



Plan Title: Hoyt Park Area Joint Neighborhood Plan
Legistar File ID #: [30377](#)
Prepared By: Planning Division Staff (Bill Fruhling, Michael Waidelich, Rick Roll, and Jule Stroick)
Report Includes Comments from City Boards, Commissions, and Committees

Summary

Study Area Boundaries: The study area is generally bounded by University Avenue on the north, N. Franklin Avenue on the east, Midvale Boulevard on the west, and Mineral Point Road on the south.

Requested Action: Adopt the *Hoyt Park Area Joint Neighborhood Plan* as a supplement to the *City of Madison Comprehensive Plan*.

Plan Summary: As described in the plan's executive summary, the document includes the following key recommendations:

- Encourage sustainability efforts including: Strengthening the area's mature urban forest; encouraging redevelopment and investment that incorporates welcoming, high performance buildings; promoting healthy transportation alternatives including walking, biking, and mass transit; and fostering opportunities for community interaction and dialogue.
- Support initiatives that strengthen existing neighborhoods through the maintenance and renovation of the housing stock; promotion of home ownership; and the development, maintenance, and improvement of parks, streets, and other public infrastructure.
- Encourage compliance with the residential design guidelines in Chapter 6 for demolition and replacement and for conditional uses. Also encourage the use of the guidelines for minor and major construction activities.
- Improve connectivity between neighborhoods, and between neighborhoods and amenities such as shopping, employment areas, schools, and parks, particularly through an integrated system of bike and pedestrian pathways.
- Support long-term redevelopment within Focus Areas as an opportunity to diversify neighborhood services, housing options, and address scale, transition, and buffering issues between different land uses.
- Protect Neighborhood Preservation Areas from redevelopment or land uses that are not in keeping with the existing character.
- Implement improvements to the bike and pedestrian system and connections throughout the neighborhood.
- Implement improvements to Hoyt Park, Quarry Park, Reservoir Park, and Lucia Crest Park through existing and proposed master plans.
- Coordinate long-term street reconstruction with opportunities for stormwater management, pedestrian & bicycle improvements, and urban forestry.
- Develop an Owen Drive Pilot Program to explore how street reconstruction could be used as an opportunity to address a variety of issues facing streets throughout the Area. This street's varied cross section, grade change, traffic, and lack of an existing stormwater system provides an opportunity to test a variety of treatments.
- Explore safety improvements at the Mineral Point Road/Midvale Boulevard intersection.
- Encourage activities and physical design that supports social capital building within the neighborhood.

Summary Recommendation: The Planning Division recommends that the Plan Commission recommend to the Common Council that the *Hoyt Park Joint Neighborhood Plan* be adopted as a supplement to the *Comprehensive Plan* subject to the recommendations included in this report.

Planning Process and Public Participation

The development of the *Hoyt Park Area Joint Neighborhood Plan* was guided by the Hoyt Park Area Joint Steering Committee, a coalition of neighborhood association representatives and other interested stakeholders. The Steering Committee (a non City appointed Committee), was formed approximately one year prior to the official start of the planning process by representatives of area neighborhood associations and the Friends of Hoyt Park.

The Sunset Village, Sunset Hills, and VanChaMasShe Neighborhood Associations in conjunction with Hilldale Row Condominium Association and Friends of Hoyt Park, applied for a City of Madison Neighborhood Grant to prepare a neighborhood plan (note: after the initiation of the planning process, the Rocky Bluff Neighborhood Association formed in the northeast quadrant of the planning area and became a partner with the aforementioned organizations in preparing the plan). In March 2011, the Madison Common Council awarded the grant to be used for the Planning Division to hire a planning consultant (Vandewalle & Associates) to assist the City and the HPAJSC in preparing the plan.

Below is a summary of some of the public participation opportunities that occurred during the process:

- Open Houses: Community wide open houses were held on September 2011, December 2011, and May 2012.
- Project Website and E-Notification: The City hosted a website (www.cityofmadison.com/planning/HoytParkPlan/) dedicated to this plan, and established an e-notification system to allow interested parties to receive periodic email updates as the plan developed.
- Hoyt Park Area Joint Steering Committee (HPAJSC): The HPAJSC was an open meeting format of constituents representing the area’s neighborhood associations and other neighborhood-based groups.
- Business Survey: The City’s Office of Business Resources administered an online business survey to businesses on Midvale Boulevard, Mineral Point Road, and University Avenue.
- Community Survey: The HPAJSC administered a community-wide online survey, neighborhood walkabout tours, and a photo inventory.
- City Staff Participation: City staff from multiple agencies attended 13 HPJSC meetings, 5 HPJSC Sustainability Subcommittee meetings, 3 open house events, and provided comments on three draft versions of the plan.

Related Reviews and Recommendations

The draft plan (dated June 2013) was referred to eleven boards, commissions, and committees (including the Plan Commission). Below is a table summarizing their actions. Specific recommendations can be found in the Recommendation section of this report.

Board / Commission / Committee	Date of Final Action	Action Summary
Board of Estimates	6/4/2013	Recommended Approval
Board of Park Commissioners	6/12/2013	Recommended Approval with changes suggested by the Board’s staff
Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission	6/25/2013	Recommended Approval with changes suggested by the Commission’s staff
Board of Public Works	7/3/2013	Recommended Approval with changes (2 & 5 only) suggested by the Board’s staff
Transit and Parking Commission	7/10/2013	Recommended Approval with changes suggested by the Commission’s staff, and that the Plan Commission discuss increasing density on University Ave.

