



City of Madison

Minutes - Draft

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

Economic Development Committee Subcommittee on Downtown Plan

January 23, 2012

5:00 pm

Madison Municipal Building
215 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
Room 313

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Zimmerman at 5:03 pm.

Present: Alfred Zimmerman, Ed Clarke, Alder Mark Clear, Sandra Torkildson arrived at 5:24 pm.

Excused: Julia Stone

Also attending: Peggy Yessa, Matthew Mikolajewski, Office of Business Resources; Michael Waidelich, Planning Division; Alder Scott Resnick, member of Economic Development Commission; Aaron Olver, Director of Economic Development Division; Steve Cover, Director of Department of Planning and Community and Economic Development

PUBLIC COMMENT

Registered Speaker, Gary Peterson, referred to his handout from January 18th. He had the following points:

1. Grand Boulevards are more than transportation corridors.
2. Sustainability needs to be addressed, see the chart in his handout.
3. Bike routes are for more than bikes.
4. The Mifflin area is important.

Mr. Clarke asked about the sustainability chart, and if that includes a definition of sustainability and its relationship to the Natural Step?

Mr. Peterson said to use his language from the chart. His definition of sustainability is an expansion of the Natural Step.

Alder Clear asked about his Mifflin recommendation?

Mr. Peterson said it could become an office park area.

Registered speaker, Mary Carbine, Business Improvement District (BID) Executive Director, referred to her handout from January 18th for the BID's vision of the Mifflin area. She reiterated that it is a fragile business climate for retailers with reduction in state worker pay. Her overall message is to increase the market of residents with disposable income in the Downtown area. Retail follows the market. Reserving space for retail in buildings is not the answer. Parking, way finding, cleanliness and safety are critical to shoppers.

Alder Clear asked about not designating retail space in developments?

Ms. Carbine said the concern is some buildings were required to be mixed-use in order to be developed. Some still have empty first floor space. The market determines where retail should be located.

Alder Clear asked if this is a chicken and the egg situation?

Ms. Carbine said retailers do look at co-tenants in potential buildings. The BID wants flexibility.

Registered speaker, Carole Schaeffer, representing SmartGrowth Greater Madison, referred to her handout containing specific suggested language for some of the objectives. She stressed the Downtown Plan needs flexibility. Complex projects need Planned Development District (PDD) zoning and this does not allow for exceeding height limits as the Conditional Use (CU) zoning does.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked about her prior comment regarding two-thirds of the Downtown being undevelopable? [*ref. Subcommittee Minutes January 18, 2012*]

Sandra Torkildson arrived at 5:24 pm.

ROLL CALL @ 5:24 pm.**Present:** Alfred Zimmerman, Ed Clarke, Alder Mark Clear, Sandra Torkildson**Excused:** Julia Stone

Ms. Schaeffer said that was not exact, she had eyeballed the areas adding up recently developed parcels, government-owned parcels, Landmarks, Potential Landmarks, Urban Design Districts, and historic areas.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked how to strike a balance between zero development encumbrances and regulations?

Ms. Schaeffer said there is too much emphasis on Historic districts in this plan. Make the plan forward looking. It should have a balance of historic preservation and creativity.

Ms. Torkildson asked how to give individuals who invested in Downtown properties assurances that future development will not lower the value of their property?

Ms. Schaeffer said we do not know what the future will bring. She wants to know what process will allow for creative projects?

Registered speaker, Susan Schmitz, President of Downtown Madison, Inc., (DMI), said DMI agrees with SmartGrowth's ideas. DMI formed the BID and knows retail is fragile. DMI likes the Wisconsin Idea District concept in the Mifflin area. Key 2 needs a vision, retail and transportation options. The Mifflin area needs a woonerf-like concept. Ms. Schmitz referred to DMI's handout from January 18th for a full explanation of DMI's "Alternative Approach to the Mifflin District."

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. Clarke, seconded by Alder Clear, to approve the minutes of the January 18, 2012 meeting.

The motion passed by voice vote.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

Mr. Clarke said he is DMI Board President and has worked with DMI for 2 or 3 years on the Downtown Plan. He has no financial interest in the Downtown.

Ms. Torkildson said she owns a business in the Downtown.

