

# City of Madison - Zoning Code Rewrite

## Community Meetings May 19-21, 2008 Summary of Results

Three community meetings were held to gather input on the Zoning Code Rewrite:

- May 19: Overture Center for the Arts
- May 21: Warner Park Community Recreation Center
- May 21: MGE Innovation Center, University of Wisconsin Research Park.

A total of approximately 60 people attended the three meetings. At each meeting, participants broke into small groups to discuss their experience with the Zoning Code, examples of good development, and their goals for the rewrite process. Individual responses were recorded on index cards and summarized on flipcharts for each small group. After the small-group sessions, the flipcharts were combined and participants were asked to use 4 sticky dots to “vote” on the most significant examples of good development and goals for the rewrite process (2 dots for each). The summary below is organized based on dot voting. Some duplicates occur because results from all three meetings are combined and some comments were repeated without receiving votes.

<b>Examples of Good Development</b>	
12	Hilldale
7	701 E. Washington (Brink/Buy & Sell Shop) – good re-use of building, mixed comm./office/food/entertainment, increased activity/visibility/safety of area
5	Increased number of bike routes
5	Middleton Hills
4	1239 Spaight St. Co-op housing
4	Renaissance Development (Williamson & Livingston)
4	Sequoia Commons
3	Hilldale/Phase 1 – Hill Farms (balanced redevelopment and neighborhood compatibility – staff expedited – neighborhood involvement.)
3	Nolen Shores (well managed, visually attractive, 11 stories)
2	1026 Williamson – good use of lot, fits in with neighborhood
2	Atwood Community Center (re-use)
2	Knickerbocker Square
2	Stonehouse on E. Wilson Street
2	Village Co-Housing
1	Chickens allowed
1	Condos @ Winnebago & First St. (Krupp)
1	Grandview Commons – Good neighborhood/open spaces, Cottage Grove/Interstate
1	James Madison Park
1	Monroe Commons
1	Porchlight (old)
1	Sequoia Commons
1	Trader Joe’s/ Monroe Commons – south of Stadium – good mixed use.
1	Williamson Street Carriage Houses
	4 <sup>th</sup> Ward Lofts @ Bassett and Main Adaptive re-use (historic properties) Arbor Gate (good process) Block 89 Capital West – reuse of building Capitol Point (downtown) – density and views Capitol Square buildings (old)

## City of Madison - Zoning Code Rewrite

	<p>Central Park Plant                  Condo at Atwood/Division – “real” size bricks                  Grandview Commons                  Keller Developments on Bassett                  Middleton Hills                  Nolen Shore Townhouses                  Old stockyard area (E. Rail Corridor)                  Patterson Building                  Southwest bike trail                  University Square (Mineral Pt. Road/Beltline) – good example of newer, outlying development.</p>
--	---

<b>Goal for the Zoning Code Rewrite</b>	
7	Exemption for Co-op housing to purchase and allow more than 5 unrelated persons to reside together in all residential areas.
6	Strike balance between ease of use and public involvement.
5	Protect walkable form and neighborhood scale.
5	Sustainability
4	Ensure sustainability/viability of existing mixed-use neighborhood.
4	Maintain neighborhood character & integrity
4	Make new/remodel projects fit better into historic neighborhoods.
4	Structure that supports maintaining historic neighborhoods and buildings.
4	Clarity
4	Flexibility
3	Affordable housing
3	Enforce and require CUPs for community living arrangements
3	Increase density
3	Integrate architectural review and covenants for older neighborhoods – tracking.
3	Preserve/require neighborhood review (at least as much as now)
3	Simplicity
2	Allow for community debate – difficult to allow uses by right.
2	Complete compatibility w/ comp plan (plan should also match zoning).
2	Preserve/create open/common spaces
2	Provide code that provides expectations for a project.
2	Simplify, but require high quality, best practices.
1	Allow housing co-ops. Allow 5 – 30 people to live together – more sustainable.
1	Clear standards for height, setbacks – currently depends on project.
1	Clearly delineate approval process (intent, neighborhood, city input, design, etc.)
1	Easy to enforce
1	Eliminate need for constant PUD process.
1	Good, clear guidelines for new projects – where the developer knows the heights, uses and size of the project.
1	Homebuyers with larger houses – easier additions.
1	Integrate Urban Design/Zoning regulations
1	Leave historic district alone
1	Make uses and requirements clear.
1	More defined ability to demolish.
1	More defined land use opportunities for development – consistency
1	Neighborhood integration during rezoning process.
1	Permit granny flats
1	Preserve cultural, historic resources – access to light, air, water.