Sustainable Madison Committee	7/15/2013	Recommended Approval with changes suggested by the Committee’s staff, and to highlight greater height on University Ave. but give due diligence to neighborhood concerns.
Economic Development Committee	7/17/2013	Recommended Approval with recommendation to add Economic Chapter and to direct the Plan Commission to review EDC Staff comments.
Urban Design Commission	7/24/2013	Recommended Approval with request that Plan Commission weigh in on neighborhood responses regarding density/height/traffic/parking ratios/noise/view shed on University Ave.
Landmarks Commission	8/26/2013	Recommended Approval with changes suggested by the Commission’s staff.
Long Range Transportation Planning Committee	7/27/2013	Recommended Approval with changes suggested by the Committee’s staff.

Recommendation

The ten boards, commissions, and committees that reviewed the draft plan prior to the Plan Commission, made numerous recommendations for revisions to the document. Each of these recommendations are listed in the following tables. To facilitate the Plan Commission’s discussion on the draft plan’s content, this recommendation section is divided into three parts, which together comprise the Planning Division’s recommendation on the draft plan:

- Part 1: Recommended Changes by Reviewing City Boards/Commissions/Committees: Content
- Part 2: Recommended Changes by Reviewing City Boards/Commissions/Committees: Clarifications and Corrections
- Part 3: Additional Planning Division Staff Comments and Recommendations

In the following tables, “SUPPORT” means that Planning Division staff agree with the recommendation of the body. “NO CHANGE” means the Planning Division staff suggest that the draft plan not be changed.

Part 1: Recommended Changes by Reviewing City Boards/Commissions/Committees: Content

Page	Acting Body	Body Recommendation	Planning Division Recommendation
General	Sustainable Madison Committee	Sustainable Madison Committee (SMC) requested that the Plan Commission review the goals and actions stated in “The Madison Sustainability Plan” and the SMC staff report which requests that the Plan Commission allow “greater density along University Avenue, Speedway Road, and at the Mount Olive site than the draft neighborhood plan currently calls for.”	SUPPORT IN PART – See the comments pertaining to each of the identified Focus Areas later in this table.
i	Landmarks Commission	Under Key Recommendations, add a bullet point that reads, “ <u>Preserving and maintaining the existing building stock</u> ”. Reason: The existing building stock is a primary factor in the character of the neighborhood and because it is missing in the bulleted list, it seems that the Plan is encouraging the redevelopment and investment that incorporates new buildings instead of existing buildings. An existing building offers a more sustainable solution than a new building.	SUPPORT IN PART– Staff suggest adding the following to the end of the sentence: “except in areas recommended for redevelopment.”

Page	Acting Body	Body Recommendation	Planning Division Recommendation
3	Economic Development Commission	Add new chapter which consolidates business data, strategies to support businesses, create jobs, or maintain/grow the tax base.	NO CHANGE – While staff do not disagree, this is beyond the scope of this plan. Discussions with the EDC and Planning Division staff are being scheduled to clarify expectations in future plans. The Planning Division expects to have the capability to do economic studies in the future.
4/5	Economic Development Commission	Add additional bullet points on economic climate of the neighborhood/region such as: size of the workforce, business mix, and major employers.	NO CHANGE – (see comment in the row above).
7/8	Landmarks Commission	Under Welcoming, High Performance Buildings, add a bullet point that reads, <u>“It is important to preserve and maintain the existing building stock and reduce the promotion of redevelopment as a more sustainable practice.”</u> Rationale: Preservation is a more sustainable practice than redevelopment. Existing buildings can be retrofitted for increased energy efficiency while maintaining the character of the original style.	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff support adding this bullet, but recommends that the sentence before the bulleted list be changed as follows: <u>“Encourage the development of buildings and sites throughout the area in areas recommended for redevelopment.”</u>
12	Economic Development Commission	Under Land Use Policies, the plan cites to ‘Encourage housing affordability through the preservation of exiting housing stock and expanded housing choices in the Focus Areas.’ Include additional documentation on the percentage of the neighborhood’s affordable housing stock. Include specific recommendations to encourage affordable housing units as part of redevelopment projects in the Focus Areas.	NO CHANGE – This is a policy statement and the additional documentation suggested would require significant research.
15	Economic Development Commission	Under Focus Area Policies, reword to: Review the City’s Urban Design District #6 Design Guidelines and consider adding adjusting new guidelines that address land use transitions and urban form.	NO CHANGE – Staff believe that a review is warranted, and the original wording does not preclude adjusting the current guidelines as well as potentially adding new ones.
16	Economic Development Commission	Under General Urban Design and Streetscaping, reword to “Encourage incorporation of sustainability initiatives throughout the Area, including energy efficiency, renewable energy, storm water management, and green products, as well as, higher density development and a blend of commercial and residential uses which will encourage more sustainable transportation choices while helping preserve farmland on the fringes of the city.”	NO CHANGE – While staff does not disagree with this comment, it seems misplaced within the “General Urban Design and Streetscape” section, and believes it is generally addressed in specific Focus Areas later in this table.
29	Economic Development Commission	For East Midvale Boulevard Transition Area, the maximum height cited is 3 stories and to encourage underground parking, if feasible. A three story building is unlikely to support the financial expense of underground parking. Increase the maximum height limit and/or delete the suggestion of underground parking.	NO CHANGE – The recommended use is residential and there are many recent examples of 3-story residential buildings with underground parking.

Page	Acting Body	Body Recommendation	Planning Division Recommendation
31	Economic Development Commission	For University Avenue Commercial Focus Area, add <u>“University Avenue is a key commercial Corridor serving the Madison area and providing an important western gateway to the central City. The University Avenue frontage addressed in the Focus Areas is an underutilized section of the corridor with potential to support commercial redevelopment that will serve the neighborhood and the larger city alike. Overall, the approach to the corridor in terms of development and redevelopment should be to remain sensitive to the surrounding neighborhood while recognizing that this is a regionally-important area, proximate to numerous major employers, and located in the central part of the City. As such, redevelopment in the corridor should be dense, multi-use, and focused on supporting business and employment opportunities.”</u>	SUPPORT
32	Economic Development Commission	For the University Avenue Commercial Focus Area (E), under Heights, change maximum building heights from three stories to five stories to be consistent with existing zoning. Note that higher buildings will be considered as conditional uses.	SUPPORT IN PART – Parking and other practical constraints may likely prevent this intensity from being implemented, but the possibility should not be precluded. Staff do not believe it is necessary to state that higher buildings will be considered as conditional uses.
31-39	Sustainable Madison Committee	For the University Avenue Commercial Focus Areas (E, F, G, H, I), 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. Rationale: Allow more space for employment and residential along the existing University Avenue Corridor will take advantage of already good transit service that currently exists and potential increase trans usage and frequency.	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – See the comments pertaining to each of the identified focus areas later in this table.
31-39	Transit and Parking Commission	TPC requested that the Plan Commission look at the allowable maximum density on University Avenue corridor as it relates to supporting transit.	NO CHANGE – This should be addressed as part of the upcoming Transportation Master Plan. Also, see the comments pertaining to each of the identified focus areas later in this table.
32,33,36, 39	LRTCP	LRTCP recommended to make aware of the University Avenue issues discussed: density, view shed, parking/traffic impacts, range of building heights, shallow depth lots, inconsistencies between the Plan and the existing zoning, and potential inclusion of parking ratios.	NO CHANGE – Comment noted.

Page	Acting Body	Body Recommendation	Planning Division Recommendation
33	Economic Development Commission	For the North Black Hawk Mixed-Use Focus Area (F), Recommended Land Uses, add a bullet point to read: " <u>Large scale commercial and/or residential buildings on the University Avenue frontage including medium size retail operations, large office buildings, and/or high density residential.</u> "	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff suggest adding the following to the end of the sentence: "within the bulk parameters of the zoning on the site."
33	Economic Development Commission	For the North Blackhawk Avenue Mixed-Use Focus Area (F), under Heights, change maximum building heights from four stories to five stories to be consistent with existing zoning. Note that higher buildings will be considered as conditional uses.	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff do not believe it is necessary to state that higher buildings will be considered as conditional uses.
34	PBMVC	Recommended to remove the following specific guideline for University Avenue, Block F: " Ingress/egress from the site should be directed toward University Avenue. " Rationale: Development site access is best determined during the development process and involves working closely with the property owner while also minimizing impacts to the nearby neighborhood. To require all access to be taken from the regional Arterial Street may limit development opportunities and become a safety problem.	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff suggest rewording to: "Ingress/egress from the site should be evaluated during the development process with focus on minimizing impacts to the nearby neighborhood."
36	Economic Development Commission	For the Hill Street Mixed-Use Focus Area (G), under Heights, change maximum building heights from four stories to five stories to be consistent with existing zoning. Note that higher buildings will be considered as conditional uses.	SUPPORT IN PART – Parking and other practical constraints may likely prevent this intensity from being implemented, but the possibility should not be precluded. Staff do not believe it is necessary to state that higher buildings will be considered as conditional uses.
37	Economic Development Commission	For the Harvey Street Mixed-Use Focus Area (H), under Heights, change maximum building heights from four stories to five stories to be consistent with existing zoning. Note that higher buildings will be considered as conditional uses.	SUPPORT IN PART – Parking and other practical constraints may likely prevent this intensity from being implemented, but the possibility should not be precluded. Staff do not believe it is necessary to state that higher buildings will be considered as conditional uses.
39	Economic Development Commission	For the East Harvey Street Transition Focus Area (I), under Heights, change maximum building heights from four stories to five stories to be consistent with existing zoning. Note that higher buildings will be considered as conditional uses.	SUPPORT IN PART – Parking and other practical constraints may likely prevent this intensity from being implemented, but the possibility should not be precluded. Staff do not believe it is necessary to state that higher buildings will be considered as conditional uses.

Page	Acting Body	Body Recommendation	Planning Division Recommendation
39	PBMVC	Recommended removal of the following specific guideline for University Avenue, Block I: “Ingress/egress from the site should be directed toward University Avenue.” Rationale: Development site access is best determined during the development process and involves working closely with the property owner while also minimizing impacts to the nearby neighborhood. To require all access to be taken from the regional Arterial Street may limit development opportunities and become a safety problem.	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff suggest rewording to: “Ingress/egress from the site should be evaluated during the development process with focus on minimizing impacts to the nearby neighborhood.”
39	Landmarks Commission	For the Harvey Street Mixed-Use Focus Area (H), under Recommended Land Use, reword to: “Evaluate the stone house at the northeast corner of the Harvey Street and Ridge Street intersection for possible Landmark status or encourage the relocation of the house if it cannot be and ensure that it is incorporated into future development at of this site”.	SUPPORT
45	Economic Development Commission	For the Mineral Point/Speedway Neighborhood Commercial Focus Area (M), under Heights, change maximum building heights to three stories for all focus area properties to be consistent with existing zoning.	SUPPORT
45	Sustainable Madison Committee	For the Mineral Point/Speedway Neighborhood Commercial Focus Area (M), under Heights, allow greater building height at the Speedway intersection. Rationale: Mixed use developments can provide jobs, services that serve the area and a range of housing types for residents.	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff support heights of up to 3 stories (see above) but this small neighborhood node is not viewed as a location for a significant increase in development intensity.
46-47	Sustainable Madison Committee	For the Mineral Point Road Institutional Campus Focus Area (N), allow for denser type of development at the former Mount Olive site.” Rationale: This site has potential to provide the City with an enhanced tax base and offer the neighborhood residents a variety of housing options and employment opportunities. The first draft of the plan provided “concepts” for an infill project for the block that was 2-3 stories (multifamily), but based on neighborhood input, the concepts were removed and/or requested not to be shown. These 2-3 concepts for infill development on the former Mount Olive site should be put back into the plan.	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff note that the site is likely to be used for a police station and recommends adding “Special Institutional” to the list under Recommended Land Use. Staff also recommend adding “Townhouses and Small Apartment Buildings to the list. Staff recommend that the residential alternatives for this site include consideration of a wider range of housing types, which might include densities into the Medium-Density range (16 to 25 units per acre), at least on some portions of the site. Specific housing types and design should be compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods and reflect the massing and setback recommendations currently included in the draft plan.
47	Economic Development Commission	For the Mineral Point Road Institutional Campus Focus Area (N), under Recommended Land Uses, delete bullet point: “Prohibit expansion of this district into adjacent Neighborhood Preservation areas”.	NO CHANGE

Page	Acting Body	Body Recommendation	Planning Division Recommendation
47	Economic Development Commission	For the Mineral Point Road Institutional Campus Focus Area (N), under Recommended Land Uses, add bullet point "Neighborhood-scale commercial, office, or multi-family residential."	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff recommend revising the proposed bullet point to read: "Office uses in the existing building or neighborhood scale multi-family residential."
49	Landmarks Commission	Recommend renaming, expanding or adding new chapter on Historic and Cultural Resources. Specifically, the Plan should incorporate the findings from the West Side Architectural Survey (2012): description of historic resources; description of significant development patterns; Potential National Register Historic Districts; potential National Register individually eligible buildings; and a discussion of local historic districts, National Register districts, and conservation districts.	NO CHANGE – The survey was a separate effort and somewhat beyond scope of this plan. Staff believe that it is too late in the process to make such significant changes.
49	Landmarks Commission	Recommend addressing the issue of Accessory Dwelling Units in the Plan Area. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) require conditional use approval by the Plan Commission. Their form and placement and size are dictated by the Zoning Code. In some cases in the Area, the ADU may be larger than the main residence or negatively alter the mass and character of the main residence or lot configuration. The neighborhood should carefully review the ADU requirements and possibly devise design guidelines to specifically address the concerns that the ADU may introduce in the neighborhood or in potential historic districts.	NO CHANGE – Staff note that the requirements for ADUs are included in the new Zoning Code. Since the code became effective in January 2013, staff believe that it is premature to conclude that the requirements will be a problem in this area.
50	Landmarks Commission	Add graphics which depict architecture characteristics of cottage, ranch and experimental housing.	NO CHANGE – Staff feel that this is unnecessary since the exiting photos and descriptions of these characteristics in the draft plan are adequate.
59	Economic Development Commission	For Bike and Pedestrian Facilities, under Policies reword: "Require Encourage new developments to incorporate bike and pedestrian facilities."	NO CHANGE
59	Economic Development Commission	For Bike and Pedestrian Facilities, under Policies, add " <u>Encourage a vibrant mix of uses in the neighborhood including businesses and a variety of housing to support a built environment that supports bicycling and walking as transportation option.</u> "	SUPPORT

Page	Acting Body	Body Recommendation	Planning Division Recommendation
60	PBMVC	<p>For Bike and Pedestrian Facilities, under Pedestrian Pathways, recommended removal of the following statement: “Although the public right of way exists to install curb, gutter and sidewalks, property owners are concerned the installation of sidewalks is costly and will result in the loss of mature trees, front yard gardens and lawns and the rural type ambience of the existing streets.” Rationale: This comment is incongruent with the overall goal of the plan to encourage walking and biking to area destinations, as well as improving connectivity between neighborhoods and within the neighborhood. Sidewalk construction does not necessarily mean that mature trees are lost or that they are incompatible with City Neighborhoods. This comment is likely to result in gaps remaining in the pedestrian transportation system within the neighborhood.</p>	NO CHANGE – Staff believe that this is fine to have this in the document as a statement of neighborhood concern.
60	PBMVC	<p>For Bike and Pedestrian Facilities, under Pedestrian Pathways, recommended partial removal of the following statement: “Map 7.1 depicts high priority improvements to pedestrian and bicycle movement by using other alternatives that allow exceptions to the existing city sidewalk standards.” Rationale: Traffic Engineering does not recommend deviating from city standards as this may result in a decreased level of safety for pedestrians.</p>	SUPPORT
60	PBMVC	<p>For Bike and Pedestrian Facilities, under Pedestrian Pathways, recommended removal of the following statement: “Removal of on-street parking to allow pedestrian pathways adjacent to the existing street terrace”. Rationale: This comment is unclear and seems to suggest narrowing and reconstructing the street and putting pedestrians in what was the parking lane. Any street narrowing will need to be carefully considered with the District Alder and all other City Agencies.</p>	SUPPORT

Page	Acting Body	Body Recommendation	Planning Division Recommendation
60	Sustainable Madison Committee	Related to density is the ability of people to access transit in a safe manner. Encouraging sidewalks that allow for the safe passage of people to transit stops and other destinations should be strongly encouraged by providing a dedicated, grade-separated right-of-way for pedestrians away from vehicular traffic when both walking to bus stops and waiting to board the vehicle. People will have a more difficult time access destinations and transit stops if they do not have sidewalks and bus shelters. This is especially true for the elderly and school-aged transit riders, as well as passengers with restricted mobility or assistive devices like walkers or wheelchairs.	SUPPORT
61	PBMVC	For Bike and Pedestrian Facilities, under Bike Routes, recommended removal of the use of Stevens Street as a possible Bicycle Boulevard in Figure 7.4a. Rationale: The use of Steven’s Street as an extension of the bike boulevard is not recommended as it does not provide a continuous route that is necessary for the success of a bike boulevard.	SUPPORT
61	PBMVC	For Bike and Pedestrian Facilities, under Bike Routes, recommended adding “ <u>bicycle facilities on Midvale Boulevard and Mineral Point Road</u> ” under On-Street Routes.	SUPPORT - Staff suggest adding the following to the end of the sentence: “if adequate pavement width exists.”
62	Transit & Parking Commission	Recommended revision of Map 7.1 to change the color coding of the bus location from red (remove) to orange (improve) for the bus stop located on the north side of University Avenue opposite of Schmitt Place. Rationale: This bus stop location has barriers to achieving full passenger accessibility (i.e. current lack of sidewalk, curb ramps, uncontrolled pedestrian crossing of University Avenue.	SUPPORT
62-63	Sustainable Madison Committee	Maps 7.1 and 7.2, according to the plan, show an expanded pedestrian pathway network and bicycle routes and connections through the Hoyt Park Area, however, there seems to be little on the map of how bicycle and pedestrian will have an expanded network of pathways and routes through the park. The Committee should consider asking for a more robust network of pathways and bicycle routes in the Hoyt Park Area.	NO CHANGE

Page	Acting Body	Body Recommendation	Planning Division Recommendation
66	PBMVC	Recommended removal of Figure 7.4b. Rationale: The graphic illustrates sidewalks only on one side of the street which is contrary to the city of Madison complete street policy. In addition, the illustration shows sidewalks placed adjacent to the roadway next to the curb and gutter which do not provide pedestrians with an inviting walking environment and do not meet the overarching goals of encouraging walking. This sidewalk placement also makes it extremely difficult to keep clear of snow during the winter as the terrace provides space between the sidewalk and roadway for snow storage. This is likely to lead to gaps in the pedestrian transportation system during winter months.	SUPPORT
73	Economic Development Commission	For Infrastructure, under Policy #5 reword to: "Encourage strong communication among city staff, alders, and residents, <u>and businesses</u> , on long term street reconstruction projects"	SUPPORT
73	Economic Development Commission	For Infrastructure, under Policy, add " <u>Work with the City's Office of Business Resources to support businesses that may be negatively impacted by road construction projects due to limitations of customer access and visibility.</u> "	SUPPORT
78	PBMVC	Recommended removal of Figure 9.3, Mineral Point Alternative 2. Rationale: This proposed design concept is likely to lead to increased congestion and an increase in rear end crashes at the intersection.	SUPPORT
79	Board of Park Commissioners	For Owen Parkway Alternatives, recommended revision to existing language: "Any proposed changes to the roadway would need to receive approval by the Landmarks Commission, especially if future changes would limit and/or close the roadway to automobile traffic, <u>potentially during certain times of the day.</u> "	SUPPORT

Page	Acting Body	Body Recommendation	Planning Division Recommendation
79	Board of Park Commissioners	For Owen Parkway Alternatives, recommended revision to existing language: Options should explore the use of pervious (porous) pavement on all or a portion of the roadway; <u>restricting automobile and truck traffic, including limiting portions of the road to bicycle/pedestrian traffic only</u> ; and storm water management at Hoyt Park in conjunction with the reconstruction of the parking lot. If retaining walls are rebuilt, use natural materials that are consistent with existing walls. Rain gardens should be explored as an option for stormwater management. Any traffic calming techniques should be subtle in design, preferably focusing on horizontal features (e.g. width and curves) and not speed bumps or speed tables. The neighborhoods and Friends of Hoyt Park are not in favor of restricting automobile and truck traffic, including limiting portions of the road to bicycle/pedestrian traffic only.	NO CHANGE – The language in the draft plan just lists these items as things to explore in preparing alternative proposals.
79	Long Range Transportation Planning Committee	Recommend that Traffic Engineering Division review the residential parking permit program (RP-3), and specifically address on-street parking issues throughout the City during the evening and overnight hours, in order to help facilitate and allow for neighborhood streets to be shared effectively by residents, commercial businesses and other users of the street. The legality and efficacy of the issue should be explicitly addressed in this review.	NO CHANGE - Staff suggest that the request be forwarded to the Traffic Engineering Division for consideration. Traffic Engineering should evaluate a change to policy on a citywide basis rather than for this particular neighborhood area.
83	Economic Development Commission	Add one or more items to the Implementation Strategy that directly address ways to support business and job growth in the neighborhood	NO CHANGE – While staff do not disagree, this is beyond the scope of this plan. Discussions with the EDC and Planning Division staff are being scheduled to clarify expectations in future plans.
103	Economic Development Commission	Add information on businesses and employment in the neighborhood from the appendix to Chapter 1.	NO CHANGE

Part 2: Recommended Changes by Reviewing City Boards/Commissions/Committees: Clarifications and Corrections

Page	Acting Body	Body Recommendation	Planning Division Recommendation
i	Landmarks Commission	Change the order of the sentences under the third bullet to read: Encourage the use of guidelines for minor and major construction activities. Also encourage compliance with the residential design guidelines in Chapter 6 for demolition and replacement and for conditionals uses. Reason: Demolition and replacement should always be the last option, not the first, when trying to maintain character.	SUPPORT

Page	Acting Body	Body Recommendation	Planning Division Recommendation
i	Landmarks Commission	Change the photo or the caption to better address one of the key recommendations.	SUPPORT
ii, 12	Landmarks Commission	Change the third bullet point from "Neighborhood Preservation Areas" to Neighborhood Protection Areas or to Core Character Areas (or similar name). Rationale: This change will allow discussions about historic preservation to occur with less confusion.	NO CHANGE
5	Transit & Parking Commission	Revised to read: The Area is served by weekday bus service at the edges along University Avenue, Mineral Point Road, Bluff Street, and the northern portion of N Midvale Boulevard <u>and has a regular service all day on Saturdays, Sundays, and Holidays.</u>	SUPPORT
7	Landmarks Commission	Delete-Policy 7: For demolitions and replacement of single family homes see Chapter 6 Single Family Character. Rationale: The policy is already covered in the language of policies 3 and 4.	SUPPORT
16	Landmarks Commission	<u>Incorporate some of the following elements to encourage</u> Although variation and innovation is encouraged, all buildings should incorporate some of the following elements to <u>while ensuring that</u> future development is consistent with the Area's character:	SUPPORT
16	Landmarks Commission	Require careful site inventory and preservation of special buildings when feasible.	SUPPORT
27	Landmarks Commission	Assess if the Anchor Bank building should be a designated landmark in the B.1 block. "Existing Anchor Bank Building should be evaluated for potential local landmark status." Rationale: This language exactly matches the language that is used on Page 30 regarding the landmark status of Fire Station No. 9.	SUPPORT
27	Landmarks Commission	Change the photo caption to read: Anchor Bank, 302 N Midvale Boulevard, has a mid- modern century modern design.	SUPPORT
50	Landmarks Commission	Sunset Village was one of the first subdivisions to offer the perspective homeowner to build their own homes <u>the option to choose floor plans, materials and finishes for their new home</u> rather than the common practice of speculators construction homes for sale.	SUPPORT
50	Landmarks Commission	Recent changes in the Federal Housing Administration loan practices <u>in the 1930s</u> made it possible for made it possible for owners to acquire a long-term mortgage, opening up the affordability to hose to design, build and own their homes.	SUPPORT
52	Landmarks Commission	Under Cottage Design, sentence should read: First floor elevations located just above the front grade with low <u>front</u> stoops.	SUPPORT

Page	Acting Body	Body Recommendation	Planning Division Recommendation
52	Landmarks Commission	Under Ranch Design, sentence should read: <u>Predominantly hipped roofs with some low-pitched gable variations.</u>	SUPPORT
54	Landmarks Commission	Add photograph of a Lustron home.	SUPPORT
56	Landmarks Commission	Change photo caption to read “Natural stone <u>siding exterior building material</u> ”.	SUPPORT
65	Board of Public Works	Figure 7.4a street width should be <u>corrected</u> from 34 ft to <u>36 ft</u> .	SUPPORT
68	Board of Park Commissioners	“Implement stormwater management techniques to increase infiltration and treatment of water generated from Park facilities and Owen Parkway, including <u>monitoring stormwater in</u> the parking area at the north corner of the Hoyt Park overlook adjacent to the top of the stone steps which was reconstructed last year to resolve stormwater ponding issues.”	SUPPORT
68	Board of Park Commissioners	“Pave the access road between Harvey and Stevens Street with a possible small on-street <u>parking area</u> for vehicles.”	SUPPORT
72	Board of Park Commissioners	“A potential public option is to explore Lucia Crest Park, <u>though a garden could conflict with existing park master plan amenities</u> depending on the size and location of the garden in <u>relation to existing park activities</u> . <u>The neighborhood should begin discussions with the Community Action Coalition and the Parks Division if they wish to pursue this further.</u> ”	SUPPORT
72	Board of Park Commissioners	“Where tree removals are necessary, require replacement plantings to regenerate the tree canopy, <u>where appropriate.</u> ”	SUPPORT
79	Landmarks Commission	Any proposed changes to the roadway would need to receive approval by the Landmarks Commission, especially if future changes would limit and/or close the roadway to automobile traffic <u>or change the location of the roadway.</u> ”	SUPPORT
84	Board of Park Commissioners	Revised to “Parks Division should be involved regarding any changes to roads or pathways in parks” under Bike and Pedestrian Facilities Primary Implementation Parties.	SUPPORT
85	Board of Park Commissioners	Revised to “Neighborhood Associations in conjunction with Parks Division <u>and MSCR</u> ” under Bird Sanctuary Pilot Project, Primary Implementation Parties .	SUPPORT
85	Board of Park Commissioners	Revised to “Develop a <u>park master plan that includes a system of pedestrian and mountain bike trails.</u> ”	SUPPORT

Page	Acting Body	Body Recommendation	Planning Division Recommendation
86	Board of Park Commissioners	Revised to "Neighborhood Association <u>working with Parks Division</u> " under Primary Implementation Parties for Lucia Crest Park Landscaping/Public Art.	SUPPORT
95	Board of Public Works	Map A-5: Street Classification and Planned Construction should be <u>corrected</u> from Schedule for Resurfacing 2013 to <u>2014</u> and Scheduled for Resurfacing in 2014 to <u>2015</u> .	SUPPORT
104	Board of Park Commissioners	Revised to: The nearest known EAB infestation is at Illinois Rock Cut State Park, Illinois in Janesville, Wisconsin which is approximately 28 miles from Madison."	SUPPORT
104	Board of Park Commissioners	The City of Madison has adopted a <u>September 2012</u> EAB Management Plan to identify proactive approaches to contain the infestation ..."	SUPPORT
112	Board of Park Commissioners	The City of Madison has recently adopted its Parks and Open Space Plan <u>in 2012</u> .	SUPPORT

Part 3: Additional Planning Division Staff Comments and Recommendations

In addition to the Planning Division Recommendations in the tables above, the Planning Division has the following recommendations:

1. Land Use Map - Include a Future Land Use Map

Planning staff believe that the draft plan would be more useful if it contained a map showing the recommended future land uses, rather than addressing land use only within the narratives for the designated Focus Areas and the Neighborhood Preservation Areas.

The Future Land Use map at the end of this report was prepared by staff and the is intended generally to reflect the recommendations in the draft *Hoyt Park Area Joint Neighborhood Plan*, except in a few specific cases where staff also recommend a different future land use or intensity of development-- in which case, the map reflects the alternative staff recommendation. As noted on the map, the plan's designated Focus Areas identify those locations where future land use changes are recommended for consideration; while in the majority of the planning area, the intent is to limit redevelopment in favor of site-sensitive preservation, renovation and reinvestment.

2. Land Use Categories - Revise and Add to the Land Use Categories

Planning staff recommend revising and adding to the land use categories and definitions used in the draft neighborhood plan (Pages 16-17) as described in the table below, and that the land use categories and definitions used for the Future Land Use map be modified from the relatively-broad categories used in the *City of Madison Comprehensive Plan* to indicate more precisely the types and intensity of use considered appropriate in the context of this specific neighborhood.

Planning staff also recommend adding the following language in the plan: "The following land use definitions are used in this neighborhood plan, and may be modified by additional narrative or mapped recommendations applicable to specific

locations. The land use categories will nest within the broader land use categories used in the *City of Madison Comprehensive Plan* but may include more-specific or more-limited recommendations regarding appropriate uses.”

Recommended Land Use Category	Allowable Land Uses	Notes
<p>Low Density Residential (up to 8 dwelling units per acre)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Single-family detached houses on individual lots ● Duplexes or stacked two-flat buildings ● Townhouses or row houses 	<p>This category was called “Low Density Single-Family & Duplex Residential” in the draft plan. Most of the Low-Density area is also within the Neighborhood Preservation Area, and presumably it is not intended to encourage replacement of the existing single-family homes with other low-density housing types except in special circumstances.</p>
<p>Low-Medium Density Residential (up to 15 dwelling units per acre)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Single-family detached houses on individual lots ● Duplexes, stacked two-flat, and stacked three-flat buildings ● Townhouses or row houses ● Apartment buildings compatible with neighborhood character. Generally limited to no more than four-unit buildings if interlaced with other housing types. Small-scale apartment complexes may include buildings with more than four units. 	<p>This category was called “Low Density Multifamily District” in the draft plan. However, on the Future Land Use map, most of the area with this land use designation consists of single-family homes on relatively small lots, with a scattering of existing duplex or two-flat buildings. It is not clear that stacked three-flat buildings either are present in the neighborhood or would be allowed by the current zoning districts, but these were listed as a type in the draft plan so are also included here. Townhouses or row houses were added as uses since they are included in the Low-Density category. Most of the mapped Low-Medium Density area is also within the Neighborhood Preservation Area and the comment above regarding replacement of existing dwellings also applies here.</p>
<p>Medium Density Residential (16 to 25 dwelling units per acre)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Single-family detached houses on individual lots ● Duplexes, stacked two-flat and stacked three-flat buildings ● Townhouses or row houses ● Apartment buildings with no specific size limitations if compatible in scale and character with other neighborhood buildings. Additional design recommendations may apply to specific locations as noted in this plan. 	<p>This and the following category sub-divides the “Medium Density Residential” category that is included in the draft plan (and in the <i>Comprehensive Plan</i>). The primary difference in the two districts is in the maximum allowed density, and, therefore, in the potential height, scale and mass of multi-family buildings. The 16-25 units per acre land use category is often very useful in a neighborhood context since there is a significant difference in potential impact between 25 units per acre and 40 units per acre.</p>
<p>Medium-High Density Residential (26-40 dwelling units per acre)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Single-family detached houses on individual lots ● Duplexes, stacked two-flat and stacked three-flat buildings ● Townhouses or row houses ● Apartment buildings with no specific size limitations if compatible in scale and character with other neighborhood buildings. Additional design recommendations may apply to specific locations as noted in this plan. 	<p>(see note above)</p>

Recommended Land Use Category	Allowable Land Uses	Notes
Neighborhood Mixed-Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Neighborhood-serving commercial buildings and uses. While primarily intended to serve adjacent neighborhoods, neighborhood mixed-use districts may also include specialty businesses serving wider markets, provided the size of establishment and scale of building is consistent with the character of the district and the surrounding neighborhood. ● Housing types similar to Low-Medium Density Residential districts, but with no fixed maximum number of apartment or row house dwelling units in a building, provided the building scale is appropriate. Generally, this will be a relatively small building when the adjacent neighborhood is low density. ● Mixed-use buildings 	<p>This category was called “Community Mixed-Use” in the draft plan, but the definition is essentially the Neighborhood Mixed-Use definition from the <i>Comprehensive Plan</i>. Since both Neighborhood Mixed-Use and Community Mixed-Use are defined land uses used in this plan, this category is simply properly renamed and a definition for the Community Mixed-Use category is added below.</p>
Community Mixed-Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Commercial buildings, employment, retail and service uses serving both adjacent neighborhoods and wider community markets. Additional use or design recommendations may apply to specific locations as noted in this plan. ● Housing types generally similar to Medium and Medium-High Density Residential districts, provided the building scale is appropriate to the district and adjacent neighborhood. ● Mixed-use buildings 	<p>Community Mixed Use is mapped at several locations in the draft neighborhood plan. These locations are all within designated Focus Areas and additional detailed recommendations regarding intended land uses, development intensity, and design are provided.</p>
Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Small business office buildings compatible with the scale and design of the surrounding neighborhood. 	<p>This land use category was included to recognize the existing office building located south of Regent Street opposite the former Hoyt School. This appears to be a unique situation, but no other designation seemed appropriate at this time since the draft plan does not address this site specifically.</p>
Institutional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Schools and school-related uses ● Places of worship and assembly ● Municipal and civic facilities ● Minor public utilities 	<p>This land use category was included to identify the current locations of these uses in the neighborhood. Several of these sites are designated Focus Areas and the plan provides additional recommendations regarding their potential reuse (which may or may not necessarily be either anticipated or recommended in all cases). However, not all Institutional sites are designated as Focus Areas, and if they should become available for alternative uses at a future time, more detailed planning would be required to determine the most appropriate uses. Since, with one exception, the future availability of these sites for potential redevelopment is unknown, the Institutional land use designation was applied to all of them, understanding that alternative future uses are also discussed in the case of the Focus Area sites.</p>

Recommended Land Use Category	Allowable Land Uses	Notes
Park and Open Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Public parks, recreation areas and facilities ● Private recreational uses characterized by open spaces ● Urban plazas, squares and greens ● Stormwater management facilities and greenways, including those with paths or trails ● Nature preserves and conservation areas 	This land use category was included to identify the existing park and open space uses in the neighborhood.

