

Zoning Code Rewrite Advisory Committee Meeting Summary
July 8, 2008
5:30 – 7:30 pm
Madison Senior Center

Staff Present: Brad Murphy, Rick Roll, Matt Tucker, Michael Waidelich

Consultants Present: Suzanne Rhees, Michael Lamb

Committee Members Present: Ald. Timothy Gruber; Ald. Satya Rhodes Conway; Ald. Julia Kerr; Nan Fey; Daniel Stephans; Lou Host-Jablonski; Diane Milligan; Michael Basford; Ledell Zellers; Amy Rountree; Steve Steinhoff; Janis Reek; Carole Schaeffer; Susan Schmitz; Michael Slavney; Kevin Pomeroy; Ken Saiki; Dave Porterfield

Committee Members Excused: Ald. Lauren Cnare; Gary Poulson, Randall Glysch; Janet Loewi; Lance McGrath; Scott Vaughn; Gary Brown

Committee Members Absent: Sheri Carter

Handout: Area Exception Review Guidelines (used by the Zoning Board of Adjustment)

- 1. Call to order by Chair M. Slavney.**
- 2. Approval of June 10, 2008 Minutes.**
- 3. Public Comments:**

	Description	Speaker
Comment	Live downtown; impressed so far with the process. Key item – neighborhood plans referenced and plans are out of date or not completed. How will City update plans and incorporate with the new code? Can the City find a way to develop/update the process? Process – blueprint or template for a basic plan.	R. Holloway
Comment	Madison community cooperative. Cooperative to be formed/developed outside the downtown; low-income residents and families; not just students; please consider.	S. Jones
Comment	Housing co-op; working on a family friendly co-op; but limited to the student housing area; are you considering?	J. Vesper C. Hayden S. Hollingworth
Comment	Regent Neighborhood; would like to build an accessory dwelling unit but don't have that right under the current zoning; 800 SF house; would give me flexibility for visiting friends and family; good for infill development rather than sprawl. Don't emulate Seattle's approach, however – do it in a thoughtful way.	J. Laurion
Comment	Live on Midvale Blvd., requiring residential parking key for each SF house just subsidizes auto use. Parking adds cost to housing; should be an option, not a requirement.	S. Devos
Comment	Madison Community Co-op; belief in co-op living but outside the Isthmus; Madison should be a leader in this as it is in other areas.	P. Fialla
Comment	Madison Co-op; zoning allowable in areas other than the Isthmus; sustainable, affordable; family friendly; consider changes so co-ops can exist in other areas.	A. Kell
Comment	Cab driver; co-op; single parent; good place for kids to grow-up. Fears of "frat-boys" are unfounded; most are "peace-loving/organic eating hippies." Note that MCC is tax exempt – this could be a criterion for a permitted use.	J. Wiley
Comment	Protect character of neighborhood R2 vs. C2; West Shore Drive and Park Shore.	S. Hoffenberg
Comment	Because of the housing market, can't sell 4-5 bedroom houses; so they are	Alder B. Konkel

City of Madison – Zoning Code Rewrite

being rented and now neighbors are complaining. Married couples are treated as “family” vs. non-married partners; rewrite should address this issue.

4. Administrative Matters

- | | | |
|---------|---|------------------|
| Comment | Advised on next steps; next community meetings, and next advisory committee meetings. | Chair M. Slavney |
| Comment | Suggest getting consultants to present to Common Council in September rather than November. | Alder Kerr |

5. Zoning Code Analysis

- | | | |
|----------|--|------------------|
| | Summary presentation of the analysis. (partial – through PUD District) | S. Rhees |
| Question | Where are the graphic examples for form-based code? | L. H. Jablonski |
| Comment | Different kinds of accessory dwelling units and how that may be defined; suites vs. attached dwelling units vs. detached dwelling units; and perhaps there should be a cross-reference of words and definitions. | Chair M. Slavney |
| Comment | Goal should be to minimize ‘non-conformities’ vs. legal conditional uses; reduce the number of “non-conforming conditional uses.” | Chair M. Slavney |
| Comment | Clarify non-conforming uses vs. non-conforming buildings. | D. Milligan |
| Question | Existing parking lots; how to address existing lots and bring to compliance. | Alder Kerr |
| Comment | City can require parking lots to be brought up to code compliance. City does not currently require a permit for maintenance but would require if updating the lot. | Matt T. |
| Question | How to update all the non-conforming and enforcement issues/buildings in the City; for example, it’s hard to tell if an apartment conversion is (legal) nonconforming or not. | A. Rountree |
| Question | Landscape standards; UDC gets into landscape issues in Urban Design Districts and PUDs. How to address good landscaping and good architecture? | L. H. J. |
| Comment | And protecting the urban forest. | L. Zellers |
| Comment | Many surrounding communities work with point-based systems and developers/consultants are familiar with working with this; look at other local communities. | Chair M. Slavney |
| Comment | Retrofitting existing parking lots is important. | Alder Kerr |
| Comment | Point system can be complicated so let’s be careful with what the burden may be. | |
| Comment | Let’s not lose sight of maintaining/preserving the urban forest. | L. Zellers |
| Q & A | What about a “dark sky ordinance?” Probably a building code – issue; yes (Matt says) it is in the Sec. 27 Building Code. | A. Rountree |
| Comment | Consider design standard for more prominent front doors on the waterfront houses – (where do kids ring the door bell on Halloween?) | Alder Kerr |
| Comment | Shoreline vegetation is an issue sometimes as well; | N. Fey |
| Comment | Vegetation rules “encourage” trimming/cutting before an applicant makes a submittal. | M. Tucker |
| Comment | Dane County considering shoreline regulations that may very well apply to Madison. | C. Schaffer |
| Comment | May not apply if adopted in another form (may not apply to area annexed before 1982). Currently apply along streams and Lake Wingra. | B. Murphy |

City of Madison – Zoning Code Rewrite

Comment	Landmarks Commission standards must be tied to the zoning ordinance; need to maintain state status and protection; DOA looks at land use vs. zoning.	D. Stephens
Comment	Is a conservancy district a problematic or troublesome issue? Think it should not be a base district – zoning private property as open space raises legal issues. Consider an overlay instead.	Chair M. Slavney
Comment	Plan Commission has had to deal with this in terms of review of parking, lighting, infrastructure, etc. in parks. Longer discussion about private golf courses and redevelopment; difference between an overlay and public land zoned for a particular use.	N. Fey
Question	Restrictive covenants: are they applicable for use in/with the zoning code?	A. Rountree
Question	We should not allow covenants within the code.	Alderman Kerr
Question	Maybe deed restrictions would be better used?	D. Milligan
Comment	PCD vs. PUD – Difference is the parking requirements: the PCD requires compliance with parking standards (but is rarely used).	M. Tucker
Comment	Many PUD ordinances have different and more stringent standards; suggest establishing a minimum size (i.e., 5 acres).	S. Rhees
Comment	Development of regional importance requirements; larger project should have more broad notification.	Chair M. Slavney
Comment	All PUDs should have broader notification.	L. Sellers
Comment	PUD should include a cost/benefit or fiscal impact analysis – how to pay for future schools, roads, services, public safety.	Alder Kerr
Question	Does the PUD require a list of variances or concessions? Applicants should list up front.	Chair M. Slavney
Comment	This is difficult because the code is so complicated and how to decipher is an issue.	C. Schafer
Comment	Mixed-use districts would reduce the need for PUDs	
Comment	Write code for the existing conditions; neighborhood vs. older neighborhoods. Don't combine duplexes with "twins" or "three-flats" or rowhouses.	M. Slavney, L.H.J.
Comment	Create small residential lot standards.	
Comment	Near isthmus neighborhoods; neighborhood conservation study; give a lot of thought to the character of the neighborhood; big shift in student housing to downtown; neighborhood preservation and the historic district.	Alder Kerr
Comment	Urging for diversity and fine-grained coding. Matt responds about how fine grain zoning (more definitive requirements) would necessarily require more staff time and review.	L. H. J.
Motion	From Ald. Rhodes Conway to suspend discussion and reschedule for another meeting in August. Motion seconded and approved to 'suspend' discussion and re-schedule a ZAC Committee in August;	
Comment	Need for zoning education and design literacy: pictures/words/numbers...	L.H.J.
Question	How we can address zoning education? 130 neighborhood associations...	Alder Rhodes Conway
Comment	Item #3 on the Participation Plan Addendum is about getting maps and analysis into the neighborhood associations – use the Neighborhood Roundtable.	B. Murphy
Comment	Need to get materials out as soon as possible – this July; (Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood annual meeting).	D. Milligan
Comment	We should ask for input from nonprofit housing developers as well as	

City of Madison – Zoning Code Rewrite

	other stakeholders	
Comment	We should focus on the new code and requirements vs. de-constructing the existing one.	M. Slavney
Comment	Give neighborhoods chance to shape what they know and value about their houses and places.	L.H.J.
Motion	From Ald. Rhodes Conway to add the following items to the Participation Plan Addendum: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Additional meetings with neighborhoods with City staff (without consultants)• Establish expectations for public meetings in advance• Staff/consultants to provide as many visual aids as possible in presentations	
	Motion seconded and approved	
Question	What can we expect for the community meetings? Sharing the annotated outline - will these be interactive?	M. Basford
Comment	We will work on creating opportunities for meaningful small-group discussions.	S. Rhees