DISCUSSION ITEM

2. #24468: A Resolution Adopting the Downtown Plan as a Supplement to the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan

Chairperson Zimmerman suggested reviewing each objective from the economic development point of view.

Ms. Torkildson cautioned the objectives are broad and the recommendations are often the constraining factor.

Mr. Clarke appreciates looking at the objectives from a higher level.

Alder Clear asked Mr. Cover if this approach makes sense and how tight is the timeline to get the EDC's recommendations back to the Plan Commission?

Mr. Cover asked if the subcommittee could get these done tonight or on February 1st ?

Chairperson Zimmerman suggested reviewing *Key 2- Strengthening the Region's Economic Engine* first and then the rest of the objectives.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 2.1.

Mr. Clarke asked about metrics?

Alder Clear said the metrics are in the appendix not in the objectives.

A motion was made by Mr. Clarke, seconded by Alder Clear to change the word “Maintain” to “Grow” in Objective 2.1.

A friendly amendment by Chairperson Zimmerman to add the word “Promote” before “grow” was accepted. The objective will read:

Promote and grow Downtown as an important regional employment center by positioning it as a premier location for the formation and expansion of basic sector businesses, including knowledge-based industries, that will retain and attract new Downtown jobs.

The motion passed by voice vote.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 2.2.

A motion was made by Mr. Clarke, seconded by Alder Clear, to change Objective 2.2 to read:

Strengthen Downtown by enhancing connections and synergies with other existing and planned employment centers such as the Capitol East District, the University of Wisconsin, the Regent Street-South Campus area, and the “Health Care Main Street” along the Park Street corridor.

The motion passed by voice vote.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 2.3. He asked what “context sensitive” means?

Mr. Cover said it means fit in with existing uses at the time of a proposed development.

Ms. Torkildson said this is a loaded word and has the undertone of keeping what is already there.

A motion was made by Mr. Clarke, seconded by Alder Clear, to change Objective 2.3 to read:

Encourage higher density infill and redevelopment that is innovative and sustainable, and complements and enhances the areas in which it is proposed.

The motion passed by voice vote.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 2.4.

Mr. Clarke suggested the word “Redevelop” replace the word “Coordinate”.

Ms. Torkildson said this is a very specific project to be an objective in a long term plan.

Mr. Mikolajewski said this project could maximize available parking in the Downtown and support the entire Downtown area.

A motion was made by Mr. Clarke, seconded by Alder Clear, to change Objective 2.4 to the following:

Create a vibrant mixed-use project on Judge Doyle Square that will maximize economic development and act as a catalyst for future projects in the area.

The motion passed by voice vote.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 2.5.

Mr. Clarke noted this objective is backwards in that it does not first call for creating the conditions that will enhance the growth of retail in the Downtown.

Mr. Olver suggested reviewing the BID’s memo for their suggested change to this.

A motion was made by Alder Clear, seconded by Ms. Torkildson to change Objective 2.5 to read:

Enhance the Downtown’s retail environment.

The motion passed by voice vote.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 2.6.

The Subcommittee members had no suggestions for change of this objective.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 2.7.

Ms. Torkildson asked what is the difference between local and casual tourists?

A motion was made by Mr. Clarke, seconded by Ms. Torkildson, to change Objective 2.7 to read: Continue to enhance and promote Downtown as a great destination, for business travelers, local citizens, recreation seekers and casual tourists.

The motion passed by voice vote.

Alder Clear said this Key (#2) did not talk about "affordable" rent and parking for start-ups in the Downtown.

Alder Resnick said companies with 40-50 employees want to be Downtown and cannot find cheap office space, or interconnectivity or Hacker houses or co-working locations.

Ms. Torkildson asked if this could be a recommendation under 2.6.

Mr. Clarke said we are missing the state government as an economic engine.

Mr. Clarke suggested subcommittee members bring written changes or additions to recommendations to the next meeting to discuss this topic.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Key 3.

Mr. Clarke said a quality urban environment should be discussed first in this key.

A motion was made by Mr. Clarke, seconded by Ms. Torkildson, to change the order of the objectives in Key 3 to move Objective 3.1 to be the third objective in Key 3.

The motion passed by voice vote.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 3.1.

Mr. Clarke said not all the views identified in the map were important.

A motion was made by Chairperson Zimmerman, seconded by Mr. Clarke, to change Objective 3.1 to read: Preserve views of, to and from the Downtown that are on the premier corridors and primary viewsheds. The rest of the views are secondary.