## City of Madison - Zoning Code Rewrite

---

1	Quality/density on the edge
1	Retain flexibility not cookie-cutter.
1	Simplify
1	Simplify modernization of old housing stock in order to preserve it.
1	Update lighting ordinances – dark sky
1	Use illustrations
1	User-friendly for all
	<p>Allow co-ops to spread – less stigma – co-housing.</p> <p>Allow for density in the City</p> <p>Code should match existing development</p> <p>Consistency</p> <p>Demand quality on the edge of the City</p> <p>Diversity</p> <p>Easier to build good developments, yet still allow public and neighborhood input.</p> <p>Easier to follow, interpret.</p> <p>Humane city</p> <p>Make it easier to build in a sustainable way.</p> <p>Make standards for family more inclusive.</p> <p>Oversized lots – balance landowner rights with neighborhood character – attract middle-upper class.</p> <p>Permit more by right</p> <p>Plan to make easier changes in the code.</p> <p>Prevent sprawl</p> <p>Quality on the edge.</p> <p>Reasonable timeframe for completion/approval</p> <p>Reduce need for PUD's (2 comments); fewer PUD's, but allow stakeholder input.</p> <p>Simplify the code especially at residential/homeowner level.</p> <p>Size of house allowed by right is oversized – preserve character.</p>

**Central Area Community Meeting  
Overture Center, May 19, 2008  
Individual Responses to Questions**

**1. Experience with Madison's Zoning Code or the Development Review Process**

- Williamson/Blair – Harvester; Olds Seed Co. – 722 Williamson; Atrium – 23 N Pinckney; Steere – signage; Urban Design – Demolition & replacement of housing.
- Prohibitions based on the number of unrelated adults that can live in one house have made a new housing co-op development more difficult, and my current housing cooperative (which has existed for 37 years) has been restricted from growing.
- Involvement – very limited. Asking how/why there's "prebuilding" permit permission. Troubles with new apartment building owner and looking for solution.
- Asked city regarding parking in single family downtown – blocked by zoning and green space requirements. Member of neighborhood steering committees with goals of working with developers looking to build, e.g. Methodist Church block. Working with neighborhood to help define predictable n'hood process. Next door neighbor – variance.
- Drumlin Community Farm is where a lot of my friends live and spend time at. Recently the zones have changed from agriculture to more dense residential. We're trying to save it. Hopefully we'll prevail. This is an example of the negative aspects of rezoning. Madison Community Co-ops (MCC) is currently limited to 5 non-related adults in one house. I recently joined the board of directors and have been more exposed to zoning.
- As an interested citizen, I've read through mostly residential zoning codes in an attempt to understand and participate in discussions of rezoning out neighborhood enclave/neighborhood within a neighborhood, and advocated for the creation of the Neighborhood Conservation District Ordinance.
- None so far, seriously.
- Current zoning laws prohibit 5 or more unrelated adults from living together in certain family-centered neighborhood districts. Madison community cooperative, in which I live and am involved, has had problems seeking to purchase housing for co-ops in these districts and we would like to have exemptions for cooperative housing.
- Many developers I work with have expressed frustration with the process. Because PUD's are the rule rather than the exception, projects often get bogged down or abandoned and costs can skyrocket. The constant use of PUD's makes for an unpredictable process which can be time-consuming and frustrating.
- Representing the neighborhood association, I experienced the development of the Sequoia Commons/Midvale plaza project. This development raised a large number of issues related to zoning and planning.
- Helping with development plans.
- I can't think of any experience with the base code, all our experiences are with PUD's. I have read it online, and it's difficult to follow.
- Practiced architecture, including in Madison since 1975. Currently work for State Facilities, State of Wisconsin. Work necessitates compliance with zoning.
- Work with zoning code nearly daily. Landscape code for parking, rezoning applications – usually through conditional use or PUD.
- Tried to get variance, helped purchase properties, met with City officials to get co-op friendly zoning, read through code, investigated zoning maps, compared code to that of other municipalities.

# City of Madison - Zoning Code Rewrite

- Prolonged development approval process because current code is complicated and at time contradictory. – Ample opportunity for public input on development projects.
- PUDs for infill dev., R4 – permitted/conditional use doesn't allow “mission house” – UDD as UDC member, W. Wash BUILD will create UDD#8, 2 historic districts in R6 district. Conservation district overlay maybe tested in Willy St/downzoning. Put the participation in development. C2 uses amazing. Inclusion zoning.
- As an alder, I am involved in these processes all the time. It is fascinating, but I can see how it would be frustrating to someone trying to build. But, I appreciate the public input that the city allows.
- It is my life. I am a real estate developer. I am continually amazed by the long hours, caring and effort put in by volunteers and staff – into running the city – it's why we are the best!
- Rezoning of 701 E. Washington Ave from M-1 to a mixed use- with office and entertainment – it was a good process.
- As neighborhood rep, I worked on PUD/parking requirements of affordable housing project on E. Wilson St.

## 2. One Good Example of Recent Development

- A lot of development in the isthmus (stockyard area has been aesthetically pleasing). – Hilldale Mall.
- Michael Matty's infill/ reuse of turn of the century house on Williamson Street.
- Michael Matty's infill on Williamson Street - Tobacco Warehouses - Loraine Hotel Condos.
- Positive recent developments I am aware of are the redevelopment of Ofek Shalom co-op and Ridgeside cooperative. They have sustainably increased density and made home ownership accessible to more Madisonians.
- Silicon Prairie, sustainable design for exceeding different codes w/o city money. Triple bottom line – people, planet, profit.
- 701 East Washington – brings office, food and music together in an area that was dark at night.
- I love the re-use of the old Buy and Sell Shop – now Brink/High Noon. Re-use of buildings is great. Really revitalized the area.
- 701 E. Washington, High Noon, Brink Lounge, etc.
- Stonehouse Developments, E. Wilson
- I'm fairly new to Madison and am not sure. Here are some ideas: Central Park plans, increased number of bike routes.
- The southwest bike trail (great common resource).
- Sequoya Commons – good example of infill of both residential/small local business in a residential setting and built in what will increasingly be a transit corridor. UDC & Plan Commission have done a good job of applying code to keep the design in keeping with neighborhood. But controversial due to height and density.
- Most of the development I prefer has not been recent (James Madison Park Porchlight, many of the Capitol Square buildings, etc.) When I think recent development, I think condos and apartments and I am not in favor of those as I see them as not sustainable, to be frank.

# City of Madison - Zoning Code Rewrite

- Arbor Gate – after landmark gate fell apart because of the state law and eminent domain, city developers cooperated and came up with a project done in a few months and should look good. Keller developments on Bassett (old liquor store and the place across street, can't think of names, several nice looking mixed use) Hamilton Place, Nolen Shores.
- Hilldale, Erdman's development, Monroe Commons
- 1026 Williamson, Atwood & Division red brick condos, 701 East Washington, 800 & 806 Williamson, good use
- Grandview Commons, Trader Joe Building on Monroe Street, Capitol West
- In 2000, Madison Community Cooperative purchased 1239 Spaight Street to expand inclusive, affordable, sustainable housing in Madison. (We have encountered zoning barriers that we would like to address.)
- 1026 Willy/Renaissance LLC, PUD, rehabbed historic house damaged by fire (previous owner wanted to demolish and fill entire lot). Divided lot and built second 2 unit house. 2 sets of granny flats above new garages – greenspace lost but not completely, density, fabric/character of street maintained.
- Trader Joes – Monroe Commons, University Square Redevelopment, Brennans West (Watts Rd.)
- “Open zone” examples: a) 1001 Willy St. Park, b) Dog parks c) The zoo got more space for some of the animals.

