

**July 15, 2010**

**Absentee thoughts for the Zoning Code Re-Write from Lauren Cnare**

Sorry I can't join you tonight but am double-booked and am needed to make quorum for Board of Health, but that doesn't prevent me from participating in some way!

I have read through the Public Comments and continue to be impressed, that while we don't have many long-term engaged residents (yet), those who are engaged have been tremendously well informed and insightful.

There are three points I'd like to comment on:

1 – We should all as individuals and a body try to engage our residents. For those areas that will assume a new mantle of similar or even identical zoning and accompanying regulations to what they have now, it might not be as surprising when the new code is adopted. But, for those that will experience some dramatic change, perhaps we could target more intensively when we hold full hearings or presentations, or even start mini-meetings in those areas. I am sure that every alder, for starters, would be delighted to help make this happen. ZCRAC on Zee YouTube?

2 – I am perfectly comfortable with the amount and depth of the discussion and proposed conclusions on both co-op housing and ADUs and urge us to support the draft code as written,

3 – As a classic suburban dweller, I strongly encourage us, through the zoning code, to continue to allow “suburban” style neighborhoods, and as we redevelop them, apply the many techniques and principles to them as was done in the northeast neighborhood plan and elements of some of the new New Urbanist designed areas. There are ways to live lightly on a quarter acre lot; there are needs and desires of people to live that way. One of the best things about Madison is that there is something for everyone. That in itself is diversity that draws new residents and allows existing residents to choose a new living style in our same city. Let's keep the variety in mind as we prescribe the city's development. I really hate losing people to Cottage Grove and Sun Prairie!

Select comments on items covered in staff memo:

1 – Seems to make sense. Question – if an existing non-resi bldg in a resi area underwent a massive change, would it trigger the opportunity to have the parking become compliant with the new code's dictates?

2 – Like the non-cluster to help blend and balance a neighborhood. Too often, the clusters end up in the less desirable areas of the neighborhood. The only question I have is that sometimes apts for older adults will be clustered for probably service provision. Would this be an acceptable application of a conditional use?

General comment regarding waivers becoming part of the Zoning Board of Appeals – suddenly, this sounds like a lot of work or caseload. Should we anticipate increasing the board composition or controlling agendas in a more formal way or something to help?

Design Guidelines – I only support using them as standards if the list is clear and comprehensive. I don't want us playing architect – mostly 'cause I am not one and may have questionable taste!

Height reductions as discussed in the memo: If a greater height could be approved as a CU, would it be limited to the initial 4-story limit or could one ask for more?

Thanks for the work. See you next time.

LC