



Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development  
**Planning Division**

Website: [www.cityofmadison.com](http://www.cityofmadison.com)

Madison Municipal Building, Suite LL100  
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard  
P.O. Box 2985  
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-2985  
FAX 608 267-8739  
PH 608 266-4635

## MEMORANDUM 2

**TO:** Plan Commission

**FROM:** Planning Division Staff

**DATE:** March 8, 2012

**SUBJECT:** **Committee and Commission Recommendations on the City of Madison draft Downtown Plan (Legistar # 24468).**

[Key 5: Enhance Livability, Appendix D: Benchmarks, Key 1: Celebrate the Lakes, Key 2: Strengthen the Region's Economic Engine, Key 7: Build on Historic Resources]

The purpose of this memorandum is to convey revisions to the draft *Downtown Plan* recommended by the City boards, commission, and committees to which it was referred (see table below). In an effort to facilitate the Plan Commission's discussion, this memorandum only includes changes to the *Plan* that were recommended by these bodies related to the sections of the *Plan* on tonight's agenda. It does not include general discussion or background information. For instance, the BID Board approved a 13-page report on the *Downtown Plan*, that is available in Legistar, but only those portions with actual recommendations are included in this memo. Complete minutes of each of the referral bodies' meetings are available on Legistar.

BOARD/COMMISSION/COMMITTEE	DATE OF FINAL ACTION
Madison Arts Commission [ARTS]	DEC. 13, 2011
Board of Park Commissioners [PARKS]	DEC. 14, 2011
Landmarks Commission [LANDMARKS]	DEC. 19, 2011
Committee on the Environment [ENVIR]	DEC. 19, 2011
Transit + Parking Commission [TPC]	JAN. 11, 2012
Sustainable Design + Energy Committee [SUSTAIN]	JAN. 23, 2012
Madison Central Business Improvement District (BID) Board [BID]	FEB. 02, 2012
Economic Development Committee [EDC]	FEB. 15, 2012
Downtown Coordinating Committee [DCC]	FEB. 16, 2012
Long Range Transportation Planning Committee [LRTPC]	FEB. 16, 2012
Board of Estimates [BOE]	FEB. 20, 2012
Urban Design Commission [UDC]	FEB. 29, 2012
Pedestrian-Bicycle-Motor Vehicle Commission [PBMVC]	FEB. 29, 2012

This memorandum includes referral body recommendations by section of the *Plan* for only those sections listed on the Plan Commission’s agenda for this meeting and will be discussed time permitting, namely:

- Key 5: Enhance Livability
- Appendix D: Benchmarks
- Key 1: Celebrate the Lakes
- Key 2: Strengthen the Region’s Economic Engine
- Key 7: Build on Historic Resources

Recommendations with a **heavy outline** around that row in a table indicates that staff agrees with and supports that particular recommendation.

**KEY 5: ENHANCE LIVABILITY** (pages 61-70)

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
65	There needs to more in the plan regarding affordable housing and schools. The plan needs more in the plan – more specifics – about schools and this should include public and private schools. <i>[SUSTAIN]</i>	NO CHANGE – Rec. 100 recommends concentrating family-supportive housing (regardless of income) near schools.
65	Access to grocery and food needed downtown. <i>[ARTS]</i>	SUPPORT - NO CHANGE – The desire for “more and larger grocery stores” is included in the text on page 31.
66?	Low income housing for service employees which often include cultural arts workers and artists = affordable housing options. <i>[ARTS]</i>	SUPPORT - NO CHANGE – The plan calls for the provision of affordable housing, but does not distinguish between the occupations of potential residents.
66	Affordable housing should be encouraged not by retaining crumbling structures but by encouraging section 42 housing and other programs. <i>[UDC]</i>	SUPPORT
66	(Add) artist/ service worker housing. <i>[ARTS]</i>	NO CHANGE – The plan calls for the provision of affordable housing, but does not distinguish between the occupations of potential residents.
67	Senior Center should have a connection to the library - the temporary location isn’t working for seniors. <i>[ARTS]</i>	NO CHANGE – This is a reference to the temporary library in place while the new central library is being reconstructed.
68	RE: natural access control: art should be an option. <i>[ARTS]</i>	SUPPORT – This can be included in the text.
Gen’l.	Consider noise and speed of cars in the downtown plan when dealing with residential density as it is a big issue...cars make a lot of noise. <i>[SUSTAIN]</i>	NO CHANGE – Key 6 addresses “complete streets” and Key 3 addresses streetscape enhancements, both of which can help reduce the speed of traffic.

**APPENDIX D: BENCHMARKS** (pages 131-132)

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
131	Review Appendix D at future EDC meetings, with the EDC as the lead committee on this review. [EDC]	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff recommend that Appendix D be removed from the plan and further developed as a follow-up companion document, with the Plan Commission as the lead since the benchmarks cover a broad range of topics.

**KEY 1: CELEBRATE THE LAKES** (pages 13-20)

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
13	We support Obj. 1.1 and its six recommendations. [DCC]	SUPPORT - NO CHANGE - This is what the plan says.
13	The UDC believes efforts on the Lake Monona shore will need careful design attention for future success. [UDC]	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE
13	(Members) felt it was a beautiful plan but did express concerns about filling in two acres into Lake Monona to increase the size of Law Park and asked whether there would need to be some mitigation efforts. [PARKS]	NO CHANGE – As the plan for Law Park develops, coordination with the DNR and Corps of Engineers will be necessary to understand requirements and options for addressing them.
13	Much of the lake shore in Madison is not natural and if we can make the space better for people- this can really be a great way to connect the city to the lake. [SUSTAIN]	SUPPORT - NO CHANGE
13	Consider not having a recommendation to fill in the lake and a more robust recommendation to cover parts of John Nolen Drive and use the existing space on Monona Terrace better. [SUSTAIN]	NO CHANGE – John Nolen Drive provides a unique lakefront drive, which is how many people experience Lake Monona and staff feel that this should be preserved.
13	Remove the first recommendation as listed in the November 2011 Downtown Plan pertaining to filling along the Lake Monona shoreline at Law Park. [ENVIR]	NO CHANGE – Staff believe that John Nolen Drive and the railroad tracks limit opportunities to expand the park inland and adding some fill to the lake provides an opportunity to create a signature lakefront park.
13	Rec. 3: Complete a public path system along Lake Mendota connecting James Madison Park to the UW Memorial Union and Picnic Point, including enhancing connections to it through the redesign of the intersecting street ends <u>and encourage lakefront dining</u> . [EDC]	SUPPORT IN PART – Allowing some limited lakefront dining in key locations could be added to the text, but much of the path is in a residential area and lakefront dining would not be appropriate everywhere.

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
14	Change last sentence: The new plan includes a park shelter and potential visitor center based on Wright's boathouse design, expands the shoreline by adding <del>approximately 1 ¼ acres of fill</del> <u>a flexible performance venue that naturally blends in with the environment</u> , and provides short term boat docking for visitors. [EDC]	SUPPORT
15	(Members) applauded the land bridges at Law Park. [PARKS]	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE
16	There is concern about the proximity of a dog park to Lake Monona and any associated environmental impacts. [ENVIR]	NO CHANGE – Staff does not feel that this will be a concern, but the issue of properly disposing of animal waste will be addressed with a more detailed plan for the space.
Gen'l.	Add pontoon rentals. [ARTS]	SUPPORT – This can be added to the text.
Gen'l.	We would suggest that water sports other than boating, such as kayaking, fishing, paragliding, etc. should also be encouraged on the lakefront. [DCC]	NO CHANGE – Kayaking and fishing are specifically mentioned in this section more than once.

**KEY 2: STRENGTHEN THE REGION'S ECONOMIC ENGINE** (pages 21-34)

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
21	Government employment is no longer stable for reasons that should be obvious -- work at home and contracting, not to mention deficit reduction need to be mentioned. [TPC]	NO CHANGE – No specific change recommended.
22	Focusing on the BID footprint of the central retail district, the BID supports priorities: retaining and expanding existing businesses; growing local businesses; addressing real or perceived disadvantages associated with Downtown; creating a more complete Downtown retail environment. [BID]	SUPPORT - NO CHANGE - This is what the plan says.
22	The BID applauds the recognition that national brands and stores can be an important part of a strong and distinctive retail mix for downtown shopping districts. [BID]	SUPPORT - NO CHANGE - This is what the plan says.

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
24	<p>Add new Obj. 2.0: <u>Maximize economic value of the Downtown by encouraging high density, high value projects that add employment and enhance property values.</u></p> <p>Add new Rec.: <u>Encourage that economic factors are considered in each land use decision in terms of employment and tax value.</u></p> <p>Add new Rec.: <u>Develop a comprehensive set of metrics and measurements upon which the economic value of development can be measured and/or benchmarked.</u> [EDC]</p>	<p>SUPPORT IN PART – Staff support the new objective and first new recommendation, but recommends that the second proposed recommendation be done as part of Appendix D: Benchmarks, which staff recommends be undertaken as a separate follow up effort to the plan.</p>
24	<p>Obj. 2.1: <del>Maintain</del> <u>Promote and grow</u> 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. [EDC]</p>	<p>SUPPORT</p>
24	<p>Obj. 2.1 emphasizes the focus on tech-based businesses. The objective and supporting recommendations should also point out the target of Creative Industries as being desired in the recruitment efforts. [DCC]</p>	<p>SUPPORT</p>
25	<p>Replace lead sentence with one that reflects a positive vision and current opportunities for downtown: <del>Like most downtowns, there is less emphasis today on the central business district as the region's primary shopping and working destination.</del> <u>While downtown Madison has grown its place as a regional "experience," entertainment and visitor destination, like most downtowns of today, it is no longer the sole shopping and working destination in the region, and must compete with other areas to attract employers, workers, and customers. Fortunately, downtowns are well-positioned to offer an urban environment attractive to young entrepreneurs: a sustainable, less resource-intense life- and work-style that does not sacrifice entertainment, culture, recreation and livability.</u> [BID]</p>	<p>SUPPORT</p>

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
26	Obj. 2.2: Strengthen Downtown and create additional business development sites by enhancing connections and synergies with other existing and planned employment centers at the edge of Downtown, including 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. [EDC]	NO CHANGE – The section focuses on locations adjacent to the Downtown planning area that provide numerous opportunities to develop additional employment uses.
27	Obj. 2.3: Encourage higher density infill and redevelopment that is context sensitive innovative and sustainable, and complements and connects to enhances the areas in which it is proposed. [EDC]	SUPPORT
27	Rec. 20: Allow existing buildings that are taller than the proposed height limits to be redeveloped at the same height provided the new building is of superior architectural design. This recommendation shall be implemented through the development of the new Downtown Zoning Districts. [EDC]	SUPPORT
27	Consider varying heights on individual blocks to avoid the walled in look. [TPC]	NO CHANGE - Building height is addressed in Key 3
27	Obj. 2.3: We are supportive of the objective but do not see connections in the plan that will provide the actions required to achieve these goals. The call for predictability in process, but flexibility in opportunity is important to the sectors of the market who will be responsible for the innovation and creating in investing in the type of buildings and supporting infrastructure needed in achieving the vision of the plan. Also, there should be acknowledgement that the downtown area is the place in Madison where density <b>should</b> be encouraged. [DCC]	NO CHANGE – The plan accommodates 4,000-5,000 new dwelling units and 4-5 million square feet of new commercial space with an estimated value of \$2-2.5 million while articulating the desired character of various neighborhoods and districts within the Downtown.
27	Rec. 16: <del>Direct</del> Guide and incentivize development to locations recommended in this Plan for buildings of that height and scale. [DCC]	NO CHANGE – While staff do not have a problem changing "Direct" to "Guide", there is concern that the use of "incentivize" is too global an application here and will set the expectation that the City will incentivize all development. Also, deleting the end of the sentence renders the recommendation meaningless.

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
30	<p>Obj. 2.4: <del>Coordinate the redevelopment of portions of Blocks 88 and 105 to create a vibrant mixed use project.</del> <u>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.</u> [EDC]</p>	SUPPORT
31	<p>The Plan needs a vision for downtown retail grounded in downtown retail realities, trends and economics. In Key 2, the retail section, we suggest a vision such as “Build on downtown’s strength as an experience destination offering distinctive shopping options while expanding neighborhood-serving retail, and support retention, expansion and recruitment of retail businesses that combines distinctiveness a track record and are best positioned for success in downtown markets of our size.” [BID]</p>	SUPPORT
31	<p>Obj. 2.5: <del>Enhance the attractiveness of Downtown shopping and entertainment to Downtown workers, residents and visitors</del> <u>Downtown’s retail environment.</u> [EDC]</p>	NO CHANGE – The recommendation in the plan is more descriptive.
31	<p>Obj. 2.5: <del>Enhance the attractiveness of Downtown shopping and entertainment to Downtown workers, residents and visitors.</del> Replace with an objective that identifies a vision for downtown retail grounded in retail economics and trends, e.g., “<u>Build on downtown’s strength as an experience destination offering distinctive shopping options while expanding neighborhood-serving retail.</u>” [BID]</p>	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff recommend keeping the stricken language, but adding the new language with: “...residents and visitors, building on Downtown’s strength...”
31	<p>Obj. 2.5: The Plan must recognize that the downtown is a regional attraction and visitor destination, and that the City and its partners must work to maintain this unique position. The current objective should be stronger in its vision, but based on retail realities. [DCC]</p>	SUPPORT – See the change recommended in the row above.
31	<p>Rec. 23: <del>Provide</del> <u>Encourage</u> more convenient access to retail goods and services <del>by creating and expanding retail sites located near employment and residential use areas</del> <u>through business clustering and placement strategies to build critical mass of contiguous retail, encourage cross-shopping opportunities, avoid potential commercial conflicts, and reduce business turnover.</u> [EDC] [DCC] [BID]</p>	SUPPORT

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
31	<p>Rec. 24: Identify and support development of locations potentially suitable for retail uses requiring relatively larger floor areas (7,000 – 10,000 SF) which could attract additional types of Downtown shopping opportunities including destination retail. Uses such as a potential city-size department or general merchandise store, larger furniture/home furnishings/electronics retailer, or movie/entertainment complex would require 20,000 - 85,000 SF. [BID]</p>	<p>NO CHANGE – Staff prefer not to identify a specific size range or call out specific types of retail that could potentially limit opportunities.</p>
31	<p>Rec. 24: Identify and support development of locations potentially suitable for retail uses requiring relatively large floor areas (7,000 to 10,000 SF) which could attract additional types of Downtown shopping opportunities including destination retail. [EDC]</p>	<p>NO CHANGE - See the recommendation in the row above.</p>
31	<p>Rec. 25: Consider filling in retail gaps like first block of Pinckney St. from Monona Terrace. [TPC]</p>	<p>NO CHANGE – Staff do not disagree, but the recommendation says “primary retail streets” and do not consider Pinckney as such compared to those cited (State Street, King Street, and around Capitol Square).</p>
31	<p>Rec. 25: Seek to fill retail “gaps” voids in merchandise categories along defined primary retail streets, such as State Street, King Street and around the Capitol Square, where additional active uses, including restaurants, taverns and entertainment venues, can help create engaging pedestrian corridors. [BID]</p>	<p>NO CHANGE – This recommendation refers to the physical voids along street frontages-- not voids in merchandise categories.</p>
31	<p>Rec. 26: Encourage Implement zoning flexibility to allow development of small, neighborhood-serving convenience uses at defined locations identified in this Downtown Plan where supported by the market and neighborhood needs. [BID]</p>	<p>SUPPORT IN PART – Staff recommend that the first change not be adopted. Staff further recommend a clarification that this applies to areas identified as “predominate residential” on the Generalized Future Land Use Map (page 40). Staff support the addition of the wording at the end of the sentence.</p>
31	<p>Rec. 27: Create additional affordable short term parking at suitable locations to support retail uses. BID SUPPORTS [BID]</p>	<p>SUPPORT - NO CHANGE - This is what the plan says.</p>
31	<p>Rec. 27: The BID strongly supports Recommendation 27 to create additional affordable short term parking at suitable locations to support retail uses. [BID]</p>	<p>SUPPORT - NO CHANGE - This is what the plan says.</p>



PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
31	Add a new Rec.: <u>Recognizing the new retail anchors, foster strategic growth in innovative entertainment and “experience” offerings and shopping to develop downtown as an experience destination. [EDC]</u>	SUPPORT
31	The BID agrees that downtown offers a truly unique shopping experience, and recognizes that residents and others are looking for more retail choices. [BID]	SUPPORT - NO CHANGE - This is what the plan says.
31	Add a new Rec.: <u>Support retention, expansion and recruitment of retail businesses that combine distinctiveness, a track record, and are best positioned for success in downtown markets of our size. [EDC]</u>	SUPPORT
31	Add a new Rec.: <u>Support retention, expansion and recruitment of retail businesses that combines distinctiveness a track record and are best positioned for success in downtown markets of our size: specialty retail (local, regional, national); 2nd or 3rd locations for established independent retailers from similar markets; regional chainlets; bricks &amp; mortar location for catalog/online retailers with strong Madison sales base; “one in a market” national brands and destination retail; and potential future possibilities for a city-scale department and/or general merchandise store. Round out with retail to serve basic and convenience needs. [BID]</u>	NO CHANGE – See the recommendation in the row above. Staff believe that the remainder of the recommendation is too specific and should not be included.
31	Add a new Rec.: <u>Recognizing that food, entertainment, arts &amp; culture and visitor destinations are the new retail anchors, foster strategic growth in innovative entertainment and “experience” offerings to develop downtown as an experience destination, particularly for young professionals and baby boomers. Rework policies such as the Alcohol License Density Ordinance which discourage rather than promote strategic growth of downtown as an experience destination. [BID]</u>	NO CHANGE – Staff believe that there are many retail anchors and a few should not be specified. Staff also believe that Downtown should be a place for all people instead of focusing on a particular demographic. Finally, staff believe that the “experience destination” concept is covered by the new Objective 2.5.
32	Drive time map is OK- Add a bike time map too, and even a ped time map. [TPC]	NO CHANGE – This map was taken from the 2007 <i>Downtown Market Analysis</i> and is included here as a reference to that study and is not a transportation map. Also, staff do not believe that data exists to create the suggested new maps.
32	Rec. 30: add a mix of executive housing and affordable workforce housing. [DCC]	SUPPORT

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
32	Rec. 32: Maintain and expand locations for sidewalk cafes <del>and street vendors</del> . [BID]	SUPPORT
32	Add a new Rec.: <u>Carefully consider strategic placement, number, and quality of street vendors so as not to adversely affect the economic vitality (not unfairly competing with in-line storefront retailers) and “lease-ability” of brick and mortar establishments.</u> [BID]	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff would prefer more positive language, such as: “Recognizing that street vending is an important component of the Downtown experience, the placement, number, and quality of street vendors should be managed as appropriate to balance this activity with the goal of maintaining vital, competitive “brick and mortar” retail establishments.”
33	Obj. 2.7: This objective is weak. It should incorporate the strategic plans that have been defined in the CVB’s Destination 2020 documents. [DCC]	NO CHANGE – (see the recommendation in the next row of this table)
33	Obj. 2.7: Continue to enhance and promote Downtown as a great <del>visitor</del> destination, <del>including for</del> business travelers, <u>local citizens</u> , recreation seekers and casual tourists. [EDC]	SUPPORT – Staff recommend changing “local citizens” to “area residents.”
33	The BID also supports the recognition of the importance of visitors and of building that downtown customer base [BID]	SUPPORT - NO CHANGE - This is what the plan says.
31	The Plan must support a flexible mix of local, regional and national retail, and a mix of store sizes and types, including medium and larger footprints in the center of other retail. A disproportionate number of small stores is not healthy. Downtown will need spaces for existing retailers to expand (i.e., retention) as well as to attract local, regional and national retailers. [BID]	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – Staff believe that the plan addressed these points.
31	Retail opportunities will not “arise.” Downtown Madison must compete for retailers—locally, nationally and with surrounding communities. [BID]	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – This is a general comment, not a specific recommendation.
Gen’l.	Consider more density and jobs downtown. [SUSTAIN]	SUPPORT - NO CHANGE – The plan accommodates 4,000-5,000 new dwelling units and 4-5 million square feet of new commercial space.
Gen’l.	Add a new Rec.: <u>Position downtown and the city to compete for business retention, expansion and recruitment by continuing to improve process and customer service for small business permitting and by creating a city handbook for small businesses (permitting, licensing, signs, etc.).</u> [BID]	NO CHANGE – Staff do not disagree with this idea, but feels this is an issue that extends beyond the Downtown and should be addressed on a community-wide scale.

**KEY 7: BUILD ON HISTORIC RESOURCES** (pages 91-98)

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
91	Add new Rec.: <u>Amend the Landmarks Ordinance to reduce the likelihood of frivolous Landmarks nominations being used to stall development.</u> [EDC]	NO CHANGE – Staff do not disagree with this recommendation, but feel that this is an issue that extends beyond the Downtown and should be addressed on a community-wide scale.
92	Rec. 160: <del>Establish</del> Consider establishing local Historic Districts as identified and as described in this Downtown Plan. [EDC]	SUPPORT – Text could be added to clarify that historic districts would have to go through the normal nomination process as required by ordinance.
92	Rec. 163: In the text define the nomination process for potential landmarks. [DCC]	SUPPORT – Text could be added to clarify that potential landmarks would have to go through the normal nomination process as required by ordinance, but not include the entire process.
94	Listing possible areas for such historic district research may be fine but maps should not be assumed. [UDC]	NO CHANGE – Staff believe that this is addressed with the recommendation regarding Rec. 160 (two rows above in this table).
95	Rec. 171: Clarify that the recommendation is intended to result in coterminous boundaries of local and National Register Historic Districts. [LANDMARKS]	SUPPORT - This should also be stated in the “Landmark Buildings and Local Historic Districts” section of the plan.
97	Rec. 175: Clarify that preserving the blocks does not preclude new development that follows the form. [BID]	SUPPORT
97	<p>Add new Obj. 7.4: <u>Strengthen historic preservation efforts by clarifying which buildings and districts qualify as landmarks and historic districts, and which do not, including the following recommendations:</u></p> <p>Add a new Rec.: <u>Provide resources to DPCED to review the Potential Landmarks list, and nominate those buildings which are eligible, within a three (3) year time limit to complete the nominations of potential Landmarks.</u></p> <p>Delete Rec. # 163: <del>Nominate as local landmarks those buildings identified in the Downtown Historic Preservation Plan (1998) as potential landmarks.</del> [EDC]</p>	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff recommend that the 3 year time limit be changed to 5 years.
Gen'l.	Use stronger language to address branding of historic districts in section of Downtown Plan that addresses branding. [LANDMARKS]	NO CHANGE – Staff feel that language in the plan already addresses this issue.