### 3. Important Goal for Zoning Code Rewrite

- Protect our neighborhoods, historic buildings, and walkable form/scale. Sustainability.
- Structure which will support maintaining our neighborhoods and buildings.
- I like a housing cooperative for sake of density and sharing of valuable resources (water, fuel, food, etc.) They are very beneficial. The 5 non-related adults “rule” prohibits co-ops (in outer neighborhoods) Cooperative = sustainability
- Exemption of cooperative housing to purchase housing and allow more than 5 unrelated persons to reside together in all residential areas.
- Include successful models of sustainable development that are accessible to low income families: Housing Cooperatives and co-housing. Include a place for them in all residential areas as long as they are family-oriented.
- I want the zoning code to accommodate the formation of new housing co-ops that are organized on a “group-living” model. Think: 5 to 40 unrelated adults living in a large house that has 5 to 40 individual bedrooms, multiple bathrooms and a single large shared kitchen. I want this option to be available to non-profit organizations aimed at providing affordable, inclusive and sustainable housing. We want to maintain historic housing stock such as large houses, mansions, and old sorority and fraternity buildings. We don't want to be thwarted by “family” definitions.
- Maintain flexibility and public/stakeholder participation of PUD process while decreasing overreliance on it. Don't want all development/rezoning designs to be administrative and staff driven. Encourage urban vs. suburban design/forms.
- Construction/traffic noise decibel level ordinance. Get the people's needs in perspective
- Preserve significant cultural resources. – Achieve an appropriate balance between preservation and new development. – Preserve open space. – Provide quality of life by insuring light, air, water, are available to all. – Protect from noise, pollution.
- Make it simpler to follow and easier to interpret. – Less PUD's

## City of Madison - Zoning Code Rewrite

---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow for community debate – Allow for the densification of the city. Demand creation of place in the suburbs.</li> <li>• As much permitted use as possible. – Clear direction on density, height, setbacks, greenspace; etc as possible, - Integration of urban design standards with zoning code.</li> <li>• Allow existing structures and built environment to conform to code, where reasonable. Help push Greenfield Development to attain the urban standards that “new urbanism” is reaching for. Drastically reduce PUDs in favor of conditional uses.</li> <li>• Mismatch between zoning and neighborhood plan/comp plan – need a process to reconcile the two.</li> <li>• Ensuring sustainability is a true goal of this re-write, such that we make sure to develop for more humane forms of housing and business. I fell Madison must if it is to be a humane city, plan such that affordable, environmentally sound living is available to all. A platitude I know, but I can’t think of anything more.</li> <li>• Simplify without making it to easy – quality over quantity.</li> <li>• Strike a balance between ease of use and public involvement – make it easier to build in a sustainable way.</li> <li>• Make it easier to build good developments, yet still allow public and neighborhood input.</li> <li>• To give good guidelines for a new project – where the neighborhood and the development know the use and size of the project.</li> <li>• Ensure sustainability/viability, existing mixed-use traditional neighborhoods.</li> <li>• Sustainable over profitable. Plan to make changes to the plan easier. Will the new code be rewritten in 50 years too? Or 15?</li> <li>• Would like to see diversity, prevent sprawl, allow for creation of cooperative housing and other affordable housing arrangements. Preserve/create common spaces, allow for expansion of public transport, keep the city “walkable.”</li> <li>• Eliminate need for constant PUD process; make process more streamlined , created more predictability. Eventually tying other ordinances in to create overall cohesiveness (i.e. Urban Design, Historic, Conservation Districts, Chap. 31, Parking, etc.)</li> <li>• Simplification of the code – especially at the resident homeowner level. (For things like home improvements, accessory buildings, replacements) – increased protection of existing greenspace, increased protection for character of existing neighborhoods.</li> </ul>
--	--

