutes:

02207 – Resolution re. Comprehensive Plan Dave Trowbridge and Linda Horvath were present on the item and available to respond to questions. DeVos asked for a change initially in Policy 7 on page 3-13 of the Oct document to include the term curb cuts. Her intent was to acknowledge that people in wheelchairs are pedestrians too and she didn't believe this was clear. Trowbridge wondered if it might be better placed as a part of Policy 2 and she supported the recommendation. Trowbridge explained that staff would prepare a response for the Plan Commission to comments that had been submitted, such as those the PBMVC would submit, and for the most part he expected the recommendations to be incorporated in the final document. Motion by Conroy/Logan to approve the resolution and to forward comments from the prior 10/25/05 meeting and the comment from today carried unanimously. Shahan reported on a recommendation made by the LRTPC as a result of a request from Mike Rewey where it referenced education and law enforcement in the bike section and since it was not specifically referenced in other sections, he believed it should be removed.

October 2005 Public Hearing Draft – City of Madison Comprehensive Plan TRANSIT/PARKING COMMISSION

D* R* A* F* T*

The following excerpt of the Draft minutes from the Transit/Parking Commission meeting of November 10, 2005 includes only the Comprehensive Plan discussion.

F.3. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Motion by Golden/Carlsen to suspend the rules to take up item F.3. out of order, carried unanimously.

Dave Trowbridge and Linda Horvath of City Planning were present. The public hearing draft was released on October 28, and that was the document the TPC had in their packets. Planning staff were looking for TPC approval of the ordinance to adopt the Plan. The Common Council will take it up on December 13.

Trowbridge remarked that the PBMVC and TPC provided good comments at their joint meeting on October 25. The recommended changes from the meeting have not been incorporated in the Plan but will be transmitted to the Plan Commission as suggested changes. Durocher wanted to know the difference between the draft Plan provided in May versus the one provided in October. Trowbridge stated the transportation changes were highlighted at the October joint meeting.

Golden inquired as to the reason for the push to get this adopted, is there a statutory deadline? Trowbridge replied that there's a deadline with the State grant. Golden noted that the Plan is going before a number of committees/commissions, and he felt some will need a "push" to act now. Trowbridge stated there's a push within Planning to get this done.

Michael Barrett, 2137 Sommers Avenue, registered in opposition and provided a written comment: "My biggest complaint is that the plan features no discussion and no policy proposals increasing frequency of service. Spatial coverage is much less important than frequency, especially if the city follows through with the rest of the plan which calls for dense, mixed use TODs."

Debo recalled that an earlier version of the Plan included a statement that the City would fund transit service in such a way that they could maintain and expand service, and she wondered what happened to that. Golden remarked that the Plan talks about expansion of service into newly developed areas but Barrett's comment is correct, they never discuss frequency issues. He would like to see something about 30-minute service. Debo pointed out that the TPC reviews the Transit Development Program developed by the MPO, and that document addresses more specific issues like levels of service. Trowbridge indicated that something about frequency of service could be put in the Plan, although Debo emphasized that frequency relates to funding. Wong commented that as urban sprawl expands, the City needs to plan for transit service and he didn't want to see service to new areas occur at the expense of existing service. At some point does the City draw a line and say that we cannot provide service to new areas because we want to provide better service in existing areas. Consideration should be given to where to increase service in order to maximize ridership. Trowbridge felt the first objective gets into that but the Transit Development Program could flesh it out.

Motion by Golden/Carlsen to add a statement that the City aspires to increase transit service so that travel time is no greater than 30 minutes from boarding to destination, with the intent that this should be a service standard.

Debo felt this is a good idea but it would require express buses. Golden just wanted to put it out there, and he emphasized that he used the word “aspire.” Debo remarked that the intent is great but where is the funding? Trowbridge suggested that “if determined to be cost effective” could be added as a qualifier, but Golden did not think it was necessary at this point. Durocher noted that the motion is to be the consensus of the TPC. It would add language to the Plan that says the City puts a high priority on effective public transportation. The chance of achieving it is a separate issue.

Motion carried unanimously.

Trowbridge asked if this comment carries a higher significance than the other comments from the 10/25 joint meeting that were not made in the form of a motion, and Golden replied no.

Wong felt there are contradictions in the Plan, such as talking about improving air quality but then making it easy to drive to the suburbs.

Durocher relayed the feedback from the ADA Transit Subcommittee, specifically two comments by member Susan DeVos. Her references to page, policy and objective numbering did not correspond with the most recent draft, but it appears they correspond to the following numbering:

1. Page 3-13: It is nice that under Policy 10 pedestrian issues such as snow removal are addressed, but there is no mention of curb cuts. In planning documents, it is very important to be aware of the issue of curb cuts and that we need construction of more curb cuts. There needs to be recognition in planning that wheelchair users use sidewalks too. It could be addressed in a separate policy or be included in an existing policy.
2. The plan talks about paratransit services as what is being done to meet ADA standards, but there is no mention that mainline buses have equipment for disabled people as well. Language about that could be included in Objective 9 on page 3-13. The word “accessible” could be inserted so that it would read “Implement a variety of *accessible* public transit services throughout the City of Madison . . . Implement *accessible* transit services in a manner . . .”

Golden asked whether the intent of these comments is to provide paratransit service above the requirements of the ADA. Durocher clarified that the intent is to remember to describe the service as accessible.

Golden noted that there are ADA requirements for housing but because of the speed of development, transit service is not yet provided because the density is not high enough. If the City truly wants to make the housing accessible, then accessible transportation should be provided.

Motion by Golden/Carlsen to add a policy stating that the City should aspire to provide paratransit to new residential developments above the ADA minimums so that accessible housing can be served by accessible transit as early as is feasible.

Debo pointed out that the ADATS deals with the issue of accessibility, and that committee has supported a policy that Metro provide the level of ADA service that is complementary to fixed route transit service. This would be an unfunded mandate and she cautioned against shifting substantial dollars from fixed route to paratransit, which would completely change the orientation of service. The ADA contains conditions of time and space that make paratransit service complementary to fixed

route service. Debo strongly felt the motion sets forth a policy decision that should be discussed at ADATS and then adopted by the TPC, but the Comprehensive Plan is not the place for it. The intent of the ADATS was to insert “accessible” where it would carry across the meaning of accessible fixed route service complemented by paratransit service under the requirements of the ADA. Golden pointed out that the ADATS advises the TPC and the TPC chooses what it wants to do with that advice. He stated that he was heavily involved in writing the City’s first ADA Plan and creating the ADA subcommittee. The City provides way above the minimum, although Debo stated not in time and place. Golden felt that wasn’t true, noting that for years the City provided services to Town of Middleton residents who were beyond ¾ mile from the mainline route in Middleton. The former Transportation Commission adopted a policy that Metro would serve this area in spite of the fact that it fell outside the ADA requirements. However, when budget stresses hit paratransit, the policy had to be rescinded. Golden commented that the motion states that the City will “aspire” to provide this service, and if the City policy makers want to make this a policy, that’s their decision. The Plan document has a list of policies in it, and he felt the motion is appropriate. The motion gives the City the authority to provide the service, but it does not commit any funding. When the City approves a development like the Habitat for Humanity development on Marsh Road, the City may choose to provide paratransit service there prior to when it’s required under the ADA. If the wants to do this, they can; but the Plan does not commit the City to making this decision. Golden stated there was nothing inconsistent with the adoption of a policy like this. He realized it’s fiscally challenging but it would only be done under circumstances where the need is great and the money is available. Including this in the Plan provides a statement of the City’s values.