3. Focus Area C - Revise the recommended future land use from Low-Medium Density Residential (called Low-Density Multi-Family Residential in the draft plan) to Medium-Density Residential

The Low-Medium Density range only extends to 15 units per acre, which is less than the current density of about 18-21 units per acre. The plan narrative for the East Midvale Boulevard Transition Area (Page 28-29) seems to suggest that some lot assembly and presumably redevelopment is supported. This is unlikely to occur unless the allowed intensity of development is at least somewhat greater than the current density. Perhaps 25 units per acre is still too low to encourage much redevelopment, but much above that might be difficult to achieve on these relatively shallow lots.

Neither of the recommended potential zoning districts, TR-V1 and TR-V2, allow more than 21 units per acre-- again, not much above the current densities. At present, however, the new Zoning Code lacks a good alternative since the next most intensive district, TR-U1 allows up to 42 units per acre. Of the two zoning districts proposed, TR-V1 only allows buildings up to four-units and does not allow townhouses, so TR-V2 is the more-flexible alternative if it is intended to support lot assembly and limited redevelopment.

4. Focus Area D - Revise the land use recommendation for the Institutional Use Area from Low-Density Residential to Medium-Density Residential

There is no current expectation that this fire station site (Page 30) will be redeveloped in the foreseeable future, but the draft plan does provide recommendations in that event. Planning staff agree that the most appropriate alternative use for this site would be residential, but note that the recommended range of low- to medium density is large and quite high at the upper end (up to 40 units per acre using the definitions in the draft plan), while the recommended TR-V1 zoning district would only allow up to 21 units per acre. Staff suggest that an upper range of 25 units per acre (Medium-Density Residential using the recommended revised future land use categories) might be more appropriate for this site since this is the same density we recommend for Focus Area C to the north. However, Focus Area D is adjacent to, or across from, single family homes on three sides, so any future re-use of this site should be carefully planned to ensure a good transition to these lower-density uses.

5. Focus Area G - Clarify that the land use recommendation is Medium Density Residential

The draft plan is not entirely clear whether or not it is recommended to replace the existing multi-family uses in the southern portions of this the Hill Street Mixed-Use Focus Area (Page 35) with higher-density residential uses. The existing residential uses are primarily in the Low-Medium (8-15 units per acre) and Medium (16-25 units per acre) density range, but the potential zoning district identified in the draft plan is TR-U1, which suggests that up to 40 units per acre (Medium-High Density Residential using the revised land use categories) would be considered appropriate. Staff recommend that the plan's intent be clarified by designating the area as Medium Density Residential.

6. Focus Area I – Clarify the land use categories to Low-Medium Density and Medium-High Residential south of Franklin Court

The recommendation to “maintain neighborhood residential transition and scale along Harvey Street (Pages 38-39) or at lot line transition with the single-family homes along Barlow Street” is quite awkward as a land use definition. It would be better to clearly identify which portions of this large block are intended to be commercial or mixed-use development and which, if any, are intended to be residential, and then deal separately with the desired scale of the residential development to maintain an appropriate transition.

On the recommended Future Land Use map, the area south of Franklin Court is designated Medium-High Residential. The recommendation in the draft plan cited above addresses the need for appropriate transitions to lower-density residential uses. The draft plan recommendation for the northern half of the block south of Harvey Street is unclear. The current use is houses, but the “Transition Area” designation suggests that some alternative, but not specified, use may be intended. On the recommended Future Land Use map, the block south of Harvey Street is designated Low-Medium Density Residential, reflecting the existing uses.

7. Focus Area J – Revise the land use recommendation from Low-Medium Density Residential to Medium-High Density Residential

Planning staff recommend that the future land use for the North Franklin Transition Area (pages 39-40) be Medium-High Density Residential (26-40 units per acre), rather than Low-Medium Density Residential (8-15 units per acre, called Low-Density Multi-Family Residential in the draft plan). The current uses are already in this density range and the plan appears to support future lot assembly and redevelopment, so the higher density recommendation is more realistic.

8. Focus Area K – Clarify that an acceptable density range is 16-25 units per acre

Because the definition of Medium Density used in the draft plan covers the very large range of 16-40 units per acre, it is not entirely clear whether it is intended that future redevelopment in the Palomino/Eugenia Focus Area significantly increase the existing densities in this area—which are in the 16-25 units per acre range. Based on the discussion of building scale in the draft plan, and the recommended zoning districts, staff assumes that the intent was encourage densities in the narrower 16-25 unit per acre range that is now called “Medium-Density Residential” on the new Future Land Use Map.

9. Focus Area L - Clarify that an acceptable density range is 16-25 units per acre

As in Focus Area K, Planning staff assumed that the recommended density for the Bluff/Stevens Focus Area was intended to fall in the lower end of the 16-40 units per acre Medium-Density range used in the draft plan-- or the 16-25 units per acre range now called Medium-Density Residential on the new Future Land Use map.

10. Authorize Planning Division staff to incorporate changes as approved by the Plan Commission and Common Council

Numerous changes to the draft plan are anticipated. To incorporate these changes into the final plan document, staff will need to make non-substantive editorial changes to improve clarity, consistency, and readability, including supporting graphics.

Draft Future Land Use

- Low Density Residential
- Low-Medium Density Residential
- Medium Density Residential
- Med-High Density Residential
- Neighborhood Mixed Use
- Community Mixed Use
- Office
- Institutional
- Park and Open Space

***** Map Note: The former Mount Olive church site is recommended for continued institutional uses, or alternatively, for redevelopment with medium-density residential uses with design types compatible with surrounding neighborhoods.

Note: The Hoyt Park Area Joint Neighborhood Plan recommends maintaining the current land uses and intensity of development in most parts of the neighborhood. More detailed recommendations for areas where redevelopment may be appropriate are presented in Chapter 5 - Focus Areas.