### Northeast Area Community Meeting Warner Park, May 21, 2008 Individual Responses to Questions

<b>1. Experience you’ve had with Madison’s Zoning Code or the Development Review Process</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with code on a regular basis developing projects around the city.</li> <li>• Comprehensive review, community meetings.</li> <li>• Considering many proposed developments in the Marquette Neighborhood. Code largely not relevant to those discussions as they were PUD’s or variances.</li> <li>• Many different experiences at many levels. – As a member of my neighborhood association board – as a community organizer that helps neighborhoods – as a member of a housing organization trying to get an exception for zoning for one of our houses.</li> </ul>

## City of Madison - Zoning Code Rewrite

---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• My experience with the development review process as president of our neighborhood association was wholly unsatisfactory for both the neighborhood and the developer who did not realize what they need to do to inform the neighborhood of their intentions.</li><li>• Served on the zoning board of appeals in mid 70's. In my neighborhood association, helped to block development of a PDQ store on a vulnerable site; participated in various discussions of proposed developments in neighborhood.</li><li>• Neighborhood meetings regarding new developments never seem to address issues I most care about – esthetics, historic appropriateness, lighting, finishes/architectural detailing. They just seem to focus mainly on parking and how tall.</li></ul>
--	--

### 2. One Good Example of Recent Development

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Stonehouse Development in Marquette neighborhood.</li><li>• Block 89</li><li>• West Main Street Development – Nolen Shores.</li><li>• Hilldale</li><li>• Good projects have been those provided defined expectations – which leads to easy implementation.</li><li>• Capitol Point – excellent process, engaged neighborhoods, excellent infill (converting run-down buildings and surface parking).</li><li>• Commonwealth Development on Willy St (Livingston)</li><li>• Stonehouse Development on E. Wilson and Ingersol.</li><li>• Condos at corner of Winnebago and First. I like the looks of the building – I think I'm in the minority.</li></ul>
--	---

### 3. One Important Goal of the Zoning Code Rewrite

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Zoning variance to put an addition on my house.</li><li>• To have adequate contact with neighborhoods during the rezoning process.</li><li>• Making the uses and requirements clear.</li><li>• <u>Simplicity</u>, not just for developers, but also neighbors.</li><li>• Provide code that will reduce the need for PUD's.</li><li>• Provide a code that defines expectations for a project. And also development to take place within a reasonable period.</li><li>• Get new or remodeled projects to fit better architecturally into historic neighborhoods <u>and</u> update lighting ordinances to make dark skies a reality in Madison.</li><li>• Make it easier to modernize/upgrade small houses on small lots so that old housing stock can be preserved.</li><li>• Neighborhood review/input of development proposals at least as much as we have now.</li><li>• Preserve and in some cases perhaps require neighborhood review.</li><li>• To clearly identify what needs to occur to successfully move through the process. Intent notice... neighborhood/city input... design, etc.</li></ul>
--	--



**West Area Community Meeting  
MGE Innovation Center, May 21, 2008  
Individual Responses to Questions**

**1. Experience you've had with Madison's Zoning Code or the Development Review Process**

- Ran a FCC business in my home. – Remodeling my house on Chamberlain. – Building inspectors (too many fire extinguishers required). – Had renter in my home in Vilas.
- None – students next door on 2 sides.
- I live in a R4A district. The neighboring R4A has had too many unrelated residents in the past. We have not been protected by the R4A label. Enforcement is minimal.
- Development review, testifying at public meetings, interpret code for residents, neighborhood meetings debating development proposals. Residents have a difficult time interpreting code; PUD process frustrates neighborhoods with its unpredictability.
- Comp plan changes – Development of neighborhood plans. – Rezoning to PD – Sign ordinance. Anything of note has to go through PUD – City likes to closely manage uses. The result is often neighborhood plans or zoning that the market won't support. Then the plan doesn't get built to match the neighborhood plan.
- Worked in City of Madison zoning for 10 years. Neighbors feuding were common.
- Hill Farms dealt with zoning when a CBRF which was in violation of the code was operating. I have submitted a letter on this topic on the definition and exception of “comm. living arrangement.” We have also been involved in the Hilldale and DOT development projects.
- As an alder, helped constituents get through unpredictable variance process. Also as an alder involved with the Home Depot Project – facilitated community meetings. As private citizen involved with Midvale Plaza redevelopment, which was a flashpoint with nearby neighborhoods.
- Worked on committee opposing Midvale Plaza redevelopment. Did not feel that neighborhoods were listened to – project was a foregone conclusion, despite effective agreements supporting alterations to proposed development.
- Difficult to find things in code and to coordinate with other relevant codes. Urban Design Commission role is too subjective and political.
- Reviewed development plans – but limited review of City Zoning Code.
- Minimal experience with Madison ZO, but extensive experience with ZO's state and nationwide.
- Responsible for 1966 zoning ordinance.
- Occasional experience with business vs. residential, with rental real estate, deed covenants.