Durocher clarified that the policy would be to aspire to provide a level of paratransit service above the minimum requirements of the ADA. On the other hand, the ADATS has had requests to extend the service area beyond the ¾ mile policy and the ADATS has consistently decided that having a policy and adhering to it is more important than granting a lot of exceptions. He wanted to provide that context. He added that the motion does not add a mandate to the Plan, rather it’s similar to a vision statement.

Debo clarified that Golden was talking about paratransit service, not ADA paratransit.

Motion carried unanimously.

In response to Wong’s question, Horvath stated the comment period on the Plan is still open.

Motion by McCabe/Hoag to approve the Plan as recommended for amendment carried unanimously.

[Golden left at 7:55 p.m.]

October 2005 Public Hearing Draft – City of Madison Comprehensive Plan PARK COMMISSION MINUTES

The following excerpt of the Draft minutes of the November 9, 2005 Park Commission meeting includes only the first page of the minutes and the page with discussion of the Comprehensive Plan and the motion to approve the Plan.

D* R * A * F * T Park Commission MINUTES

The regular meeting of the Madison Board of Park Commissioners was held on Wednesday, November 9, 2005 at Warner Park Community Recreation Center, 1625 Northport Drive.

Members present: Betty Chewning, Betty MacDonald, Santiago Rosas, Emanuel Scarbrough, Paul Skidmore, and Bill Barker

Members excused: Randy Glysch

Special Guest: Julian Walters mentored by Mr. Scarbrough

Parks staff present: James Morgan, Si Widstrand, Elinor Riley, Laura Bauer, LaVonne LaFave

ROLL CALL

President Barker called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. A quorum was present and the meeting was properly noticed. A welcome was extended to Julian Walters when he was introduced to members.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no members of the public who wished to comment on items not on the Agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Scarbrough/Chewning to approve the Minutes of the October 19, 2005 regular meeting of the Park Commission. **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Olbrich Botanical Society

A motion was made by Rosas/MacDonald to accept the Minutes of the September 20, 2005 meeting of the Olbrich Botanical Society. **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.** In response to a question, it was noted that the Garver parcel is a former industrial site that contains non-native plants. Native plants will be planted there as part of the restoration of the site.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE PARK COMMISSION

President Barker announced that Park Commissioner Randy Glysch advised him that he was stepping down from the Park Commission as of this meeting. He stated he will miss Randy's perspective and that he has done a great job for parks and has worked as hard as anyone to make the swimming pool a reality. Members expressed regret that he is leaving the Board.

REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PARKS

Written Report of Supervisors' Activities

A motion was made by Skidmore/Scarborough to approve the written report. **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.** Superintendent Morgan referenced page 3 of the Report that lists the huge number of events coordinated by the Mall Events Coordinator. The events listed are what's already on the books for next year and when spring arrives there will be at least that many more added, together with another 4 to 5 pages of additional student events at the end of the spring term and beginning of the fall term in 2006. In response to a question about trash being dumped in parks, Superintendent Morgan stated that instead of citizens taking their discards to the collection sites in the city or even placing items on the curb, they dump trash, including deer carcasses, in parks throughout the city. Maintenance crews stop daily emptying of trash barrels when shelters are no longer open. A majority of the barrels are removed from the parks and stored for the winter months.

Central Park's Potential Impact on Park System's Budget

The Commission had indicated an interest in knowing what costs would be associated with the proposed Central Park. Parks staff has been working on those costs at the request of Urban Open Space Foundation (UOSF). When this park was first proposed, UOSF made a commitment to the Park Commission early in the planning process that the park would be built with private funds and operated with an endowment that would pay for its maintenance. UOSF has now requested maintenance numbers as they determine the

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Resolution ID#02207 Adopting and confirming the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan.

Widstrand stated drafts of the plan have been presented to the Park Commission at previous meetings. Changes have been incorporated into the Park and Open Space Plan and Park Sections of the Comprehensive Plan based upon the comments he received. A Resolution has now been introduced to approve the City's Comprehensive Plan. The Park Commission can make additional recommendations that will go back to the Plan Commission before it goes back to the Common Council for final adoption.

He reported that at the Long Range Planning meeting held November 8 suggestions were made to the Comprehensive Plan and the Park and Open Space Plan. In the Comprehensive Plan, on the last three pages of Chapter 7, Volume 2, comments included changing the second to the last sentence of the opening paragraph to read: "The table on the following page includes a summary of the major recommendations from the POSP." In Table 1 insert the words "Summary of Major" before Park and Open Space Implementation Actions. There was discussion to remove the Priority column from the table or provide an explanation of how actions are prioritized. Some items are part of ongoing programs and others that are responded to on the basis of opportunity or pressure. A suggestion was made that language be added about not following a rigid set of priorities. In the section addressing the *Comprehensive Trail Network*, the second sentence would read: "Complete a city-wide trail network using bike paths and routes, paved walkways for accessible routes, and unpaved hiking trails in parks and greenways." In the section entitled *Beach and Swimming Needs* add a sentence at the end "Improve maintenance of beaches and public shorelines. Dane County and the State of Wisconsin will be the coordinating agencies." The Agriculture and Natural Resources portion contains considerable language about water quality and cooperation between governmental agencies dealing with water quality issues.

On the last page he recommended adding sections on Staffing Needs and Intergovernmental Cooperation, as follows: Staffing Needs – The recommendations of this plan for a growing city – new land, new facilities and better management of the park system, will all require more work, more staff and more funding in the operational budget. Intergovernmental Cooperation – Local park systems have

mutually benefited from the cooperative government efforts at city, village, town, county, state and federal levels. Such cooperation will need to continue and be strengthened.

The Park and Open Space Plan (POSP) is not yet in final form. His concern was to make certain that the recommendations going into the Comprehensive Plan would be consistent with the policies and statements in the POSP. He is comfortable that the two documents are in sync and that the Comprehensive Plan is ready to be adopted.

The following comments were then made regarding the Park and Open Space Plan update. Page 29 referenced a mooring field design for Marshall Park that is not a good recommendation because a star dock pier is more problematic for storing boats in windy situations. He recommended removing that sentence and replace it with: To improve public access to the lakes, consider adding mooring fields and non-motorized storage racks at several locations, if the aesthetic impact is acceptable and we are able to recover costs. On page 32, a wording change in the Olbrich Gardens portion to make it clear that it is the Master Plan for the entire garden that is discussed in the second paragraph and not just the expansion to the north. Also on that page, in the third line from the bottom, the reference to the Center for Urban Forestry Education should be deleted. There is no continued funding identified for that program.

