

From: Lucas Dailey [mailto:lucasdailey@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2009 6:01 PM
To: Hoffman, Jeanne
Subject: Re: Agenda for Sustainable Design and Energy Meeting 7/20/09

Sorry this is so late. I understand it will limit the amount of time for response by staff. My questions are fairly general and more subjects for discussion than something that requires a lot of prep, so it should work out.

Overall, as an urban planner I was very impressed. There was little for me to take issue with, especially considering the limitations of our current role and that this is a land use plan and not a proposed development plan.

Questions:

1. A question about Housing Mixes. The different mix types have maximum densities, in the form of units per acre, but why not minimums?

We know density is unequalled in its ability to increase efficiency of materials, energy, infrastructure, etc. Why not at least put a floor on the House Mix 1? Say 6 units per acres.

[The Plan recommends a variety of housing types and therefore densities. Including a minimum density would likely limit the variety of housing types.](#)

2. Why is the maximum density of Housing Mix 1 only eight units per acre?

Many of the most desirable single-family-home neighborhoods in the city are on the near east side with a density of nine units per acre. If an occasional duplex or two is thrown in 9.5 isn't unrealistic.

The potential political difficulties of *minimum* densities is understandable, but to limit the maximums in Housing Mix 1 at 8 units per acre, when we're talking about a single-family-home building typology, seems unnecessarily low. I understand the need for a density divisor between Housing Mixes 1 and 2, but I would encourage it to be raised, and to be open to a fractional number such as 9.25 or 9.5. It would be hard to imagine the public complaining about being allowed to build smaller, more efficient houses.

Additionally, with the form-based new zoning code, the risk of allowing a density of 9.5 detract from the character of a typical single-family-home area is all but eliminated.

[The Plan's Housing Mix 1 District includes individual developments up to 16 units per acre, but the average density for development the District is intended to be less than 8 units/acre \(top of page 28\).](#)

3. Regarding the averages projected for every type of land use, would it be possible to provide the full range instead of just assumptions based on averages.

For example, in table 4 Housing Mix 1 covers 488.4 acres. Assuming an average rate of 6 UPA we would have 2,770 units. If we showed the allowable range, and for example Housing Mix 1 had a maximum of 9.5 and minimum of 6, we would have a range of 2,930-4,640 units (ignoring the existing SFHs)

We feel the Plan's population estimate is a reasonable estimate. Further, we feel having one population estimate is more useful than having a range of estimates which would vary widely. A wide range would make it difficult to plan for parks, schools, roadways and utilities.

4. Table 4: The population estimates are based on 2 persons per unit, wouldn't it make more sense to use the national average, state average or Madison average?