



# City of Madison

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

## Meeting Minutes - Approved PLAN COMMISSION

*This meeting can be viewed LIVE on Madison City Channel, cable channel 98, digital channel 994, or at [www.madisoncitychannel.tv](http://www.madisoncitychannel.tv).*

---

Thursday, January 7, 2010

5:30 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.  
Room LL-110 (Madison Municipal Building)

---

### ZONING CODE REWRITE WORKING SESSION

**Note: Please disregard the note above about this meeting being televised, which only pertains to regular Plan Commission meetings. This session will NOT be televised!**

#### CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

**Present:** 5 -

Lauren Cnare; Nan Fey; Eric W. Sundquist; Michael A. Basford and Tim Gruber

**Excused:** 7 -

Michael Schumacher; Julia S. Kerr; Judy K. Olson; James C. Boll; Judy Bowser; Michael G. Heifetz and Douglas J. Pearson

Staff present: Matt Tucker; Brad Murphy and Michael Waidelich

Fey was chair of the meeting. The meeting was called to order by Fey at 5:43 p.m.

#### SCHEDULE OF UPCOMING WORKING SESSIONS

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Ledell Zellers, 510 N. Carroll Street, registered to speak. She is concerned that the draft Zoning Code does not appear to provide lakefront setbacks for commercial (non-residential) property. She said the requirement should apply in all zoning districts. She expressed concern about lake quality and sustainability, particularly the negative impact of impervious surface near waters. She is also concerned about the clarity of the rules. She is concerned about the potential for additional lakefront properties might be rezoned to a commercial district in the future. Also, expressed concern about views of the shoreline from the water. She would like Zoning Code Rewrite Advisory Committee or at least the Plan Commission to discuss the issue.

Fae Dremock, 1211 Rutledge #4, Madison, registered to speak. Expressed her concerns about water quality. She noted the importance and variability of the aquatard and potential to be thin near the lakeshore. Also, expressed importance of tree canopy, including along the lakeshore.

A motion was made and seconded to conduct the working session under informal consideration. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### DISCUSSION ITEM

7. [15932](#) Adopting and confirming amendments to the Madison General Ordinances as set forth in attached Exhibit F pursuant to Sec. 66.0103, Wis. Stats. to revise the City's Zoning Ordinance.

**This was Rerefered to the PLAN COMMISSION**

Consultant and Staff Responses to the Zoning Code Sustainability Ideas Document dated October 14, 2009

Discussion referred to a future meeting.

Design Review Role of Urban Design Commission

Staff summarized the role of the Urban Design Commission, noting differences from their current role.

Discussion about the UDC practice of initial and final approval. Current process is not an ordinance requirement but has become a standard practice allowing the Plan Commission to approve something after UDC's initial approval, subject to receiving final UDC approval. Plan Commission should look for opportunities to streamline the process further.

Discussion of concerns about a cumbersome process and burden on the developer.

Discussion about the potential of not requiring all waivers to go to the UDC. Maybe only if several waivers are requested would UDC need to be involved. However, since these are design standards, maybe the UDC should be involved.

Discussion about potential of some staff/administrative design review.

Discussion about UDC's impact on the outcome of development approvals and how their role in the approval process may affect the location of development. Also discussion about UDC review being a potential disincentive to downtown, infill, higher density development.

Staff noted that the purpose of the meeting is to provide Plan Commission information on the UDC's role in the new zoning code.

Discussion about UDC's role in the Campus Institutional District process if there isn't a mast plan and design standards in place. This process should encourage master plans and design standards to be developed.

Discussion about building standards and building forms . UDC review may be more appropriate for one than the other.

Discussion of sequence of design process. This could be a consideration if the Plan Commission may have a concern with design.

Suggestion that a flow chart of review process would be useful.

Discussion to continue to look for ways to streamline the review process.

Staff will think of possible code revisions and some type of flow chart.

Built Form and Compliance with New Standards for Commercial and Mixed-use Districts

Staff provided background of the issue, noting that how to treat Commercial Corridor-Transitional district was most problematic.

Comment that pulling buildings up to the street doesn't work well if there is no street parking.

Staff noted that existing development in potential CC-T districts is often very different from the type of development envisioned in the new code.

Discussion of allowing one row of parking between building and street.

It was noted that waivers are possible to deal with situations where standards aren't feasible. Example, HyVee at former K-mart site. Redevelopment improved the site in some ways, but didn't change basic suburban layout. There wasn't any building expansion with the project.

Other examples (along Park Street) were also discussed. Development pattern is different along Park Street than along East Washington Avenue. Staff suggested that some parts of Park Street might be more Traditional Shopping Street District than Commercial Corridor-Transitional.

Discussion about potential zoning of Villager Mall. It could be Commercial Center, or possibly Mixed-use Center District. Other possibilities are Commercial Corridor-Transitional or Neighborhood Mixed-use District instead of Commercial Center District. Big box standards may be more appropriate than standards in the code.

Height of Mixed-use Buildings

Discussion and general consensus that considering three stories as maximum permitted use in Traditional Shopping Street is worth revisiting. Some discussion about having a two story minimum.

Parking Requirements

Discussion about clarifying "maximum" and especially "minimum" parking requirements. Consensus seemed to be to clarify this within 28.141(3) or possibly a new section.

Discussion and consensus about adding something in the statement of purpose about a goal of reducing impervious surfaces, runoff, etc. 28.141(1).

Discussion about districts that don't have minimums in the code, e.g. Planned Development District, Transit-Oriented Development. It was noted that these districts require master plans which will address parking requirements. Also noted that some of these districts could easily be added to the no minimum parking table.

Discussion notes that districts where inadequate parking is most likely to result in spill-over into neighborhoods that are already recommended as having no minimum parking requirement.

Comment that automobile-oriented locations/uses need to accommodate parking.

Comment about technical concern with overly crowded parking areas with vehicles blocking aisles, etc.

Discussion of confusing nature of Table 28J-2 and whether it would be better to reverse the table.

Staff comment about concern about having no minimums in some districts, especially Commercial Corridor-Transition.

Suggestion to rewrite parking maximums - could some be further reduced?

Staff described how parking maximums were determined.

Were high school parking areas evaluated? Yes. Staff described how that was done.

Staff noted the need to address bicycle parking where vehicle parking is addressed.

Discussion about moped parking. No current requirements in the code. Suggestion that there should be requirement for moped parking in the code. especially in residential projects.

Discussion about deferring requirements for building parking until needed. No apparent trigger for when parking must be provided. No problem in single family and two family areas, but may need a way to get the parking elsewhere.

## **BUSINESS BY MEMBERS**

## **SECRETARY'S REPORT**

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Discussion about when to reconvene the Zoning Code Rewrite Advisory Committee and what they would discuss. It was suggested that at a minimum, the committee will need to discuss the downtown zoning districts and the draft zoning maps. It was noted by the chair that the Zoning Code Rewrite Advisory Committee meeting (as a body) didn't expect unresolved issues coming back to them. The policy bodies (Plan Commission and Common Council) should make the decisions. The chair noted that the Zoning Code Rewrite Advisory Committee is an advisory committee.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**A motion was made by Basford, seconded by Gruber, to Adjourn at 8:34 p.m.  
The motion passed by voice vote/other.**