**2. One Good Example of Recent Development**

- Chickens: brings life and sustainability and food production into everyday life. Monroe Commons – Bike Paths – Village Co-housing on Mills.
- Trader Joe – Monroe Commons – Redevelop as mixed use – multi-use site
- Grandview Commons – new development replicates traditional neighborhood.
- Redevelopment at Hilldale – Middleton Hills residential development – it's quiet and has walking feel.
- Village Co-housing
- Carriage houses behind traditional homes on Willy St. Nolen Shores townhouses.

## City of Madison - Zoning Code Rewrite

---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monroe Commons (Trader Joes/Condos). Sequoya Commons. Good aspects: mixed use, increased density, improve the street form and aesthetics.</li> <li>• Sequoya Commons – looks great, good foresight, worked with neighbors until they (developers) got it right. Kupfer – Atwood Community Center.</li> <li>• 4<sup>th</sup> Ward Lofts – great scale, fits neighborhood. Block 89</li> <li>• Knickerbocker Square</li> <li>• Hilldale Phase 1</li> <li>• Hill Farms State Office Bldg. property and Hilldale redevelopment.</li> <li>• Hill Farms redevelopment process especially the involvement of neighborhood association and City Staff.</li> <li>• Hilldale redevelopment (2 comments)</li> <li>• Bike paths, chickens, Monroe, Midvale, Hilldale</li> </ul>
<b>3. One Important Goal of the Zoning Code Rewrite</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity, easy to read, use and enforce.</li> <li>• I would like additional dwelling (ADU) units allowed in my neighborhood (Regent). Specifically a tiny apartment on the top of my garage rebuild.</li> <li>• Additional dwelling unit would increase density in a livable way in R1, R2.</li> <li>• Simplify when possible. Illustrate as much as possible.</li> <li>• Clarity, concision and flexibility. Huge bonus points if you can do all 3 at once.</li> <li>• More clarity and user-friendly for all who use it, including the non-connected, non-development professional.</li> <li>• Require CUPs for community living arrangements if a CLA is planned within 2,500 feet of another CLA in residential neighborhoods.</li> <li>• Consistency</li> <li>• Incorporation of architectural review process from neighborhood covenants into zoning process for aging neighborhoods.</li> <li>• Retain flexibility</li> <li>• Address the need to balance neighborhood character preservation with ability to invest and expand home. Related: small lot zoning in large lot areas and ability to redivide.</li> <li>• Complete compatibility between zoning code and comprehensive plan, <u>and</u> between comprehensive plan and the zoning code where incompatible.</li> <li>• Maintaining character and integrity of neighborhoods.</li> <li>• Facilitate redevelopment of aging commercial and multi-family areas – South Beltline, Odana Road, South Park Street, Regent Street, etc.</li> <li>• Address issue of home additions – balance neighborhood character with reinvestment in city n’hoods.</li> <li>• Possibility of larger lot size zoning district(s) or other mechanisms to limit redivision of large lots in certain n’hoods – Oakland Ridge.</li> <li>• Granny flats – family member suites.</li> <li>• Standards for findings related to state consistency requirements for CUPs, PUDs, map changes.</li> </ul>