On page 41, a section will be written to go at the end of the maintenance needs and before the section on Park Dedication and Fees, to explain the trend of increasing parkland acreage and facilities and decreasing staffing and what that means to our operating budget and include pertinent information in the appendix about these things in comparison to other park systems. Some of that data is found in our Strategic Plan and will be included.

Distributed this evening was an Appendix on the reduction of park deficiencies. A significant amount of revision was required because of a change in park standards and it resolves some of the deficiencies. There are three kinds of park deficiencies identified. There is also a general recommendation that all school playground properties are important and if a school is declared surplus the Parks Division should consider acquiring it. There are deficiencies in the Isthmus area and there are also deficiencies in facilities. A park deficiency analysis is included as well as a map identifying the six areas. A review of areas that have some recreational usability and diversity of activities, not just open space, needs to be conducted. A dearth of available areas for sports activities was reported. Conclusions and recommendations were noted. The other strategy used is to provide better access to the lands. They also look for trail corridor opportunities a little more creatively, even within existing right-of-ways. The terms “no-mow,” “low-mow” and “reduced mowing” are being reviewed throughout the document for consistency.

A motion was made by Skidmore/Scarborough to adopt Resolution ID#02207 confirming the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan with the modifications to the Comp Plan as noted this evening. **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

Widstrand mentioned how some developments are providing usable courtyard open space that is not necessarily available to play sports, including rooftop open space. President Barker then thanked both Parks staff for their hard work and the members of the Long Range Planning Committee for their diligence.

October 2005 Public Hearing Draft – City of Madison Comprehensive Plan URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION DRAFT MINUTES

DRAFT

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 16, 2005
TITLE: Ordinance File I.D. 02207 Adopting and confirming the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan	REFERRED:
	REREFERRED:
	REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED:
	POF:
DATED: November 16, 2005	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Lou Host-Jablonski, Lisa Geer, Robert March, Ald. Noel Radomski, Todd Barnett, Michael Barrett and Cathleen Feland.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 16, 2005, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL** of Ordinance File I.D. 02207, adopting and confirming the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan. Appearing on behalf of the plan was Michael Waidelich, Principal Planner; Rick Roll, Planner IV; and Rebecca Cnare, Planner II. Discussion on the plan centered around its "Land Use, Volume II-Recommendations" as follows:

- Page 2-17, Objective 19: Voiced support for this objective, concerned that we have been seeing some "leapfrogging" over undeveloped land with some new developments on the west side.
- Page 2-36 Objective 48, Policy 3: Concerned that the statement that "The greater the height-to-width ratio the better" needs to have some limitations attached to it, otherwise one could potentially end up with canyons like downtown Chicago. Need to have some optimum height-to-width ratio standards.
- Page 2-37, Objective 48, Policy 6: Statement "Architectural styles,...should relate to a common vocabulary of materials and scale" is too restrictive in that it implies, a broadscope uniformity of materials and style. This may be desirable for a locale, neighborhood, or district, but is certainly not intended on a citywide scale.
- Page 2-37, Objective 48, Policy 7: "Prohibit" is too strong of a statement. There may be some corporate designs that are of good design and would be viewed as desirable or acceptable in some locations.
- Page 2-39 to 2-40: It was noted that the transportation component of the Land Use Chapter may conflict with the Transportation Chapter.
- Page 2-61, Objective 87, Policy 1: "Flexible Building designs" needs clarification. Building codes requirements may conflict with trying to convert a building designed for residential to commercial use. Discussion clarified that there is precedent in buildings designed for first floor commercial use with residential above, but that the first floor gets used as residential initially until there is a demand for commercial use. This could be clarified in the text.
- "We are playing chicken with our neighbors to see who can get to the greenspace first. I would like to see very significant open/greenspace between communities." Would like to see two versions of the peripheral area map; the existing map, and an additional one that illustrates best-case scenarios of open space agreements.

In response to the discussion on these elements, staff provided supportive information and details contained within the text of the plan document with any necessary clarifications and concerns provided by the Commission on the plan to be further explored with Plan Commission consideration of the draft plan.

ACTION:

On a motion by Geer, seconded by Host-Jablonski, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL** of the ordinance. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0). The motion recommended approval of the ordinance with the above stated comments, concerns and clarifications.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The Commission did not apply the ranking process to this consideration.

October 2005 Public Hearing Draft – City of Madison Comprehensive Plan
BOARD OF ESTIMATES MINUTES



City of Madison
Meeting Minutes - Final
BOARD OF ESTIMATES

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

Monday, November 21, 2005

4:30 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room 260 (Madison Municipal Building)

CALL TO ORDER

Present: Ald. Paul J. Van Rooy, Ald. Michael E. Verveer, Ald. Tim Bruer and Ald. Zachariah Brandon

Absent: Ald. Judy K. Olson, Ald. Brian Benford and Mayor David Cieslewicz

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was one registrant.

ITEMS CONSIDERED

1. **02305** Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Labor Agreement between the City of Madison and the Building and Construction Trades Council of South Central Wisconsin and Its Appropriate Affiliated Locals for the period January 1, 2004 through December 31, 2005.
A motion was made by Ald. Bruer, seconded by Ald. Verveer, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT (15 VOTES REQUIRED) - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by acclamation.

2. **02334** Adopting and confirming a Labor Agreement between the City of Madison and the Building and Construction Trades Council of South Central Wisconsin and Its Appropriate Affiliated Locals for the period January 1, 2004 through December 31, 2005.
A motion was made by Ald. Bruer, seconded by Ald. Verveer, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by acclamation

3. **02250** Authorizing the Madison Department of Public Health to accept up to \$474,800 from the Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services (WDHFS) Division of Public Health to be utilized by the Women, Infants and Children Nutrition Program during the period of January 1, 2006 through December 31, 2006, and authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to sign for the City.
A motion was made by Ald. Bruer, seconded by Ald. Verveer, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by acclamation



City of Madison
Meeting Minutes - Draft
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
COMMISSION

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

Thursday, December 1, 2005

4:30 PM

Madison Municipal Bldg., LL110 (Lower Level)

1 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

2 MINUTES OF OCTOBER 5, 2005, MEETING

3 ITEMS REFERRED FROM THE COMMON COUNCIL

3a 02207 Adopting and confirming the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan.
The EDC reiterates their support for the Plan designating sufficient area and land for the location and attraction of employment and industrial uses.

Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the PLAN COMMISSION

3b 02093 Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute the Green Tier/Clear Waters Initiative Environmental Results Program Charter pursuant to Section 299.83, Wisconsin Statutes. (City-Wide AD)

Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the Engineering Division

3c 02077 Creating Section 3.57 entitled "Mandatory Minimum Sick Leave" of the Madison General Ordinances to require employers in the City of Madison to provide sick leave benefits to employees.

3d 02320 Repealing Section 28.04(25) of the Madison General Ordinances to eliminate the requirements for Inclusionary Zoning.

3e 02363 Amending Section 28.04(25) of the Madison General Ordinances to change the equity distribution at sale, add a new kind of occupancy, and add exemptions to the inclusionary zoning ordinance.

4 STATUS OF INITIATIVES CURRENTLY BEFORE COMMISSION

4a Hotel Room Tax Study

5 ALDER'S REPORT

6 CHAIR'S REPORT

7 STAFF REPORT

October 2005 Public Hearing Draft – City of Madison Comprehensive Plan II. WRITTEN COMMENT FROM THE PUBLIC

At this time, only a single written comment on the October 2005 Public Hearing Draft of the Comprehensive Plan has been received from the public. A compilation of all the public comments received on the May 2005 Discussion Draft of the Comprehensive Plan can be found in the “Reports” section of the Comprehensive Plan website at www.madisonplan.org.

Staff Responses to Comments by Dan Jaffee on the Public Hearing Draft of the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan (October 2005)

November 30, 2005

The Cherokee lands in question are addressed in numerous plans and actions, including: the 1981 Cherokee Long-Range Open Space Plan, the City’s 1990 Peripheral Area Development Plan, the City’s 1997 Park and Open Space Plan, the City’s 1988 Land Use Plan and the October 2005 Public Hearing Draft of the City’s Comprehensive Plan, as well as subsequent actions by the City Council. These plans and actions incorporate compromises that were reached between the City and the Cherokee owners in the 1960’s and 1970’s. Cherokee actually had an option to purchase the uplands north of their current holdings. The City worked with Cherokee, which resulted in the City’s acquisition of the lands that Cherokee intended to develop.

The Cherokee Park, Inc. Fifth Addition lands west of Sherman Avenue and north of the Fourth Addition to Cherokee Park, are designated “Residential Low-Medium Density-Residential-Mixed Housing Type District” (RLM-X) on the 1988 Land Use Plan map for the City of Madison. The same general area is designated “Low Density Residential” (LDR) on the Generalized Future Land Use Plan map in the Public Hearing Draft of the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan. These designations are based on previous planning efforts and compromises reached between the City and the Cherokee owners.

The area along the east side of Sherman Avenue, north side of Wheeler Road and south of the large area designated “Park and Open Space” (P) on the City’s Comprehensive Plan Generalized Future Land Use Plan maps, is designated “Neighborhood Design District Low-Medium Density-Mixed Housing Type” (NDLM-X) on the 1988 Land Use Plan map and “Low Density Residential” on the Public Hearing Generalized Future Land Use Plan maps. The condominiums west of Sherman Avenue are designated “Residential Low-Medium Density” (RLM) on the 1988 Land Use Plan map and “Medium Density Residential” (MDR) on the Draft Comprehensive Plan Generalized Future Land Use Plan maps. This area is developed with condominiums.

In summary, the lands near Cherokee Marsh that are designated in City plans as potential future development areas or open space areas, go as far back as the 1960’s and 1970’s. The Public Hearing Draft of the Comprehensive Plan continues these recommendations and recommends that they be refined through the preparation of more detailed neighborhood development plans or special area plans.

City staff acknowledges that development on the uplands near the marsh may have negative impacts on natural resources in the area. As development concepts for these areas are presented to the City by landowners, City staff will work to minimize the potential negative impacts of any future

development on natural resource features in the area. Techniques such as detailed neighborhood planning, land dedications for parks and open spaces, easements for permanent open space buffers between development and natural resource features, careful storm water management planning and implementation, and preservation of high-quality trees will be considered for use in the Cherokee area. It should also be noted that the City of Madison, Dane County and the state of Wisconsin have been working, with mixed success, to implement the 1981 Cherokee Marsh Plan.

We note that in the second paragraph of your e-mail to us that the two “trophy” homes you refer to were not built in the City. They are located in the Town of Burke, which is under Dane County zoning. Further, the City did not have an opportunity to block the development of these homes through the use of its extraterritorial land division jurisdiction.

We also note that in the second to last paragraph of your e-mail, you suggest that the City: “a) annexing the land and permanently designating it as open space, or b) purchasing the area outright as an addition to Cherokee Park”. Neither of these alternative actions is likely for a variety of reasons. Condemnation of these lands by the City is an option, albeit an highly unlikely one.

We certainly understand your concerns and we thank you for taking the time to send them to us. The Public Hearing Draft of the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan is to be considered by the Plan Commission on December 5, 2005 and the City Council on December 13, 2005. You are welcome to attend these meetings to express your concerns about potential development in the Cherokee Marsh area. Further, you also may be interested in attending a neighborhood meeting that Cherokee Park, Inc. is holding on December 14th from 7:00 – 9:00 p.m. at the Warner Park Community Room. At this meeting Cherokee Park, Inc. will explain the preliminary land use concepts for their holdings in the area.

October 2005 Public Hearing Draft – City of Madison Comprehensive Plan III. SUMMARY COMPILATION OF REVIEWING BODY COMMENTS WITH PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

This section is a compilation of the comments from the reviewing boards, commissions and committees that included or might imply a recommendation to make a revision to the October 2005 Draft Plan document. The comments are organized by reviewing body and Plan chapter. Each comment or grouping of comments is followed by a Planning staff recommendation to respond to the comment. Most recommendations propose revisions or additions to the Plan text. In some cases the recommendation is to make no changes. Note that minor typographical and format revisions are usually not included.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Park Commission Comments
Transportation Commissions Comments
Urban Design Commission Comments

**October 2005 Draft City of Madison Comprehensive Plan
 PARK AND OPEN SPACE CHAPTER
 Park Commission Comments and Staff Recommendations**

Park Commission Comment

Volume II, Page 7-10: The Implementation Recommendations should be modified as indicated below.

Page 7-10: Change the text introducing Table 1 as follows: The table on the following page includes a summary of the major recommendations ~~summarize~~ from the POSP.

Change Table 1 as follows:

- From Table 1, remove the Priority column and add Summary of Major to the title of the table.
- On page 7-11 in Table 1 change the Comprehensive Trail Network write-up to read as follows:

Comprehensive Trail Network

Continue working to provide regional bike ~~trail~~ path corridors and connections from the Isthmus to Sun Prairie, Isthmus to Warner Park, and in the East Side and West Side Growth Areas. ~~Provide~~ Complete a city-wide trail network using bike paths and routes, paved walkways for accessible routes and unpaved hiking trails in parks and greenways.

- Add the following sentence to the end of the Beach and Swimming Needs write-up:

Improve maintenance of beaches and public shorelines.

- Add the following rows to the end of Table 1:

<p>Staffing Needs The recommendations of this plan for a growing City – new land, new facilities, and better management of the parks system, will all require more work, more staff and more funding in the operational budget.</p>	<p>Parks Division, Common Council, and Mayor’s Office</p>
<p>Intergovernmental Cooperation Local park systems have mutually benefited from the cooperative government efforts at City, Village, Town, County, State and Federal levels. Such cooperation will need to continue and be strengthened.</p>	<p>Planning Unit, neighboring municipalities and townships, Dane County, and State and Federal governments.</p>

Staff Recommendation

Modify text and table as suggested.

October 2005 Draft City of Madison Comprehensive Plan TRANSPORTATION CHAPTER Transportation Commissions Comments and Staff Recommendations

Note: This section combines the comments received from the three transportation commissions: the Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission, the Transit and Parking Commission, and the Long Range Transportation Planning Commission.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSIONS COMMENTS ON VOLUME I (BACKGROUND INFORMATION)

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-9, Paragraph 2. Modify text as shown below to clarify that other transportation modes may also share rail corridors with active railroad operations:

- All rail corridors in the Madison Urban Area converge in the Isthmus area providing opportunities for use as special transportation corridors (e.g. bus, bike, rail, etc.), ~~if/or when even if rail freight is no longer viable continues to operate in the corridors.~~ In fact, numerous Comprehensive Plan public Transportation Commissions Comments have noted the need to utilize existing rail corridors for future commuter rail, bicycle and other non-auto forms of transportation.

Staff Recommendation

Modify text as suggested.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-21, Paragraph 4. Modify text as shown below to clarify meaning:

Issues of concern for bicyclists include: barriers (freeways) and hazards (e.g., rail crossings), lack of bicycle accommodations on existing major roadways, lack of alternatives to heavily used major roadways due to inadequate street connectivity, and lack of traffic control devices that ~~do not~~ work for bicyclists.

Staff Recommendation

Modify text as suggested.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-22. Remove the two sections with the headings “Public Education” and “Law Enforcement”.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends instead modifying the text as shown, using softer language and also stressing the need for education and enforcement of all modes of transportation, including automobiles:

Public Education

~~Many adults have little knowledge of bicyclists’ rights, responsibilities, and safe riding techniques required to be a responsible cyclist. To be responsible bicyclists, riders should learn their rights and responsibilities and safe riding techniques.~~ This knowledge is also necessary ~~to be a responsible~~ for

motor vehicle drivers sharing the road with bicyclists. There is a continuous need to provide education for bicyclists and motorists, including developing and distributing bicycle maps and other informational materials, and conducting safety- and training programs.

Law Enforcement

Bicycles are subject to the same rules of the road as motor vehicles with all the rights and responsibilities that follow those rules. ~~However, many adult bicyclists often disregard traffic regulations, which results in unsafe riding, setting a poor example for younger riders, and perpetuating the view that bicycles are “toys” rather than a legitimate means of transportation for adults, as well as children [remove paragraph shift here]~~ Law enforcement agencies are operating under increasing constraints of limited budgets and personnel, while the demand for police services of all types is increasing. As a result, resources for traffic enforcement are limited, and many law enforcement officers consider enforcement of traffic violations by ~~and against bicyclists~~ and motorists a low priority.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-30, 1st Paragraph under “Parking” heading. Add bicycle parking.

Staff Recommendation

Modify text in first sentence as shown below:

As travel and parking needs have increased, there has been recognition of the constant need to better manage transportation and parking facilities (both auto and bicycle parking), to minimize the amount of valuable land needed for travel and parking purposes, and to minimize the public investments, which may be required for transportation purposes.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Map 3-5, Madison Metro Bus Routes. Map 3-5 is not current as of October 2005.

Staff Recommendation

Metro route maps change frequently. Map 3-5 is current as of January 2005 (the date on the map), which is the date for most of the other base map background data presented in the Comprehensive Plan. Staff recommends no changes to this map.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSIONS COMMENTS ON VOLUME II (RECOMMENDATIONS)

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-2, Objective 1, Policy 2. Add “consistency” as well as coordination with MPO planning.

Staff Recommendation

Modify Policy 2 as shown below:

Policy 2: Ensure coordination and consistency of ~~between~~ the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan ~~with~~ and the MPO’s long-range regional land use and transportation plan.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Pages 3-3 and 3-4, Objective 2. Ensure the correct usage of terms “efficiency and effective”, or be consistent throughout Objective 2.

Staff Recommendation

Staff believe that the terms “efficient” and “effective” are used as intended. Recommend that the Goal statement on Page 3-3 be revised as shown below:

Goal: Develop and maintain a transportation system that supports new and existing residential, employment, commercial and recreation areas, preserves and enhances neighborhood livability and the quality of life for City of Madison residents, while providing for the safe, ~~and~~ efficient and effective movement of people and goods.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-6, Objective 3, Policy 3. Add language regarding block size that specifies a number of feet for the optimum block size, using some numerical standard as a goal.

Staff Recommendation

Staff do not recommend that a numerical standard for TOD block size be included in the Comprehensive Plan due to the potential wide variability in size and scale of TODs and the need to independently evaluate block size within the context of each unique TOD.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-6, Objective 3, Policy 3, second bullet. Add language regarding the location of parking in relation to the building, explicitly stating that parking should be in the back or sides of the building. Might reference some minimal, if any, parking in front.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-6, Objective 3, Policy 3, second bullet. Add language that recognizes the need for appropriate placement of bicycle parking.

Staff Recommendation

To address both comments, modify the text as shown below:

- Placement and supply of parking;

Prohibit large and highly visible surface parking in TODs, especially in the core areas of TODs. The supply of parking may be reduced from the amount that is typically provided in some instances. Automobile parking should generally be located in the back or sides of buildings, although some minimal parking may be located in the front of buildings in some situations. Bicycle parking facilities within TODs should be located near building entrances and designed and sized appropriately. Parking supply and management should be addressed in the specific special area plan for each TOD.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-4, Objective 3, Policy 3 (general). Add language that recommends providing expedited review and approval of TODs.

Staff Recommendation

Staff do not recommend including language in the Comprehensive Plan that refers to providing an expedited approval process for TODs, given the more complicated nature of most such developments and the need for thorough staff review.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-8, Objective 4, Policy 4. Add language that recognizes the need for appropriate signing and marking of bike paths and routes.

Staff Recommendation

Modify the text note for Policy 4 as shown below (also make the same change to the text note for Policy 6 under Objective 12 in the Bicycle section, Page 3-18):

Policy 4: Develop a hierarchy of City of Madison bicycle corridors for use in making roadway infrastructure decisions.

Note: Bicycle corridors should be inventoried, ~~and~~ classified, and appropriately signed and marked for their function in providing bicycle mobility, similar to a roadway functional classification. This classification system should be used to help prioritize bicycle facility improvements.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-8, Objective 5. Add language that recognizes the fact that alleviating traffic congestion should not degrade the safety of users of other modes of transportation moving along or across the corridor.

Staff Recommendation

Modify Objective 5 as shown below:

Objective 5: Alleviate traffic congestion, where appropriate, in a manner that improves traffic flow and minimizes travel delays, ~~but also~~ minimizes the impacts on adjacent land uses and neighborhoods, and does not degrade the safety of users of other modes of transportation moving along or across the corridor.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 5-9, Objective 5, Policy 3. Modify language regarding capacity increases to emphasize engineering as the best way to increase capacity (such as restricting driveway access, eliminating cross roads, or adding turn lanes).

Staff Recommendation

Staff believes that this policy primarily meant to recommend against considering increasing roadway capacity by widening the roadway (adding lanes) until all other approaches had been considered, including increasing use of other transportation modes and the other engineering approaches suggested in the transportation commissions comment. Recommend revising the policy to clarify this as shown below:

Policy 3: Consider adding lanes to increase roadway capacity on City roadways only after all other alternative approaches have been considered, including enhancing other transportation modes and engineering-oriented roadway improvements such as restricting driveway access, eliminating cross roads and adding turn lanes).

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-9, Objective 5, Policy 4. Modify the language to emphasize the need to not degrade other modes of transportation when improving traffic flow.

Staff Recommendation

Modify the Policy 4 text as shown below:

Policy 4: Use transportation system management (TSM) strategies to improve traffic flow, where appropriate, and where it does not degrade the safety of users of other modes of transportation moving along or across the corridor. TSM measures include traffic signal control systems, Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technologies (such as real-time traffic and parking information along roadways), intersection improvements, channelization (such as dedicated turn lanes), and access management techniques.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-9, Objective 5. Add a general policy to emphasize the need to maintain the safety of all modes of transportation when improving traffic flow.

Staff Recommendation

Add a new Policy 8 under Objective 5, as shown below:

Policy 8: Consider and evaluate the movement of pedestrians and bicyclists along and across roadways when undertaking roadway capacity expansion to assure that safety will not be compromised.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-10, Objective 7: There is a lot of narrative defining Transportation Demand Management, but wonder if some policies are also needed. For example,

- Should TDM be expected in all developments?
- Should there be some specific measurable goals and reference to the EPA TDM program and should these goals be tied into TODs?
- It should be clear that the City would have a Demand Management Program for its employees, particularly since the City was expecting this of others.
- It should include outreach to neighboring municipalities and County to get them on board to do something similar.
- There is also a lack of reference to carpooling, Rideshare and car-sharing.

Staff Recommendation

Add the following four policies under Objective 7:

Policy 1: Develop Transportation Management Associations, where appropriate, as a mechanism to organize individual employers and administer TDM initiatives.

Note: A Transportation Management Association, or TMA, is an organized group that applies various approaches to help facilitate the movement of people and goods within an urban area - most often stressing the use of transportation demand management strategies and measures. TMAs are often legally constituted and frequently lead by the private sector, in partnership with public sector entities, in an effort to address transportation challenges.

Policy 2: Create an incentive program for City employees rewarding them for using alternatives to the automobile for commuting. Promote use of the City Rideshare and Carpool programs and coordinate these efforts with the other major public sector employers in the City including the University, County and State.

Note: The U.S. EPA administers the Best Workplaces for Commuters program, which gives special recognition to employers that meet a National Standard of Excellence for their employee commuter assistance programs. The City could choose to pursue a TDM program that meets the US EPA standards and recognizes Madison as one of the Best Workplaces for Commuters.

Policy 3: Promote alternatives to the automobile through education campaigns on riding transit, bicycling, car-sharing programs, organizations that develop transportation management for employers and other programs to help employers encourage alternatives to the automobile.

Policy 4: Encourage the use of transportation demand measures in Transit Oriented Developments, new neighborhoods and commercial and business districts. Consider developing TDM standards, perhaps basing them on the US EPA National Standard for Excellence, as indicated in the note above for Policy 2, for new development and redevelopment.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-12, Objective 8. The City's Pedestrian Plan should be referenced and identified by name in the Comprehensive Plan.

Staff Recommendation

Modify Policy 2 as shown below (also make the same change to the 1st sentence of the recommendation in the Implementation Section, Page 3-31):

Policy 2: Maintain, update and implement a pedestrian system plan (*Pedestrian Transportation Plan for Madison, Wisconsin; September 1997*) to identify and prioritize sidewalk needs (e.g. pedestrian ramps, crosswalk enhancements, etc.). An implementation program for funding pedestrian improvements in existing neighborhoods should continue to be used.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-12, Objective 8. Add language to make explicit reference to the use of in-street "yield to pedestrian" signs in neighborhood business districts.

Staff Recommendation

Modify the text in Policy 6 as shown below:

Policy 6: Utilize traffic calming techniques and strategies in high pedestrian activity areas, such as schools and parks, using the Traffic Engineering Neighborhood Traffic Management program. Identify priority areas for the possible use of traffic calming strategies in a sidewalk system plan. Consider the use of in-street “yield to pedestrian” signs in neighborhood business districts, where appropriate.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Pages 3-12 and 3-13, Objective 8. Add some language in the Objective 8 section (Pedestrian Accessibility and the Walking Environment) that recommends providing special pedestrian accommodations in areas with a high density of elderly residents, such as around Hilldale Boulevard along Segoe Road.

Staff Recommendation

Add a new Policy under Objective 8 (insert after existing Policy 8), to read:

New Policy 9: Identify barriers to pedestrian mobility for users of the pedestrian system with special needs (such as elderly populations and wheelchair users) and prioritize locations where improvements are most needed. Such improvements could include pedestrian ramps and special crossing accommodations. Ensure that the design and maintenance of pedestrian facilities takes into account these special needs.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-13, Objective 8, Policy 8. The policy should address barriers to mobility in new developments, not just retrofitting to address existing barriers.

Staff Recommendation

Modify the text in Policy 8 as shown below:

Policy 8: Identify existing and potential barriers to pedestrian mobility (such as highways without adequate crossing facilities, cul-de-sacs and other non-traditional street designs such as L-shaped streets), and prioritize locations where improvements are most needed. Such improvements could include new crossings or connections to link areas within neighborhoods, (including sidewalks that link the ends of cul-de-sacs to one another). New developments should include walkways that create a grid pattern for pedestrians at locations where cul-de-sacs and other non-traditional street designs fail to provide direct routes along a roadway sidewalk.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-13, Objective 9. The Transportation Commissions Comment notes that with population increasing and fuel and capital costs also increasing, the phrasing of Objective 9 to “reduce the costs to provide transit” is misleading and an unlikely outcome. This should be clarified to refer reducing “costs per trip.”

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-13, Objective 9. The Plan refers to provision of paratransit to meet ADA standards, but there is no mention that mainline buses have equipment to accommodate disabled riders as well. Language about that could be included in Objective 9 on page 3-13. The word “accessible” could be inserted so that it would read “Implement a variety of *accessible* public transit services throughout the City of Madison . . . Implement *accessible* transit services in a manner . . .”

Staff Recommendation

To address these two comments, modify the text in Objective 9 as shown below:

Objective 9: Implement a variety of accessible public transit services throughout the City of Madison (including connections to surrounding municipalities and other major activity centers), in an efficient and effective manner. Implement transit services in a manner that endeavors to increase system-wide ridership, reduce the costs per trip to provide transit services and help to increase revenues for Metro operations.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-13, Objective 9. Add a statement that the City aspires to increase transit service so that travel time is no greater than 30 minutes from boarding to destination, with the intent that this should be a service standard.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Pages 3-13 through 3-15, Objective 9. Throughout this section, modify public transit policies to include more discussion about increasing the frequency of transit service.