The motion passed by voice vote.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 3.2.
There were no comments on Objective 3.2.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 3.3.

Mr. Clarke suggested this include providing greater density Downtown.

Ms. Torkildson said there needs to be a balance of planned areas for people to have confidence that a plan exists for a higher building.

A motion was made by Mr. Clarke, seconded by Alder Clear, to change Objective 3.3 to read:

Provide a flexible framework for building scale that encourages innovation and growth while reflecting the existing or planned character of the area in which a site is located and considers the larger Downtown context.

The motion passed by voice vote.**Break at 7:05 pm****ROLL CALL @ 7:14 pm****Present:** Alfred Zimmerman, Ed Clarke, Alder Mark Clear, Sandra Torkildson.**Excused:** Julia Stone

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 3.4.

Alder Clear wants the streets to also be functional in addition to what is listed in the Objective.

A motion was made by Alder Clear, seconded by Chairperson Zimmerman, to change Objective 3.4 to read: Continue a comprehensive “complete streets’ streetscape design approach for Downtown streets to reflect their place in the community and ensure that they are beautiful, interesting, engaging, functional, safe, and comfortable public spaces.

The motion passed by voice vote.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 3.5.

There were no comments on Objective 3.5.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 4.1.

Chairperson Zimmerman said the recommendations do not align with the objective.

There were no changes to Objective 4.1.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 4.2.

Alder Clear noted retail uses could also be on the upper levels along State Street not just apartments.

Mr. Clarke said this Objective says State Street will not change. It is telling the market what to do. It should preserve the architecture, not the uses.

Ms. Torkildson said to look at the BID's suggested wording on this Objective. The Downtown needs innovation and a mix of old and new.

Chairperson Zimmerman suggested maintaining its heritage.

A motion was made by Chairperson Zimmerman, seconded by Mr. Clarke, to change Objective 4.2 to read: As a premier Madison destination, the State Street district should continue to encourage a vibrant, diverse, eclectic dynamic mix of uses and users, a human scale and unique sense of place, and evolution as a shopping, dining, entertainment and cultural destination that links Madison's heritage with Madison's future.

The motion passed by voice vote.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 4.3.

Alder Clear said there is significant redevelopment potential in the Mifflin area.

Chairperson Zimmerman likes DMI's vision for the area.

Ms. Torkildson said this could be a model area for greater density in a multi-use district.

Chairperson Zimmerman suggested the subcommittee come back and address this objective.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 4.4.

A motion was made by Alder Clear, seconded by Chairperson Zimmerman, to change Objective 4.4 to read: The Bassett neighborhood should continue its predominately residential nature, with an evolving mix of new higher-density buildings carefully integrated with existing older structures that are compatible in scale and character. Neighborhood-serving commercial uses in mixed-use developments would be appropriate at specific locations, such as the intersection of West Main and Bassett Streets.

The motion passed by voice vote.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 4.5.
There were no comments on this objective.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 4.6.
There were no comments on this objective.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 4.7.

A motion was made by Chairperson Zimmerman, seconded by Mr. Clarke, to change Objective 4.7 to read: The Tobacco Warehouse District should continue its revitalization as a residential and corporate office area blending new buildings and restoration of historic structures. Future emphasis should be on strengthening connections to surrounding areas and enhancing the streetscape and open space.

The motion passed by voice vote.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 4.8.
There were no comments on this objective.

Chairperson Zimmerman asked for discussion on Objective 4.9.

Chairperson Zimmerman wants to strongly encourage the rehabilitation of the housing in the Mansion Hill Neighborhood.

A motion was made by Chairperson Zimmerman, seconded by Mr. Clarke, to Change Objective 4.9 to read:

Mansion Hill's historic character is a major asset and establishing a "complete historic district experience" of restored buildings, distinctive streetscape amenities, and a limited amount of new residential development that preserves and reflects these historic attributes should be pursued. The large historic homes provide a diversity of housing opportunities for executives, families, and students. Encourage sustainable rehabilitation of existing housing stock and period architecture and owner occupancy.

The motion passed by voice vote.

**Alder Clear made a motion, seconded by Mr. Clarke, to adjourn the meeting.
The motion passed by voice vote.**

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm.