

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map**  
June 23, 2107

#	Sector	Comment Location	Please enter comments about the 2017 Draft Land Use Districts on a specific parcel or area:	Please enter any general comments on the 2017 Draft Land Use Districts:	Consent Agenda
601	Central	East Washington Ave	The entire eastern side of the <b>East Washington</b> corridor looks like it's barely changed. This is an area that seems underused with declining or lower-density industrial uses that's ripe for mixed-use redevelopment. The plan does nothing to encourage more efficient land use or to unite the new development on the other side of E. Wash with the other neighborhoods east of there on the Isthmus. This is a disappointing lack of vision.	I see hardly any net change in expected densities across many areas of the city that could justify higher-density residential use. The plan continues to preserve a single-family-home status quo when we need more development of increased density in inner east + west side neighborhoods. I see nothing here that encourages substantial development of new rental housing which is desperately needed in greater amounts.	N
607	South	Park Street	<b>1109 - 1199 S Park St</b> , including 1123 (coin shop) should become multi-use buildings that are limited to 3 stories on the Eastside of Park St.,		N
608	South	Park Street	Thanks for your work. You need to make a distinction between the east and west sides of South Park Street	You have to work with the County on the development around and of the <b>Alliant Energy Center</b> . This is town of Madison land owned by Dane County that will become part of the City of Madison in less than six years. If we want to build twelve story buildings, that is a great place to do it. County ownership gives it many great possibilities beyond private	N
609	South	Park Street	It is wholly inappropriate to have this level of height and density (12 stories!!!!) for tiny shallow parcels on the <b>east side of Park St.</b> (from Midland to Beld) that are hard up against modest single family homes. This transition from RMU to LR is incredibly abrupt and very ill-advised. This would have devastating effects on quality of life for the blocks adjacent to these rezoned parcels including the cutting off all sunlight from mid-afternoon on. In fact, 12 stories would cast shade way far down the blocks on Olin, Spruce, and Cedar. These small parcels east of Park St. from Beld St. all the way north to Erin should be zoned NMU since CMU has know been increased to 6 stories. Six is too big to be immediately next to a single family home.....so 4 stories should be the limit on these shallow lots on the east side of Park St.		N
611	South	Park Street	The <b>east and west sides of Park St.</b> need to be treated very differently. The east side parcels are very shallow and allowing 6 stories right up to a stable, largely owner-occupied LR neighborhood is too intense and too abrupt a transition. East side Park St. zoning should be NMU or at least a special CMU capped at 3-4 stories. The Bay Creek Neighborhood Association passed a motion in 2016 supporting development guidelines that would differentiate between the east and west sides of Park street south of the Hospital and keep east side developments at a more modest scale to protect the integrity of Bay Creek neighborhoods.		N
612	South	Park Street	As far as I can tell from the map, there is not a single other proposed RMU parcel anywhere in the entire city that backs up directly onto an LR area as in one property touching the other. All other RMUs are more isolated or they are surrounded by transition buffers or in the very least a street. To go from 12 stories to 2 from one building to another is simply unacceptable, especially on such tiny parcels. Please change the zoning on the <b>east side of Park</b> to something more appropriate (4 stories). You can build higher on the west side of Park and further south on the street.		N
615	South	Park Street	Dear City of Madison, RMU zoning on the <b>East side of Park Street</b> starting at Emerson and South towards Wingra Creek will ruin evening sunlight for a lot of longtime residents in the neighborhood. Lowering the number of floors would help somewhat. I know you are probably trying to reduce sprawl, etc, but at what price? Same story on Lakeside St., Romnes Apartments. That works so well, and it's such a breather to see that wide green space full of trees. Would new buildings take up the whole parcel, or only where Romnes stands right now? Same with <b>commercial buildings on Lakeside</b> . You would be ruining the character of the neighborhood if you start putting in higher buildings there. I wish there weren't such a conflict about all this... Not that all the present buildings are gorgeous either, but the historic brick ones seem worth preserving! Thank you, Consuelo Sanudo, 805 W Lakeside St.	Just frustrated in general about what seems to be disregard for Madison residents who have lived here a while and are about to have their peace and quiet thrown out the window - more traffic, more noise, less sunlight. Tough tradeoff. Yes, we'd have a few ugly buildings gone on Park Street, but the new buildings don't seem that beautiful in general, and cut out far more light.	N
624	South	Park Street	These lots along <b>Park St</b> , especially the small ones on the east side should not have buildings higher than four stories. The 12-story option is completely absurd and would destroy the adjacent neighborhoods. Please help us to make Madison more of a blue zone ( <a href="https://bluezones.com/">https://bluezones.com/</a> ) so we can all live longer and happier. All developments should take this idea into consideration at every step of the process.		N
625	Central	East Washington Ave	I would like to see the south side of <b>East Wash</b> with RMU to match the redevelopment that's happened on the Lapham side.		N

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

626	South	South Madison	Some of the parcels bordering the CMU-zoned parcels along <b>Park Street</b> , in the Bram's Addition and <i>Burr Oaks</i> neighborhoods, could be up-zoned to LMR. The housing stock in Bram's Addition and Burr Oaks is not in great shape and will be tough to rehab or improve. Replacing them with higher-density housing (especially affordable housing developments) would be a great opportunity to replace the low-quality housing stock with higher-quality affordable housing. The new townhouses at Park Street and Dane St are a great example of what we should be shooting for.		N
627	West	Greenbush	Email from Craig Stanley - area cross-hatched in diagram should remain LR, not LMR. <b>Greenbush /Vilas.</b>		N
628	West	Greenbush	Email from Craig Stanley - A more focused look at where LMR should be located which outlines where (in my opinion) greater density should go in the <b>Greenbush Vilas</b> area. As you will see, I have followed the broadly outlined areas that increase the area from 2006 map, but I have also focused other LMR changes along corridors that have slightly greater traffic, specifically along Randall and Drake street on only one block face. These areas / corridors are more natural for an		N
633	South	Park Street	Buildings up to 12 stories on the <b>east side of S. Park Street</b> are too high. I even have qualms about 4 story buildings butting up against a residential housing area. Please reset this proposal to a maximum of 3 or 4 stories. I can't believe that 12 stories is even being considered.		N
634	South	Park Street	I see that the city is considering a rezoning of the <b>East side of Park Street</b> between Olin Avenue and Cedar Streets to accommodate commercial developments of up to 12 stories. As a resident of this neighborhood (710 Spruce Street) I am opposed to this height allowance. I think up to 4 stories is enough. Should that not attract big developments, I am OK with that. Several small businesses (such as Quality Hardware - a 4 generation family owned business - and Cargo Coffee) would surely be driven out by zoning allowance of up to 12 stories. If I wanted to live in a canyon, I would move to New York City. (Well, I also would need a lot of m,oney to do that!) Sincerely, Mondest C. Tichards		N
635	South	Park Street	Properties along the east side of South Park Street		N
636	South	Park Street	Properties along the east side of South Park Street		N
637	South	Park Street	Properties along the east side of South Park Street		N
638	South	Park Street	Properties along the east side of South Park Street		N
639	South	Park Street	Properties along the east side of South Park Street		N
640	South	Park Street	Properties along the east side of South Park Street		N
641	South	Park Street	Properties along the east side of South Park Street		N
642	South	Park Street	Properties along the east side of South Park Street		N
643	South	Park Street	Properties along the east side of South Park Street		N
644	South	Park Street		The option to build a 12 story building on the east (or west) sides of Park street is unrealistic and unfair to the many homeowners in the neighborhoods next to these developments. A 3 story building may be reasonable, but no more than that. Parking is already strained on these neighborhood streets. The increased traffic that new buildings would bring would create an even worse situation for the marginal parking and traffic flow along neighborhood streets. The shade from a large building is also a problem, as well as privacy and noise issues for existing homeowners. J.L. 721 Spruce St Madison	N
645	South	Park Street	Four floors is too tall for this area. Single family residential properties north of these properties will be shaded too much.		N
646	South	Park Street	Four floors is too tall for this area. Single family residential properties behind these properties will be shaded too much of the day		N
652	South	John Nolen Dr Corridor	Need to move Traffic Engineering out of this area. This area should be RMU with 6 to 2 floors. apartments/condos on upper floors; retail/commercial on lower floors; and shared parking on two lowest levels. Ground level could have wide ped/bike boardwalk atmosphere along west side of RR corridor that continues across Wingra Creek and all the way to Alliant Energy Center with grad separation at Olin Avenue.		N
653	South	John Nolen Dr Corridor	Need to move Traffic Engineering out of this area. This area should be RMU with 6 to 2 floors. apartments/condos on upper floors; retail/commercial on lower floors; and shared parking on two lowest levels. Ground level could have wide ped/bike boardwalk atmosphere along west side of RR corridor that continues across Wingra Creek and all the way to Alliant Energy Center with grad separation at Olin Avenue.		N

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

654	South	John Nolen Dr Corridor	Need to move Traffic Engineering out of this area. This area should be RMU with 6 to 2 floors. apartments/condos on upper floors; retail/commercial on lower floors; and shared parking on two lowest levels. Ground level could have wide ped/bike boardwalk atmosphere along west side of RR corridor that continues across Wingra Creek and all the way to Alliant Energy Center with grad separation at Olin Avenue.	N
655	South	Park Street	Changing this area from CMU to RMU when butted up against LDR seems unnecessary at this time. There is undeveloped and underdeveloped areas west of park street that can be used for growth and development. This portion east of park street slated to be up to 12 stories should be limited to 4 stories.	N
656	West	Greenbush	Hi there, there is some really interesting thinking and maps here. Lots for us all to engage in. One specific comment: in the recent city-wide rezoning, the Greenbush neighborhood was zoned at two different densities- higher in the northern part of the neighborhood, and lower in the southern. The idea generally was that the housing in the Northern part was more rental, closer to campus, and much more beat up, so it was appropriate to imagine that it would be replaced with newer, larger development. The southern part has a lot more single families, little kids, families and such, and so is more slated for rehabbing than bulldozers. There was recently a TIF district to support rehabbing old houses. But making the whole district one, homogeneous planning designation, the differences in character are wiped out. Please retain that distinction to keep the varied, diverse, older feel of the neighborhood. Thanks.	N
657	West	Greenbush	I am concerned about the increased density proposed for the area I have pointed to on the future land use map. Our neighborhood, Greenbush, has spent considerable effort considering future density and outlined areas, north of Mound St (that were appropriate for increased density) leaving the remaining portion of our neighborhood to low density. The current zoning code reflects those decisions. In exchange for large developments (Vicinato, Ideal, the Dude, and Longfellow) we were made a TIF district to promote single family home ownership. Your proposed increased density is not consistent with the TIF or other revitalization (Greenbush Vilas) efforts. 1 and 2 story developments would be welcome in our neighborhood but 3 story construction would destroy the character of our mostly modest homes. I would prefer that the future plan be consistent with the current zoning code, Greenbush neighborhood plan, and Greenbush Vilas revitalization efforts and maintain lower density south of Mound St. There are many homes in our neighborhood that are not well maintained and if sold would be possible sites for development. In terms of future development it would benefit our neighborhood and the city if those homes could more easily be demolished and new construction be single family homes or 2 flats, providing more affordable ownership.	N
658	West	Greenbush	Neighborhood for 30 years. Homeowners in our neighborhood have worked extremely hard over the decades to increase owner occupancy and make our neighborhood attractive fto families. The Greenbush Neighborhood Association (GNA) has been active in city planning processes, including general city-wide processes and processes relating to individual major project within our boundaries. The proposed Future Land Use Map wipes out our hard-earned gains by converting our neighborhood from Low Density Residential to the LMR designation.  During the last city-wide rezoning, all residential streets south of Mound Street were designated Low Density Residential. The GNA worked hard to reach this understanding with the City, and the City concurred that planning and zoning should indeed encourage the steadily increasing trend of owner occupancy in our neighborhood. Since that time, owner occupancy has continued to rise, with concurrent significant improvement of aging housing stock as new families purchase and renovate properties, and longer term residents feel confident investing funds in remodeling to remain in the neighborhood. The City even created a TIF intended to spur conversion of former rental properties to single family use. Now this momentum is threatened.	N
659	West	Greenbush	Madison's Future Land Use Map designates the entire Greenbush Neighborhood as "low to Medium Residential" density. This allows buildings up to 3 stories and up to thirty dwelling units per acre. In contrast, our current zoning code allows a maximum of 2 stories and 15 units per acre.  Our Greenbush, largely single family, neighborhood has already been infiltrated by large multi-story apartment "towers:" In the small area from Drake St. to Regent, we have The Ideal, Dude, Vicinato, and Longfellow apartments. Will greater urban density foster cordial, considerate, quiet neighbors who know and help each other? Not likely, as newly arrived strangers lead separate alienated lives!	N

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

660	South	Park Street	I have two concerns about my immediate area, specifically: #1 the sharp transition from LR (1-2 floors) to a narrow strip of RMU (General Height: 4 - 12 floors) on the East side of Park Street and for a narrow strip along it... this doesn't maintain the character of the neighborhood !! #2 the long frontage of RMU (General Height: 4 - 12 floors) on BOTH sides of Wingra Creek - but especially on the South side of the creek, between Park and Beld - where there appears to be NO access and construction approved directly up to the creek. I would suggest that with buildings permitted up to 12 floors that MORE green space should be allowed along the creek, but certainly object to this stretch on none !		N
661	South	Park Street	ANY building taller than 3 stories is too much! However it appears that the best we residents are allowed to hope for is 3-4! Those of of who about Park Street are going to be in the dark with the density and height of proposed use.	Too high and too dense is what all the Park Street "Development/Progress" seems to be about and not enough listening to the long term residents whose neighborhoods surround Park Street. Keep the buildings shorter and less dense!	N
672	South	John Nolen Dr Corridor	This entire area bounded by Olin Avenue, Wingra Creek, and the railroad tracks could be redeveloped as a master planned development. Put most of the parking under new high rise buildings (8 stories or more with up to two levels of parking on lowest floors. Raise the grade of Olin avenue enough to put a wide ped/bike corridor through this area that would connect the Alliant Energy Center with this redeveloped area. The corridor would continue across Wingra Creek to Lakeside Street. At Wingra Creek, widen the existing Wingra Creek bed/bike trails on both sides of the creek to better connect this new corridor with the Wingra Creek corridor. This new widened ped /bike underpass under John Nolen Drive at Wingra Creek and continuing all the way to the Alliant Energy Center would be less costly and less obtrusive than building a huge ped/bike overpass in the area as suggested by the 'Nolen Centennial Project' a few years ago.		N
679	North	Aberg Ave	though.		N
692	North	Northport Dr	Somewhat higher density should be allowed. Many of the SF homes are getting worn down and the busy road in conducive to SF either.		N
701	South	Park Street	I would prefer not to see RMU extended to Beld street. I think it has a much more residential feel than park street and the people living there would probably agree.		N
703	South	Park Street	I am very concerned about the potential for up to 12 stories on the East side of Park street from basically Emerson to just south of Wingra creek. This area is adjacent to all residential areas. It concerns for me for blocking the sunlight for these houses, as well as creating congestion that Park Street is not able to handle. It is two lanes and already very congested in the morning, with none of this extra development. Additionally, there is only street parking. Thank you for your attention to this matter.		N
707	South	Park Street	I strongly object to the proposed change to make the highlighted area RMU which would allow buildings up to 12 stories tall. This would be a huge and unwelcome change to those of us living in this fairly quiet residential neighborhood nestled in the 'tree streets' of Bay Creek. I specifically object to RMU designation for the those parcels on the east side of Park Street between Cedar and Olin as well as just north of Olin on the east side. Please keep these at the current or equivalent new designation (CMU?) which would limit buildings to 5 or 6 floors at most. Thanks for your consideration.		N
708	South	Park Street	I strongly object to the general height of 4-12 floors. As a resident who lives very close to Park Street, I request that land use east of Park not exceed 5 stories.		N
714	West	Greenbush		It was my understanding that the Greenbush neighborhood was trying to decrease medium density residential and encourage more owner-occupied housing, but here the graphic shows the bulk of the neighborhood zoning going from low density to medium density. If the goal is to turn the neighborhood into student housing residents should be made aware. Troubling to see this.	N
717	West	Greenbush	Prefer you leave in place the distinction that the recent rezoning made in Greenbush between the north and southern portions, with higher density in the north and an emphasis on single family residences in the south. We have been working to get more owner-occupancy in our neighborhood, and this represents a big step away from that, to large, rental buildings that are fine on Park and other big streets, but not inside the core of the neighborhood.		N
726	West	Greenbush	Regarding the Greenbush Neighborhood I'm asking the city to leave in place the distinction that the recent rezoning had made in our neighborhood between the north and southern portions, with higher density in the north and an emphasis on single family residences in the south.		N

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

741	South	Park Street	<p>East side of S Park St. Apparently there is a proposal for a 12-storey building fronting S Park St adjacent to the Bay Creek Neighborhood, where I live. While there are duplexes and a few four-unit properties in the neighborhood, these are distributed throughout the area.</p> <p>Along S Park there are several tall new buildings, but they abut neighborhoods with majority multi-unit properties. To build anything above four storeys adjacent to Bay Creek would redefine the character of the neighborhood, and not in a good way for the residents.</p> <p>David Snook 1014 Lowell St.</p>		N
746	South	Park Street	<p>corridor has already exceeded any reasonable amount, since changes have already spurred rapid development. The traffic in this corridor has become untenable during many times during weekdays and of course on football Saturdays. Without a major upgrade in public transportation, this will continue to get worse as rapid development occurs. Having 6 or 12 story buildings adjacent to single family dwellings just seems like a heavy handed attempt to drive these smaller dwellings out of the neighborhood. Having large buildings abut our backyards will infringe on our privacy, will certainly make the area noisier (it already is quite noisy at times- (traffic, partying, sirens, medflight), and will continue to make it almost impossible for a pedestrian to cross Park St at any time of day, not even considering rush hour. Please reject this change as it will continue to make our neighborhood less desirable. The rapid influx of high-end housing has already made property taxes rise very fast. The unavailability of affordable housing is driving middle class people away from here.</p>		N
747	South	Park Street	<p>very much opposed to the Community Mixed Use and especially the Regional Mixed Use In my neighborhood. Bay Creek and S. Park, Wingra. This is a fragile neighborhood. 12 Sory buildings in our little neighborhood way out of line.</p>	<p>very much opposed to the Community Mixed Use and especially the Regional Mixed Use In my neighborhood. Bay Creek and S. Park, Wingra. This is a fragile neighborhood. 12 Sory buildings in our little neighborhood way out of line.</p>	N
751	West	Greenbush	<p><del>This comment is regarding the Greenbush area. I am disappointed by the large increase in both height and density. This</del> neighborhood has already had several zoning changes in the recent past but this is a major "down-zoning". Where is the information regarding the impact of this change on current property owners property values in the affected areas? and what is the plan regarding the already tight parking situation/limited street parking? Is a parking lot/ramp/park'n'ride planned? if yes, where? and how will that coordinate w/ the South Park Street</p>		N
753	South	Park Street	<p>Community Mixed Use and should remain so! This area is a neighborhood of mixed residential houses, apartments, and commercial, and would best be described as Community Mixed Use and should be designated as such for future development. It should NOT be changed to 'Regional Mixed Use' with major increases in density and height of buildings - this is not downtown, it is the residential south side, and can accommodate some higher density than presently exists, but NOT what is proposed for RMU. The height of the buildings indicated as 12 stories or higher as RMU is utterly ridiculous!! If we wanted to live in high rises we would live downtown, not in our single family homes. The kind of height and density proposed for the area along Park St south of Olin Ave .(to the railroad tracks?) is completely unacceptable!! It should remain CMU, please correct your maps to better reflect what this area is and should continue to be. I realize Park St is a major transportation corridor, and as such we can accommodate future development that meets the criteria for CMU. It does not mean it should be developed to high density high rise commercial or residential buildings 12 stories</p>	<p>RMU is NOT compatible with existing single family residential neighborhoods or residential mixed use neighborhoods. Many of these changes are not consistent with Neighborhood Plans for these designations. Have you met with individual neighborhoods associations to articulate these proposed changes and get feedback from the residents that would be directly impacted?</p>	N
755	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood	<p>As a Bay Creek resident I am very disappointed/surprised that the City is proposing such an enormous change in the zoning. Our neighborhood was united in our displeasure of a proposed 5 story building on the same block so to allow 12 just doesn't make sense.</p> <p>I would ask you to reconsider this and can you please explain why the CMU designation for the rest of Park st has changed from 2 - 4 stories in 2006 to 2 - 6 in 2017. This whole area is populated with 2 storey primarily single family homes and anyone to the east side of Park st would immediately be in shade for half the day.</p>		N
756	South	Park Street	<p>As a 30 year resident of this neighborhood,(950 W. Shore Dr.) I am opposed to allowing buildings over 5 stories. There is inadequate parking for existing residential units and to add hundreds more residential units is nonsense. The existing street will be grid locked and are barely able to handle the residential traffic present now. Public transportation is inadequate and addition of this many residents will destroy the tranquility of the neighborhood.</p> <p>Timothy Correll, MD 950 W. Shore Dr.</p>		N

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

757	Central	Marquette Neighborhood	Why is this parcel on Paterson and Jenifer singled out as the only MR section on these blocks of Jenifer St? It seems like an unnecessary encroachment of 5 story buildings in a area of 2 story homes. Just because 1960s City Planning made a mistake in allowing the current 2 story structure, doesn't mean that we need to follow it up with a 5 story mistake in the 2020s. Other similar buildings in the neighborhood are not called out for up-zoning. There doesn't seem to be an obvious rationale for this anomaly.		N
759	South	Park Street	<p>Twelve stories is waaaaay too high for the residential side of Park St. The tallest building is now two stories. I think the absolute limit (that is, *with* conditional use) should be four stories except where Park Street is elevated above residential between Lakeside and Spruce streets; the limit should be three stories there since it will feel like four stories. There is no way to blend anything taller with the primarily residential portion of the neighborhood. See The Ideal on the other side of Park Street for a newish building that integrates well into the neighborhood... the building height next to the first house is the same height as the house.</p>	<p>of those:</p> <p>* Equity: The more we gentrify the near south side of Madison, the more we drive out affordable housing from there southward. That means economically disadvantaged people will be driven out of their homes, and that's bad for equity. Bram's Addition, Capitol View Heights, Arbor Hills, and other neighborhoods contain very affordable housing that's in a good location.</p> <p>I think the challenge of our time is not "how to provide density", but rather "how to provide livable, affordable neighborhoods that allow more people to benefit from a good location". What do Madison planners think? If you agree, are we up for that challenge?</p> <p>* Sustainability: I've certainly heard that infill and increased density are good for the enviroment, and that makes sense. There's the potential for reduced driving (fewer greenhouse gases and less pollution) and shared walls mean less natural gas is required to heat. I think there's a general assumption that higher density is good for the environment.</p> <p>However, while I am not an urban planner I can google around and find that this idea is controversial. For example, from the LA Times:  <a href="http://www.latimes.com/science/sciencenow/la-sci-sn-carbon-footprint-suburban-urban-20140114-story.html#axzz2qUGLH3Uk">http://www.latimes.com/science/sciencenow/la-sci-sn-carbon-footprint-suburban-urban-20140114-story.html#axzz2qUGLH3Uk</a>          "People in the densely populated cores of big cities are responsible for less greenhouse gas emissions, but the more carbon-intensive lifestyle of their far-flung suburbs cancels out any of the benefits, researchers at UC Berkeley found."</p>	N
760	South	Wingra Creek Triangle	<p>Cool map pairing!</p> <p>It makes sense to have some density in the Wingra BUILD triangle, though twelve stories is too much. A twelve story building will dwarf the new T. Wall flatiron building, which is supposed to be iconic. Nine stories seems like a good upper limit, but only with conditional use... otherwise, seven.</p>		N
761	South	Park Street	<p>comments should be extended to include the entire Park Street corridor). Park Street, though commercial, is not and should not be compared to the extreme development on East Washington and, apparently, that's exactly what is being proposed. For years we, the residents were assured the height of buildings would be no higher than 4 floors, which is tolerable to the residential areas co-exisiting side by side. The east side of Park was even more protected than the west side of the street by one floor. To even entertain the possibility of changing the codes to accommodate 6 stories and up to 12 toward the belt line is frightening. ALL of our residential properties including the landscaping investments through the years will be considerably reduced in value. The quality of our lives will be compromised - if not completely ruined. I do not approve nor do I want these changes. I am not sure my neighbors realize the quest to change the zoning is going on - we are not a part of Bay Creek and our communication is not as effective. But be assured, I write on behalf of my neighbors: DO NOT MAKE THESE CHANGES.</p>		N
764	South	Park Street	<p>Having up to 12 stories backing up to LR seems insane. Where is the gradual feathering of big buildings into the neighborhood? It doesn't seem as bad across the street, between South St. &amp; the west side of Park St., but the east side of Park St. backing up to single-family homes should certainly be lower density/lower height.</p>		N

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

766	West	Greenbush	Medium Residential if done in a way that continues forward the character of what is a very historically significant neighborhood. Currently the neighborhood has many multi-family homes but it seems that the effort goes into either turning them into single family homes or tearing them down to build apartment buildings. I would like to see an effort made to improve the current houses but keep them as multi-family homes. I think that the current revitalization program could serve the neighborhood well by offering incentives for any property owner to make improvements especially to exteriors (which is to the benefit of everyone as it improves the overall look of the neighborhood and makes the rentals appeal to a wider range of residents). With many houses that are 100+ years old it is easy tear them down and build new but it takes away the character of a neighborhood that has historically had many multi-family homes which could well serve the city going forward.		N
768	South	Park Street	We want our neighborhood to remain low 2-5 stories and not high-rising. At most 3-6 stories for residential and business opportunities is enough for now and future development.Thank you		N
769	South	Park Street	We want our neighborhood to remain low 2-5 stories and not high-rising. At most 3-6 stories for residential and business opportunities is enough for now and future development.Thank you		N
770	South	Park Street	Keep the buildings and memorials to 3-5 stories thank you		N
771	South	Park Street	12 stories next to low density residential is too abrupt. Limit this to 2-6 stories.		N
772	Central	Marquette Neighborhood	stories and 18 apartments. A LMR designation would cover the existing use. Having additional stories, or more of the lot covered, does not fit in a historic neighborhood. Existing plans provide for TE in the 600-800 blocks along the bike trail. With the increased height and increased density of CMU, NMX would be a better designation for Williamson St. CMU would allow too intense of development and destroy any remaining charm. In 2010, 768 people lived in the blocks on the north and south sides of the 600-900 blocks of Willy. Since then 273 units have been approved and/or built. The density being allowed under CMU could add at least another 650+ units on those blocks. The 1/2 block of Williamson east of the Yahara should not have an expanded NMX area. 5 homes would gain NMX status, likely allowing commercial takeover of residential properties. The Elk's Club should not be able to be 5 stories (or even possibly higher if there is a conditional use available to increase height). It is one of the few places that the lake can be seen, it is part of the historic district, it is on the south side of Willy which, to date, has not suffered from the height being approved on the north side.	Height should not be part of the categories for residential and mixed-use districts. Density does limit (or expand) the potential height. It may make sense to have height limits in the lower density residential areas. But allowing, for example, 6 stories in all CMU districts does not take into account the characteristics of individual neighborhoods. ^ stories may be fine in some areas, 3 stories should be the max in others. I realize maximizing density and increasing the tax base seem to be the City's overarching goals. But pursuing those goals without thought to the impact on neighborhoods, and the livability of those neighborhoods, is foolish.  It is rather interesting that of the TSS Districts, it appears that only Monroe Street will be allowed to retain a less intensive use (NMX instead of CMU, HR, RMU). Perhaps some of the other TSS districts are too far gone to be saved (like parts of Old University), but Williamson is not, and segments of Atwood could still be salvaged.	N
773	South	Park Street	is a small retail and residential section. There is no street buffer between the two bringing them into immediate proximity. Structures of more than two stories would simply ruin the neighborhood character. Moreover, larger structures and large population and traffic increases would bring even more stress on land and water. If you don't care about the neighborhood character, aesthetics, and culture, consider this. A large portion of Madison storm sewer runoff comes to Monona Bay. The city has historically done a terrible job of managing that as evidenced by the condition of Monona Bay - weeds, garbage, etc. Your new plan only continues that with absolutely no apparent plan for mediating what would be substantial new contributions. Perhaps your budget should include mass printed apology notes for later use. James Beane, 928 West Shore Dr.		N
774	South	Park Street	This parcel and the ones immediately to the south of it along the east side of Park Street will not comfortably support a building height of more than 3 or 4 stories. These parcels back up directly to modest 2-story homes, so building heights of up to 12-stories are out of the question. The western side of Park St., esp. the Wingra triangle, can support such height, but not on the east side. In general, I support greater density for Park St., esp. as evolves into a Bus Rapid Transit corridor. But this must be done with sensitivity to the single-family home environment directly adjacent to Park St.		N
775	Central	Marquette Neighborhood	It is entirely unacceptable to open up the potential for a 5 story development on to Jenifer Street. This is a neighborhood of historic 1-2 family homes, who will want to maintain the fiber of these buildings which make up the character of this place if they will literally surrounded by 5 and 6 story buildings? The map is not allowing me to key into S. Park St. My concern is with any more buildings above 4 stories. The city should		N
776	South	Park Street	respect neighborhoods that are well established with owner occupied dwellings even if they are adjacent to major thoroughfares such as S. Park St. 12 stories is not a good fit. How much more traffic can this street take on? The road is crumbling as it is.		N
777	South	Park Street	The draft plan for South Park Street	I feel we are ruining Madison with this kind of planning. I visited Boulder, CO and was amazed at how they've managed to do it so well. Yes, it means high taxes, alas... but I had the sense they plan how much can be built way in advance, and bought land around the city to keep it empty.	N

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

778	South	Park Street	community that has developed in our neighborhoods over decades. Building more and more high end housing in ever growing taller buildings in this area will impact all of us in a negative manner. 6 and 12 story buildings next to single family dwellings is simply a total mismatch. The developers will get rich and so will those that rent these spaces. In the meantime, property values and rental costs will skyrocket, leaving middle and low income households only the chance to live somewhere else. All of these changes have come way too fast and the transportation issues will continue to become greater. Simply crossing Park Street is a major challenge, especially for all the elderly and disabled folks who live closeby. Please reject the proposed changes.		N
779	South	Park Street	I can't believe the plan proposes 12 story buildings along the South Park Street	See above.	N
780	South	Park Street	Seriously, up to a 12 story building? Do you know there is low water table there, so developers can't provide much for underground parking, so where will they park (and occupants will own cars, buses come once an hour during non-peak hours, and ends at 10pm on Saturdays- you try to work and live with that, not easy/possible)? How will occupants cross the busy Park and Fish Hatchery streets safely? The vast majority of neighbors in the Bay Creek neighborhood want to see Park Street developed, but in away that complements the neighborhood that emphasizes safety and community.  Park street IS NOT E. WASHINGTON AVE!!! there is no consistent divider between east/west bound lanes north of Wingra, sidewalks are right next to the road (you know a young woman was killed by a car on Park and she was on the sidewalk) and residents live right behind the businesses on Park st and will be greatly affected by these tall developments. This area is already dangerous for pedestrians because of two busy streets converging. And how are ambulances going to get through to the hospital safely and quickly with more traffic introduced on Park/Fish Hatch at that horrible intersection? And why are you making these high density housing plans without combining it with a plan to improve public transportation? There would not be parking spots available for each tenant- visitors and tenant will spill over into coveted residential parking spots- especially difficult in winter with alternate side parking. Not acceptable nor fair for nearby residents.  These large developments, in the winter, affects nearby neighbors sunlight. It is the winter when we truly need the sun- would you like a building going up by your house that blocked your sun in December? Be honest, I doubt it!!  This area was planned to be low-mid density plot, per many meetings with the South Madison council- why did this get changed?  To be a good neighbor and planner, I suggest you listen to the neighbors who will be affected by this ridiculous	Please do a better job listening to and involving Neighborhood plans. Many of these land use plans/drafts contradict what residents want.	N
781	Central	Willy Street	3 stories is the max for this block at Williamson with 4 stories at the bike path		N
783	South	Park Street	This entire RMU section in the Park St Corridor should not be taller than 6 stories and therefore should revert to the previous 2006 designation.		N
784	South	Park Street	Everything on the East side of Park St should be NMU (Neighborhood Mixed Use) since it's adjacent to a residential neighborhood. Everything on the West side of Park St that is CMU, should revert to 2006 density levels (units/acre). The current area is largely undeveloped, and should not be subject to drastic density changes.		N
785	Central	Willy Street	I do NOT agree with additional medium to high rise buildings planned for the Williamson St corridor. Buildings in this area should be capped at 3 stories. High rises should be kept to East Washington Ave corridor. Leave the 2006 Future Land use map as it relates to the Williamson St corridor in place. Keep Willy weird! Not gentrified!		N
786	Central	Monona Bay	These are residential homes (southwest of Proudfit) and it should remain that way. Therefore, they should return to their previous designation equivalent, which in this case would be LR (Low Residential).		N
787	North	Northgate Shopping Center	These are residential homes on the interior of this block and should be designated LR.		N
788	South	Park Street	Please please please don't allow these tall buildings in our residential neighborhood. We live here. Families live here. Would you want a 12 story building built next to your house? No. I'm sure not. Please stop and think about this. Don't just ignore me or let this roll off your back. Would you want a 12 story building built in your home neighborhood? No. You wouldn't. Please don't build them in my neighborhood. Thank you.	Would you want a 12 story building built in your home neighborhood? No. You wouldn't. Please don't build them in my neighborhood. Thank you.	N
789	South	Park Street	Please please please don't allow these tall buildings in our residential neighborhood. We live here. Families live here. Would you want a 12 story building built next to your house? No. I'm sure not. Please stop and think about this. Don't just ignore me or let this roll off your back. Would you want a 12 story building built in your home neighborhood? No. You wouldn't. Please don't build them in my neighborhood. Thank you.	Would you want a 12 story building built in your home neighborhood? No. You wouldn't. Please don't build them in my neighborhood. Thank you.	N



**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

790	South	Park Street	Please please please don't allow these tall buildings in our residential neighborhood. We live here. Families live here. Would you want a 12 story building built next to your house? No. I'm sure not. Please stop and think about this. Don't just ignore me or let this roll off your back. Would you want a 12 story building built in your home neighborhood? No. You wouldn't. Please don't build them in my neighborhood. Thank you.	Would you want a 12 story building built in your home neighborhood? No. You wouldn't. Please don't build them in my neighborhood. Thank you.	N
791	South	Park Street	Please please please don't allow these tall buildings in our residential neighborhood. We live here. Families live here. Would you want a 12 story building built next to your house? No. I'm sure not. Please stop and think about this. Don't just ignore me or let this roll off your back. Would you want a 12 story building built in your home neighborhood? No. You wouldn't. Please don't build them in my neighborhood. Thank you.	Would you want a 12 story building built in your home neighborhood? No. You wouldn't. Please don't build them in my neighborhood. Thank you.	N
795	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood	plans to allow high-rise development of up to 12 stories on the east side of Park street. This is totally out of proportion to the quiet character of the residential, largely owner occupied neighborhood that is Bay Creek. Adding such disproportionately large buildings to the east side of Park St would dramatically increase population density, increase traffic through small residential streets to dangerously high levels, eliminate direct sunlight for half the day, and simply overwhelm the 1- and 2- storey residential homes next door with the sheer bulk and height of these inappropriately large buildings. Property values would go down and we would be forced to choose between a degraded environment and selling to opportunistic developers and investors at a loss. Quite simply, the quiet, peaceful neighborhood we love would no longer exist. I urge you to reconsider this reckless plan and keep building height limited to 3 storeys or less for the east side of Park Street.		N
796	South	Wingra Creek Triangle	Increasing density on a high-traveled corridor that serves two hospitals is kinda dangerous. Not to mention that there is not enough street parking at present in the Park Street corridor. Adding more high-density structures will make that problem worse. There are always more cars than parking spaces in any multi-unit residential structure.	Overall, I am in favor of more mixed-use development, all across the city. But keep a focus on fitting in with the existing character of the neighborhood. That means most areas will have low- to medium-density mixed use. The only area where high-density mixed use--and tall structures--is in the small downtown core adjacent to the Capital. Tall high-rise residential buildings don't "fit" anywhere else. Thank you.	N
797	South	Park Street	Please do not compromise the quality of life for those living in single family homes in this area by allowing 6 to 12 story buildings. Particularly land to the east of Park from West Washington to South of Emerson for 6 story and north of Olin to south of Wingra Creek for 12 story buildings. Please keep land use East of Park in this area at 3 to 5 stories.	In general, please be thoughtful of traffic patterns and parking with the increase of multiple story buildings in neighborhoods where single family homes are impacted. I also urge you to consider percentages of vacant store fronts like this area on Park St. when considering mixed use buildings.	N
798	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood	I'm going to comment on all of the proposed changes I see for Bay Creek rather than drop my pin on each separately since I don't know whether I will be allowed further comments once I hit submit. 1) The proposed changes along Park, which allow for increased height in this CMU are wrong for the neighborhood along the entire east side of the street. The height limitations should remain as they are in the 2006 land use map for this area. Otherwise we might see 6 stories towering over the single family homes which are immediately adjacent to the east of Park Street. 2) The same is true for the proposed RMU east of Park from about Midland to Gilson (as well as along South Street and its spur and Fish Hatchery to the west). Are you for real in proposing 12-story buildings hard up against single-family homes? Earlier this year a proposed 5-story development at Park and Emerson was voted down by the UDC because it cast the first block of homes east of Park Street in shade throughout the year. How much worse your proposed changes would be! All of the east side of Park Street to where it intersects with Beld should be allowed development of no more than 3 stories where it is adjacent to or across the street from single family homes! 3) Equally destructive to Bay Creek's integrity and visual appeal is your proposal to upgrade the Romnes development from MDR to MR to allow for up to 5 story construction. Anything taller than the 2 stories now there would stick out like a sore thumb. Ditto your proposed change to the HISTORIC block one block east of Romnes along Lakeside across from the school. Not only would 4 stories there be in appropriate, but they would eliminate the visual, cultural and historical appeal of these buildings, which are already partially redeveloped. Leave the land use here alone as it is. 4) Why do you not explain what the new Employment are north of Wingra and east of Gilson and across the street from more homes entails? I can't comment on what you don't show us, but I ask that you respect the homes that are already	Growrh and density are important and will necessarily reshape Madison. However growth and density that compromise the value to citizens of their homes and neighborhoods is a mistake. I am glad that you are soliciting feedback; however your slide show was a joke (it forced me to choose between A and B when I wanted to say C or D) and you are missing feedback from many of the older residents in Bay Creek who do not use computers. You should be out knocking on doors and listening to what people have to say in their homes. And you should be looking at our streets up close. Clearly you were not when you proposed 6- and 12-story buildings next door to our 1- and 2-story homes!	N

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

801	West	Greenbush	What you propose for this entire neighborhood--doubling its density--is a crime. Have you been to the bear mound and seen the homes that circle it, especially its northern half? This is one of the most special circles in Madison. Have you read the neighborhood plan, which promotes redevelopment of existing homes and owner occupancy.	Madison character you pretend to promote. And despite this call for input, we will likely remain a city developed by "experts" from the top down, people who ignore our thoughtful, streetwise comments and have the audacity to tell us what is best and how we live.  You need to leave your offices, walk the streets, and listen and look. Residents don't know everything, but they can tell you how life is lived currently on and along our streets, Only once you have done so can you make knowledgeable proposals about how they might be and build the health, vibrant community you say you want. Yes there is change and yes people move out and new people move in. But many of your proposed changes will force people and community	N
803	West	Greenbush	We purchased our home in the Greenbush neighborhood last summer and are so excited to be in a neighborhood with lots of families who are investing in making a home here. Please leave in place the distinction that the recent rezoning had made in our neighborhood between the north and southern portions, with higher density in the north and an emphasis on single family residences in the south. We have been working to get more owner-occupancy in our	We purchased our home in the Greenbush neighborhood last summer and are so excited to be in a neighborhood with lots of families who are investing in making a home here. Please leave in place the distinction that the recent rezoning had made in our neighborhood between the north and southern portions, with higher density in the north and an emphasis on single family residences in the south. We have been working to get more owner-occupancy in our	N
804	South	Wingra Creek Triangle	I'm concern about the height and density being proposed for this entire area -- up to 12 stories. The properties lining Wingra Creek should not see this kind of height and density; there, properties should not overwhelm this natural corridor (fish, birds, wildlife) but be scaled down. I also believe that while it might be appropriate to have higher buildings in the center of this triangle, the buildings should be stepped down -- particularly where they abut smaller properties.  The property south of Wingra Creek is in a low spot and would not support underground parking that might be necessary in a large building.		N
805	South	Park Street	I oppose the proposal to raise the height of buildings above the current 3 to 5 story limit on the east side of Park St. on any lots next to single family residences. Shade from buildings taller than this would prevent residences from the future option to install residential solar clean energy, since the amount of sunshine that these properties receive could be substantially reduced. Likewise, green areas such as yards, trees and gardens could be similarly adversely impacted. There needs to be a sufficient amount of space between single family residences and commercial/multifamily structure taller than 3-4 stories. The current proposal to raise allowable building heights does NOT provide sufficient space.		N
806	South	Park Street	Given the shallowness of the lots along Park St and their proximity to single-family owner-occupied residences close to Park here, it would be a terrible idea to have anything greater than two or three story buildings here. Anything larger would dwarf people's homes, cut off light, and not integrate at all with the character of the neighborhood.		N
807	South	Park Street	Given the shallowness of the lots along the east side of Park St and their proximity to single-family owner-occupied residences close to Park here, it would (likewise to further up the street) be a terrible idea to have anything greater than two or three story building down to Cedar. Once again, anything larger would dwarf people's homes, cut off light, and not integrate at all with the character of the neighborhood.		N
811	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood		to Emerson, allowing one additional story in the proposed change. But where is the logic from Emerson to the railroad tracks going from four stories to twelve stories? I'm speaking of the East side of Park Street in both cases. The new proposal may be valid fifty years from now, but it certainly is not within reason at this date. The West side of Park Street is a different matter, but having a high rise building next to one-to-two story houses one lot away from Park Street doesn't make any sense to me. Shading will be intolerable for these residential houses, let alone those who already have gone to or are proposing any solar energy use. (There already are residences in this area using solar effectively.) I think it is time for the city to become more realistic about these proposed changes.  As a retired planner (graduate architect, home designer for over 30 years, home owner in Bay Creek Neighborhood for 45 years) I could go on about some other concerns on proposed changes to the mapped areas, namely the 300 block of Lakeside Street, and Romnes. The latter is one of the best architectural amenities in the South side of Madison. Its design and siting with extra land as park area is valuable as is. I become frightened at the thought of increased density in some areas to mean the destruction of some of the best that our area has to offer. Much deliberation should occur before we allow inevitable builder enthusiasm to prevail.  Thank you for listening.	N

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

812	South	Park Street	please do not allow 12 story buildings right next to this residential neighborhood. I have lived in Bay Creek for almost 20 years, the neighborhood has old houses, mature tree canopies and a friendly feel. I personally like right next to this parcel. Having a 12 story building next to me would change the entire character of not only my house, but the whole neighborhood. Even 4-5 stories would be challenging to integrate with the neighborhood. Please consider a more moderate zoning proposal for the parcels along South Park St that are immediately adjacent to residential neighborhoods. I think development is great and helps the neighborhood, but it needs to be done reasonably. I ask for no more than 4-5 stories. Thank you for collecting feedback!		N
819	South	Park Street	I think the absolute limit (that is, *with* conditional use) should be four stories except where Park Street is elevated above residential between Lakeside and Spruce streets; the limit should be three stories there since it will feel like four stories.  with: I think the absolute limit (that is, *with* conditional use) should be four stories ON THE EAST SIDE OF PARK ST FROM REGENT TO THE BELTLINE except where Park Street is elevated above residential between Lakeside and Spruce streets; the limit should be three stories there since it will feel like four stories.		N
820	South	Wingra Creek Triangle	I do not have any reservations or problems with the proposed Regional Mixed Use designation. Allowing buildings up to 12 stories is a part of urban growth in cities and this designated area in Madison should not be an exception. In my opinion, Park Street has been an "eye sore" and has needed a face lift for years. If some taller buildings can be apartments with multi-use options like the apartments that currently have Rockhound Brewery as a business, this would add to the much needed positive development in my neighborhood. Since I have lived in this area of the city for the last 10 years, I have been surprised by the types of issues people complain about. This shows narrow mindedness and a limited perspective for change.		N
828	South	Greenbush	I have heard through my neighborhood association (Greenbush) that the idea of making Greenbush a high density area is afloat. Ironic, considering how the city DESTROYED the original Greenbush in the late 50s and early 60s through urban renewal. Please don't wreck my neighborhood. Already parking is at a premium and more high density apartment buildings on Park Street is helping to create an impersonal atmosphere. Currently, we know most of our neighbors, we plant gardens and share resources, we have a friendly, safe and family-friendly community. Please don't wreck it!!! My fear is that high density planning doesn't take into account the future--iffy economics, a changing university, businesses (like Epic) building outside downtown or near West side. Please, don't pretend Madison is a big city or is going to be one. Grow as the times dictate rather than destroy one of our greatest assets, unique and historic housing stock.		N
829	South	Park Street	The RMU east of Park from about Midland to Gilson (as well as along South Street and its spur and Fish Hatchery to the west) is out of place for the neighborhood. How can it make sense to have 12-story buildings hard up against single-family homes? It will throw homes for the first block east of Park Street into year-round shadow and tower over them. The east side of Park Street should be kept to the 3 stories allowed for now where it is adjacent to single family homes.		N
832	Central	Willy Street	I object to the Draft Land Use Plan building heights on Williamson St from the 700 block to Baldwin St.: up to 6 stories in this plan. That is higher than the height limits prescribed in the BUILD plans. The BUILD plans brought together the neighborhood, developers and other stakeholders in a careful public process. This draft land use plan override neighborhood planning with a process with minimal neighborhood input.		N

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

833	West	Greenbush	<p>As a resident of the Greenbush Neighborhood, I am disappointed to see that increased density is overwhelmingly slotted for downtown, near downtown neighborhoods, and along a few major street corridors. By targeting these areas, older buildings will be torn down while less distinctive architecture in other areas will be kept. The historical center of our city, already denser than outlying neighborhoods, is put at the most risk.</p> <p>There's a class dimension as well. More pressure is put on less-well-to-do neighborhoods, as if affluent communities farther from the center are more worthy of preservation than poor and moderate income neighborhoods. Have we put ourselves into a box where we use 20th century planning frameworks when we have the capacity to think of new urban designs? Who says density cannot be spread more evenly across all of the city? Can't an apartment building be sited on some of the larger lawns between more expensive homes, or placed in neighborhoods that are less diverse?</p> <p>We have seen significant changes in density in our neighborhood along our eastern boundary at Park Street in the last few years. But we have been forced always to react to development rather than given a role in making neighborhood policy. Whatever the density target for our neighborhood, couldn't we help draw the planning and zoning maps, instead of coming to this website and seeing that the map has been drawn for us? In 2007, there was a different density designation in our neighborhood for the areas north and south of Mound Street. What was wrong with that model?</p> <p>A few years ago a member of the Planning Department told a group I was in that the worst mistake Madison ever made was bulldozing the heart of the old Greenbush in the name of Urban Renewal. Don't subject our neighborhood to a similar mistake today.</p>		N
834	West	Greenbush	<p>portion of the neighborhood. The future land use plan proposed for 2017 changes the entire Greenbush neighborhood and some of the Vilas neighborhood to allow much higher densities. This will encourage developers to consolidate several lots and build large apartment buildings. This is fine along Park and Regent Street but will discourage residential home ownership if applied to the entire neighborhood. I advocate that if this higher density needs to happen for some reason close to the University that the areas south of Oakland and Mound Streets be left as low density residential.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>		N
836	South	Park Street	<p>Proposed changes at Park street (W Wash to south of Emerson) allow for 6 story buildings that will tower above the single owner properties surrounding this area. The proposed changes along Park, which allow for increased height in this CMU are wrong for the neighborhood along the entire east side of the street. The height limitations should remain as they are in the 2006 land use map for this area.</p>		N
837	South	Park Street	<p>The proposed RMU east of Park from about Midland to Gilson (as well as along South Street and its spur and Fish Hatchery to the west) would create the only location in Madison that would allow up to 12 stories directly adjacent to single-family homes. The east side of Park Street from near Emerson to where it intersects with Beld should be no more than 3 stories where it is adjacent to or across the street from single family homes!</p>		N
600	West	Far Southwest	<p>Green space should remain as a buffer between the residential area of <b>Linden Park</b> and the Employment district as shown in the 2006 plan. The Employment area should be a mixed-use neighborhood center, offering services that residents in nearby neighborhoods could walk to.</p>		Y
602	Central	Downtown		<p>Maintaining the land use recommendations of the <b>Downtown Plan</b> in this update of the Comprehensive Plans is a sound decision.</p>	Y
603	Central	Downtown	<p>Regarding <b>443 west Washington</b> avenue: It is a current 5 + story office building and we want the future zoning to reflect the fact that it is now commercial and will be commercial in the future. Why was this change made without notifying us?</p> <p>Dave Keller 608-227-6543</p>		Y
604	Central	Downtown	<p>Regarding property on the <b>400 and 500 block of West Washington Avenue</b>: We are asking that these properties be zoned DMX as that is what is naturally occurring on these properties. Please respond and let us know why these properties do not have a mixed use proposed zoning.</p> <p>Thanks, Dave Keller 608-227-6543</p>		Y
605	West	University Research Park 2	<p>Should <b>Watts Road</b> be connected sooner, to provide more east-west mobility? Mineral Point Road is very crowded.</p>		Y

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

606	South	John Nolen Dr Corridor	<b>133 E Lakeside</b> and the adjacent City lot should be Community Mixed Use. Its an opportunity to set the tone for the John Nolen gateway corridor with a mixed use project. Density and mix of uses makes sense here because it keeps traffic out of the surrounding neighborhood by utilizing John Nolen Drive for the majority of its access and visitation, while still providing the neighborhood with amenities that would be part of a mixed use project. The lot is currently not generating any tax dollars as a non profit VFW and city owned lot. The tax increment potential here is in the tens of millions, helping the city tax rolls. Its proximity to Downtown and the Beltline also make it a transportation friendly location for residential and commercial uses. This lot can support more than just the Employment designation it currently carries.		Y
610	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood	The <b>Romnes property</b> should stay at the density category it is now, which I suppose would be closest to LMR using the newer categories since it is smack dab in the center of a stable, LR neighborhood.		Y
613	West	Westgate Mall	The <b>West Transfer Point and Westgate Mall</b> area feels like a missed opportunity. I'd love to see the WTP become a park & ride, and to see better vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle accomodations in that area. Bike lanes in that area just evaporate, making it difficult to get to the WTP, through Odana to West Towne, or south on Whitney.  I also think Research Park is a barrier, and the empty Epic building is sad. Could different zoning make these more mixed-use places, rather than places irrelevant to everyone but those with offices there?		Y
614	West	Monroe Street	Why the change in land use in this area ( <b>Monroe near Pickford St</b> )...a doubling of potential units? Requirements should be made that hold these units back from the street at their current setback...I've found the buffer makes helps transition to single family residential and allows 'front lawn' space for tenants to integrate with the neighborhood. Also non-flat roofed structures should be the norm in this area.  also please connect Edgewood Park and Pleasure drive to Wingra park...through that sliver of green...this land use map appears to suggest that owner(s) does not have lake frontage...and this area could support a bike path connection?		Y
616	East	Secret Places	A very controversial large apartment complex was just approved on the northside of the <b>Secret Places</b> neighborhood last year (Catalina Parkway) which many neighbors and community members objected to. The traffic flow through the neighborhood (since the only street access is via residential) and the increased traffic on <b>Siggelkow</b> is of major concern to neighbors. The 2017 plan is calling for even more density to be added to the east of the neighborhood with more apartments. This area should remain single family housing, not more apartments.		Y
617	East	Secret Places	The land to the <b>north of Kuehling Dr. and west of Bellingrath st. (just to the east of the current quarry)</b> is currently marshland. Flooding has begun to increase in the basements of houses along this area as the quarry keeps exapnding to the easternmost edge of their property. The current plans seem to call for turning this very marshy lake area into residential property. Neighbors are very concerned that this would increase flooding along all these houses even more. In addition, the plans for the soon-to-be-constructed 113 unit apartment complex just to the east on Catalina will decrease the grassland even further. All of this seems to be combining to make flooding a real problem.  Any basement in the area with the 9ft basement style has their sump pumps running nearly 24/7 as is. Please don't decrease the marshland space even more and push that water even further out into the neighborhood. (the neighborhood association has taken aerial photos of this problem if you need them).		Y
618	East	Yahara Hills		It would be nice to have a <b>choice of lot size</b> and have ones that are smaller and larger. Right now, there aren't any lots in the area that are around .5 acres or even .25 acres. It seems it is all about how many house can be crammed into one area for profit sake.	Y
619	East	Marsh Road NDP	Would be nice if these <b>lot sizes</b> were bigger than the 10k sqft Veridian forces you to have. <b>-Siggelkow Rd</b>		Y
620	East	Marsh Road NDP	Please keep this area LR or LMR. Thank you <b>-Siggelkow Rd at Stroock Rd</b>		Y
621	East	Marsh Road NDP	This area should remain LR (LMR at most). <b>-Siggelkow Rd at Stroock Rd</b>		Y
622	East	Secret Places	has the potential to becoming a problem neighborhood. This area is close to everything in Madison if you have your own vehicle. If you rely on public transportation, this area is very isolated and has the potential to be the new Allied problem neighborhood. The area above, is perfect for a isolated neighborhood that could easily slip into an open-air drug market if the apartments are mismanaged. Why can't the city encourage this property to remain the farm that it is? Where will you put the new police and fire station on this side of the belt line. Where are the new grocery stores and non-subway restaurants going to go?		Y

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

623	East	Cottage Grove Rd	<b>Cottage Grove Rd.</b> is underutilized and not dense enough. I would welcome more mixed use beyond just the Royster development. Restaurants seem to fail in this area (due to low density?) I would love to wine and dine in the area, but there are few options.	Looks like a similar footprint to 2006. Well-done saving farmland and discouraging sprawl! Now if we can convince the townships to not ditch the Dane plan!	Y
629	West	Regent St	I'm glad to see higher density on the <b>north side of Regent</b> . This area is ripe for redevelopment.	The map seems to be a mix of density and type, so it's hard to really make sense of the whole picture. For instance, what is the density of type "E" or "DC"?	Y
630	Central	Downtown	This seems like an odd place for "employment" use. ( <b>North Shore Dr at Bedford</b> )	Overall, I think we need even more high-density parcels on the <b>isthmus</b> . It's where many people want to live, it's the most walkable area of the city, it supports transit-oriented development, etc.	Y
631	East	n/a	<b>NPA's on east side of town</b> (or anywhere else for that matter). It would be nice and forward-thinking if city planners set aside specific locations within NPA's for new "downtowns" or "main streets" for commercial/retail/government centers. This would force developers to incorporate retail (grocery stores, restaurants and other basics needs) within the NPA so we don't end up with food deserts or with people driving long distances for necessities. I realize that there is a Woodmans on C, north of the large NPA (between 151 and 94), but you can't walk there or easily access by bike.	aside specific locations within <b>NPA's for new "downtowns"</b> or "main streets" for commercial/retail/government centers. This would force developers to incorporate retail (grocery stores, restaurants and other basics needs) within the NPA so we don't end up with food deserts or with people driving long distances for necessities and recreation. It looks like some NPA's from 2006 had this in mind but the idea was removed in the 2017 plan - Why? Shrink NPA's and single family areas and increase density (allowing for more parkland - yes I realize Park Div is stretched already but overall population increase will be same so increased tax funding will be same). I like the ring of parkland that seems to be forming around the city limits. Looks good! More, please! