



# City of Madison

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

## Meeting Minutes - Draft SUSTAINABLE MADISON COMMITTEE

---

Monday, July 15, 2013

4:30 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.  
Room 300 - Madison Municipal Building

---

### CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

**Present:** 10 -

David Ahrens; Hans J. Hinke; Lance E. Green; Richard J. Pearson; David A. Albino; Anya M. Firszt; Lou W. Host-Jablonski; Richard A. Heinemann; John M. Conowall and John M. Conowall

**Absent:** 1 -

Selamawit Z. Wondaferew

**Excused:** 4 -

John M. Robinson; Sam J. Breidenbach; Jesse J. Shields and Jeannette E. LeZaks

**Also present:** Jeanne Hoffman and Gerald L. Campbell.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Firszt moved to approve the minutes - motion was seconded by Albino and the minutes were approved with comments from Gerald Campbell.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

### DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None.

### NEW BUSINESS

[30377](#)

Adopting the *Hoyt Park Area Joint Neighborhood Plan* and the goals, recommendations, and implementation steps contained therein as a supplement to the City's *Comprehensive Plan*.

**Attachments:** [Planning Area 2013.pdf](#)  
[Link to Project Website](#)  
[Link to General Public Responses During Plan Preparation](#)  
[Hoyt Neighborhood Plan Draft 061113.pdf](#)  
[Letters of Support-060313.pdf](#)  
[Mount Olive Letter 043013.pdf](#)  
[Petition 060313.pdf](#)  
[sustainability rev2.pdf](#)  
[Hoyt Park Area NHP Comments.pdf](#)  
[30377 Hoyt Staff Recommendations.pdf](#)  
[7/2/13 Letter to Council re: Hoyt Neighborhood Plan.pdf](#)  
[Hoyt Park NP Metro Comments-TPC 07.10.13.pdf](#)  
[EDD staff report Hoyt Plan 7\\_9\\_13.pdf](#)  
[Raffa Valerius letter regarding Mt Olive 7\\_9\\_13.pdf](#)  
[PBMVC Registrants 6.25.13.pdf](#)  
[LC STAFF REPORT 7-15-13.pdf](#)  
[LC STAFF REPORT graphics.pdf](#)  
[SMCMEMBERComments.pdf](#)  
[Facilities and Sustainability Memo.pdf](#)  
[Pocket Neighborhood Memo 2013\\_7\\_15.pdf](#)  
[LCReport 071513.pdf](#)  
[Facilities and Sustainability Memo to SMC Members Regarding Hoyt Plan as Kinzel Comment 072013.pdf](#)  
[SVCA comments to PC-Hoyt Plan\\_07-31-13.pdf](#)

Heinemann – The committee decided to take some time with the plan and send comments to staff so that all members can see all comments and have a more robust discussion.

Host-Jablonksi – Now we also have staff comments that we need to consider. People that want to talk, please tell us what comments you have from our discussion last time and comments from staff comments.

Gerald Campbell – brought comments read second paragraph. The plan was a consensus document and some good ideas was not included because of the way to plan was put together. He spoke in favor of the EDD language. There was a proposal for housing for elderly and charter school for the former Mt. Olive Site.

Julianne Dwyer – Thank you for your work. Clarification on the map regarding bike route – ADA issues. Currently bikes are not allow in the park. Installation of sidewalks does that really improve health outcomes? Issues with mature trees if you add sidewalks. The planning area is older and housing are modestly priced and housing don't turn over. However there are areas where the young live, homes are less expensive, and homes do turn over.

Green – I need more thoughts on sidewalks?

Dwyer – We bought were we bought because of the rural area. We are looking for the City to come up with something creative.

Host-Jablonksi – TE comments say you can build sidewalk without hurting mature trees but TE also says that we can't do creative things.

Dwyer – If sidewalks are considered the residents want to be included in the design. BPW did not adopt language from Engineering staff regarding removing pathways language.

Host-Jablonksi – Did the City come and give presentations?

Dwyer – Vandewalle came and gave presentation which talked about more creative road design. TE came and would like to be more standardize but could consider issues under certain situation.

Host-Jablonksi – There is a conflict between current zoning and the plan. They don't mess well together.

Dwyer – The new code was being worked on while we developed the plan. Stroick came to the meetings and kept the committee informed about the new code. I like the comment from a SMC member saying that we would consider more density with more sustainability.

Anthony Lathrop – With Rocky Bluff. Regarding University Ave., - I would like to keep the 4 stories and not to go to 5 stories and like SMC members comments about getting more density for more density. There is too much talk about density and there are too many people on transit.

Green – Plan calls for 4 stories – people are asking for higher more density, but if new development happens - you don't want more than four stories?

Lathrop – That was the compromise. As there is development pressure – 4 stories seem like a good compromise.

Host-Jablonksi – Zoning is not specific – it is area-wide. Plan can be more specific than zoning.

Lathrop – Yes we were informed.

Host-Jablonksi – Your example of Whole Foods and the view, you can talk about that in the plan regarding specific sites that way you can have your cake and eat it too.

Lathrop – It would have taken longer and people were done and didn't want to take longer. We know that zoning is there. This plan represents what the neighborhood want.

Host-Jablonksi – You used “canyon like” environment and suggested that taller building bring more water problems, however, impervious site, not height cause water problems. What about density do you think is not sustainable? 2% of the plan area would be “canyons” because most of the area is single family homes.