Staff Recommendation

To partly address these two comments, further modify the text in Objective 9 to add a third sentence at the end, as shown below:

Objective 9: Implement a variety of accessible public transit services throughout the City of Madison (including connections to surrounding municipalities and other major activity centers), in an efficient and effective manner. Implement transit services in a manner that endeavors to increase system-wide ridership, reduce the costs per trip to provide transit services and help to increase revenues for Metro operations. The City aspires to increase transit service, during peak travel periods, so that travel times to destinations in the central business district and the University of Wisconsin campus are no greater than 30 minutes from boarding to destination.

Staff Recommendation

In addition to the changes to Objective 9 shown above, modify the text notes for Policy 7 and Policy 9 under Objective 9 as shown below:

Policy 7: Metro Transit should continue to develop a long-range transit service plan - the Transit Development Program (TDP) - in close collaboration with the Madison Area MPO.

Note: The Land Use chapter should help guide the development of the TDP, and strong emphasis should be given to designated TOD activity centers. Land use-oriented transit service recommendations include:

- *Consider additional limited stop/express services, to help provide more competitive transit service in peripheral areas of the City, particularly in terms of travel times;*
- *Consider increasing the frequency of transit services being provided throughout the City, in order to help improve door-to-door travel times and increase ridership;*
- *Continue to examine how best to integrate routes and timed transfers at activity centers;*
- *Consider adopting routes that minimize large loops in order to increase competitiveness with auto travel times; and,*
- *Continue to consider using ITS technologies that enhance transit information, reliability, security and convenience (such as real-time bus location information at transit stops.).*

Policy 9: Metro should enhance transit services that attract ridership from those who own their own vehicles (i.e., “choice” riders), particularly in the downtown and other large employment areas (where parking supplies may be limited and/or costly to provide).

Note: Possible transit service improvements that could help attract choice riders include:

- *Pursuing the development of more pre-paid unlimited ride pass programs, commuter-choice pass programs, and employer-subsidized transit fare programs with large employers and employer associations in the City;*
- *Increasing the frequency of transit services being provided throughout the City, in order to help improve door-to-door travel times and increase ridership;*
- *Pursuing further introduction of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technologies that enhance service reliability, real-time information, convenience and security; and,*
- *Continuing to install bicycle racks on buses.*

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-17, Objective 10. Add a policy stating that the City should aspire to provide paratransit to new residential developments above the ADA minimums so that accessible housing can be served by accessible transit as early as is feasible.

Staff Recommendation

Add a new Policy 3 under Objective 10, as shown below:

Policy 3: The City should aspire to provide Metro Plus paratransit service to new residential developments above the ADA minimums so that accessible housing can be served by accessible transit as early as is feasible.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-18, Objective 12, Policy 5. Add that bicycle parking should be provided in public areas that are “convenient” as well as prominent.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-18, Objective 12, Policy 5. Add some language that coordinates the need for bicycle parking facilities in public automobile parking facilities (i.e., parking ramps).

Staff Recommendation

To partly address these two comments, modify Policy 5 under Objective 12 as shown below:

Policy 5: Ensure that bicycle parking facilities – ~~both~~ within the public right-of-way, within public parking facilities, and on development sites – are located in appropriate locations (such as near building entrances), ~~be~~ are appropriately designed/ and sized, ~~and~~ are located in prominent and convenient public areas, and ~~be~~ are well-maintained (including adequate snow removal). Ensure that development review processes acknowledge bicycle parking and other bicycle facility needs.

Also modify Objective 15 on page 3-20, as shown below:

Objective 15: Provide for the construction and maintenance of parking facilities as part of an integrated strategy for urban development and redevelopment. Consider the desired density of land uses, the need for facilities to provide safe and convenient bicycle parking, ~~to utilize alternative modes~~, the availability of on-street parking, and the impacts on the pedestrian environment in future parking planning, management, and parking facility design activities.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-18, Objective 12. Add some language that recognizes the importance of bicycle access to schools.

Staff Recommendation

Add a new Policy (insert after Policy 7) as shown below:

Policy 8: Ensure that bicycle facilities are planned in a manner that ensures safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle access to schools. The City should encourage school designs and the transportation facilities that serve them (through financial incentives and other means), that afford safe and convenient non-motorized transportation access for students.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-20, Objective 14. Add a policy discussing the need to address the polluting impacts of mopeds.

Staff Recommendation

Add a new Policy 2 under Objective 14, as shown below:

Policy 2: Explore opportunities to improve the air quality impacts of mopeds, including changes in air quality regulations governing such impacts.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-20, Objective 15. Add some language that recognizes parking accommodations for people with disabilities.

Staff Recommendation

Modify the text of Objective 15 as shown below:

Objective 15: Provide for the construction and maintenance of parking facilities as part of an integrated strategy for urban development and redevelopment. Consider the desired density of land uses, the need for parking facilities to provide safe and convenient bicycle parking, to utilize alternative modes, availability of on-street parking, the special parking needs of persons with disabilities, and the impacts on the pedestrian environment in future parking planning, management, and parking facility design activities.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-21, Objective 15, Policy 2. The language in this policy encouraging short-term use for visitors and shoppers could be interpreted as encouraging shopping trips to be made only by car. Add language to ensure that all modes of transportation are considered.

Staff Recommendation

Modify the text note for Policy 2 as shown below:

Policy 2: Provide parking facilities that can be conveniently accessed by downtown customers and visitors.

Note: The most desirable and convenient parking should be managed to encourage customer and visitor access. The least convenient parking lots/ramps should be targeted for long term and employee usage. Parking management strategies should continue to be employed, in order to manage the usage of City-owned parking facilities, such as instituting time limits and pricing policies to ensure higher turnover for short-term parking. Visitors and shoppers should be encouraged to access downtown Madison by non-automobile modes of transportation, to the extent possible.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-20, Objective 15. Add some language discussing on-street parking, noting that a more urban form with street parking is desirable. It was suggested that if more on-street parking is allowed during planning considerations, less off-street parking might be required and former parking areas could become infill sites for development.

Staff Recommendation

Add a new Policy under Objective 15 (insert after Policy 4 on page 3-21) as shown below:

Policy 5: Encourage the provision of on-street parking on City streets, unless special conditions and circumstances warrant parking restrictions.

Also modify the text in Objective 15 (adding “and desirability”) as shown below:

Objective 15: Provide for the construction and maintenance of parking facilities as part of an integrated strategy for urban development and redevelopment. Consider the desired density of land uses, the need for parking facilities to provide safe and convenient bicycle parking, to utilize alternative modes, availability and desirability of on-street parking, the special parking needs of persons with disabilities, and the impacts on the pedestrian environment in future parking planning, management, and parking facility design activities.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-21, Objective 15. Add some language about coordinating parking rates and transit fares; in other words, when transit fares are raised, parking rates should also be increased as a way to mitigate transit ridership losses.

Staff Recommendation

Add a new Policy (insert after existing Policy 5 on page 3-21), as shown below:

Policy 6: Consider the coordination of parking rates and transit fares, so that when transit fares are raised, parking rates are simultaneously increased (as a way to mitigate the potential loss of transit ridership to automobile travel).

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-24, Objective 18, Policy 1, Second sentence. Add “multi-modal” ahead of “support facilities.”

Staff Recommendation

Modify Policy 1 as shown below:

Policy 1: Work with Dane County to ensure that appropriate transportation support facilities and services are provided and coordinated at the Dane County Regional Airport - for employees and travelers using the airport. These multi-modal support facilities and services include auto and bicycle parking facilities, pedestrian facilities and amenities, private taxi services, airport shuttles, and public transit services.

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-24, Objective 18, Policy 2. Remove language referring to potential new Interstate access to the airport.

Staff Recommendation

Staff is not sure that this change is needed since the current language is only recommends exploring the possibilities of more direct Interstate access, but the recommendation to address the Transportation Commissions Comment is to modify Policy 2 as shown below:

Policy 2: Explore opportunities to provide improved street and highway access to Dane County Regional Airport ~~—including the potential addition of more direct Interstate Highway access, where feasible.~~

Transportation Commissions Comment

Page 3-24, Objective 18, Policy 2. Add language stressing the need for better non-automobile connectivity (such as rail or bus) to the Dane County Regional Airport.

Staff Recommendation

Add a new Policy (insert after existing Policy 2 on page 3-24), as shown below:

Policy 3: Explore opportunities to provide more direct public transit connections to the Dane County Regional Airport from key employment, residential, business and institutional destinations within the City.

October 2005 Public Hearing Draft – City of Madison Comprehensive Plan LAND USE CHAPTER Urban Design Commission Comments and Staff Recommendations

Note: The following summarizes comments received in October/November 2005 from the Urban Design Commission on the Public Hearing Draft of the Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Chapter (Volume II) and recommended staff responses.

Urban Design Commission Comment

Page 2-36 Objective 48, Policy 3: Concerned that the statement that “The greater the height-to-width ratio the better” needs to have some limitations attached to it, otherwise one could potentially end up with canyons like downtown Chicago. Need to have some optimum height-to-width ratio standards.

Staff Recommendation

Staff agrees that the height-to-width ratio needs a maximum desired ratio in order to prevent streets with canyons of development. Recommend modifying Policy 3 as shown below:

Policy 3: Require new development to establish effective levels of spatial enclosure. Spatial enclosure is created through the use of a height-to-width ratio (i.e. the relationship between a building’s height and the width of the street on which it fronts). ~~As a general rule, the greater the height to width ratio, the stronger the sense of place. As a general rule, the greater the height to width ratio, the stronger the sense of place.~~ The optimum height-to-width ratio in Madison may be about 1:1, although ratios that are greater than 1:1 may be appropriate in certain locations in the City as identified in special area plans or neighborhood plans. Too small a ratio generally does not result in the creation of a sense of place.

Urban Design Commission Comment

Page 2-37, Objective 48, Policy 6: Statement “Architectural styles,...should relate to a common vocabulary of materials and scale” is too restrictive in that it implies, a broadscope uniformity of materials and style. This may be desirable for a locale, neighborhood, or district, but is certainly not intended on a citywide scale.

Staff Recommendation

Staff agrees to amend the policy, specifically changing the word “common” to “complementary”, as shown below.

Policy 6: Architectural styles, facade treatments, walls, fences, streetscape elements and colors should relate to a ~~common~~ complementary vocabulary of materials and scale.

Urban Design Commission Comment

Page 2-37, Objective 48, Policy 7: “Prohibit” is too strong of a statement. There may be some corporate designs that are of good design and would be viewed as desirable or acceptable in some locations.

Staff Recommendation

Staff agrees. Staff recommends revising Policy 7 to indicate that some standard corporate designs may be allowed if they are of good design and would be viewed as desirable or acceptable in some locations, as shown below.

~~**Old Policy 7:** Prohibit development projects that incorporate standard corporate architectural designs, since such designs invariably have a negative impact on the City’s unique visual character and beauty. New developments shall respect and enhance Madison’s unique visual character and beauty.~~

New Policy 7: Discourage corporate architectural designs that do not respect and enhance Madison’s unique visual character and beauty. Standard corporate architectural designs may be allowed in limited areas of the City provided they are of high-quality design and are desirable or acceptable in certain areas of Madison as identified in the Comprehensive Plan, neighborhood plans and/or special area plans.

Urban Design Commission Comment

Page 2-61, Objective 87, Policy 1: “Flexible Building designs” needs clarification. Building codes requirements may conflict with trying to convert a building designed for residential to commercial use. Discussion clarified that there is precedent in buildings designed for first floor commercial use with residential above, but that the first floor gets used as residential initially until there is a demand for commercial use. This could be clarified in the text.

Staff Recommendation

Staff agrees: “Flexible building designs” needs clarification. Add a note to Objective 87, Policy 1 that says:

Note: Flexible building designs may include such techniques as designing floor and window heights to allow easy conversions from residential to nonresidential uses. Flexible building designs can include live-work units in which mixes of nonresidential and residential uses are allowed in a single building. Numerous live-work uses already exist in Madison.

Urban Design Commission Comment

“We are playing chicken with our neighbors to see who can get to the greenspace first. I would like to see very significant open/greenspace between communities.” Would like to see two versions of the

peripheral area map; the existing map, and an additional one that illustrates best-case scenarios of open space agreements.

The Urban Design Commission did not recommend this comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that no new map be prepared at this time. The City is working with other units of government to accomplish intergovernmental separation and protection of open space. An “optimum” map will require more detailed planning in subsequent planning processes.

Also, note that the following objectives and policies are already included in the Plan:

Excerpted from Parks and Open Space Chapter:

Objective 5: Preserve open space at the City’s permanent edge by utilizing intergovernmental plans, agreements and natural environmental corridors.

Policy 1: Explore, support and cooperate with innovative methods of preserving open space and creating a visual separation between Madison and other cities and villages.

Policy 2: Use agricultural preservation efforts on the City’s periphery as one means of providing open space areas adjacent to the developed area of the City.

Policy 3: For areas within Madison's extraterritorial plat approval jurisdiction not likely to develop within the City, the City will:

- Recognize the park and open space plan of the municipality in which development is occurring, provided that it does not conflict with the City's nor the County's objectives and policies.
- Apply the standards from the City's Park and Open Space Plan when development is occurring in a municipality that has no adopted plan.

Excerpted from Natural and Agricultural Resources Chapter:

Objective 1: Balance land development proposals with the preservation and restoration of natural communities and resources, including grasslands, wetlands, woodlands and soils.

Policy 1: Fully implement the natural resource protection elements of the City of Madison and Dane County Parks and Open Space Plans.

Policy 2: Continue to map, designate, and protect environmental corridors from any new development.

Objective 2: Preserve and enhance lands of significant natural value.

Policy 1: Protect lands having significant natural values within the City limits and in outlying areas; cooperate with other governmental units and agencies to acquire or control valuable environments near the edges of the City where there are multiple political jurisdictions.

Policy 2: Work with the County to develop and promote a county-wide system of open space corridors as a framework to protect the natural environment and scenic values, provide outdoor recreation opportunities and preserve for posterity the nature and diversity of our natural heritage.