Lathrop – We should not make the problem worst by adding more density. Taller buildings mean more apartments, more people taking transit. For water – taller buildings may mean taking up more of the site.

Green – Did you consider different levels of density along University Ave?

Lathrop – We should have provided more specifics about density along University Ave.

Dwyer – We did talk about some sites in that some of the lots are very shallow and it would be hard to go to 5 stories.

John Stolzenberg – Will comment on the staff comments and other committee members – maximize energy – we don't ask for LEED or other green building standards – we would look for developer guidelines. Are the trade off allowed... not sure what performance standard mean? Looking and under/over pass along university ave – maybe at the time of BRT. . Yahara Watershed... not in the plan and is something that is very interesting with regards to Willow Creek outfall and the Yahara Watershed. Need more specifics on density on University Ave. and for former Mt. Olive look for ways to make more creative redevelopment options of the site. The neighborhood was not all on the same page.

Host-Jablonksi – Planning staff report 7 pages long – They indicate they wish there was more information and specifics in the plan. They (Planning) can also see there is stuff that is not in agreement in the neighborhood. Neighborhood did not have the skills to even write this plan. It is important for neighborhoods to educate themselves, but the city didn't do very much to educate the neighborhood either. The neighborhood does have the right to tell through the plan what they want but because the plan is not clear and some issues were not resolved I see conflict down the road; we will fight about it later.... The plan says we will punt to the future.

Stolzenberg – This is a valid observation – the process became fairly arduous. We needed to get it wrap up. I believe the City will do things different next time. The developer guidelines might be a document that is needed.

Host-Jablonksi – I am not sure if this plan is going to pass and maybe the neighborhood – can work on it again. The plan could get rejected.

#### Discussion

Heinemann – Lot of effort put into the plan – there is a lot of sustainability in the plan. There is a lot of stuff in sustainability plan. If there are gaping holes then yes, SMC should weigh in but there is a lot of good in the plan too.

Heinemann moved to approve the plan. Dick seconded.

Ahrens – Question for Jule Stroick. At BPW it was stated that this is the neighborhood plan – not 'binding' so we don't want to change it. However, at a meeting with staff regarding neighborhood plans there was different levels of strength for a plan... where does the plan fall?

Stroick – This plan will become a supplement of a Comprehensive Plan. What are the overarching goals in the comp plan – we want to see them expressed in the neighborhood plan in a fairly specific way and through the plan develop a working relationship with departments so that controversial items will be worked out. It is not tied to the budget – but it is tied to implementation – in that the adopted plan is something that we would look to, to follow.

This plan has least detailed plan of any plan I have worked on – lots of compromise and controversy.

Ahrens – How does the neighborhood plan reflect the comp plan? I feel there is a disconnect between the comp plan and the neighborhood plan. This is not representative of the comp plan.

Stroick – The plan is for 5-10 years of where the community is at and where the community is going.

Host-Jablonksi – Every plan could be better. TE could say here are ways to deal with mature trees and sidewalks, but instead we just take it out so our plans are not great and can be ignored. The city is a partner - when the city deigns a street – it is design.

Ahrens – This plan is vague and contradicts to the comp plan. What do we need to do?

Hoffman – We send our comments to Plan Commission.

Stroick – This is a very different than most plan. The neighborhood knew that the plan would be changed and the committee was not appointed it was a neighborhood committee. The Plan Commission will make changes or ask staff to go back work with the community and come back with more detailed. That deals with the controversy.

Green – Part of the issue is that the area is too big – folks needed more training.

Conowall – friendly motion to forward with comments.

Ahrens seconded... makers of the original motion consider it friendly.

Ahrens – The City did hire Vandewalle, which then we should have a plan that is even better because not all plans could hire a consultant. Also we do not want too much specific as it could hinder development in the future.

Host-Jablonksi – What are the core issues in the plan?

Firszt – What is our mission/goal?

Host-Jablonksi – Our comments should be grounded in the sustainability plan.... Which is broad.

Green – How does the SMC look at the staff report?

Ahrens – We have not done this before. This is the first neighborhood plan to come before SMC.

Heinemann – First plan, but we have our sustainability plan as a guide.

Conowall – not sure if density and zoning is for us but bike, bus definitely is – I think this plan could have better addressed pedestrian and bike and access transit.

Green – How is timing going?

Stroick – This plan will go to the Plan Commission – on August 5th but could be referred - Long Range Transportation Committee needs to take it up as well as EDC needs to take it up.

Ahrens – Hoffman’s memo is a good starting point... are additional points?

Host-Jablonksi – everyone is ok with staff’s memo?

Green – There is no maximum in the memo - this the development corridor and the transit corridor.

Host-Jablonksi – There is zoning and when developing – the development comes forward with the need to deal with water, design etc.

Host-Jablonksi – edit sentence to say “In particular: Allow greater building height, more than the maximum of 4 stories, along the University Avenue corridor with due diligence given to neighborhood concerns with retaining trees, mitigating storm water run-off and promoting high efficiency buildings”

Conowall – calling for a vote....to forward to the Plan Commission SMC recommendation to adopt the plan with the staff’s memo (including the edit noted earlier)

All present voted yes except Lance who voted no.

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn was made by Conowall - Ahrens seconded - motion was unanimously approved and the meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m..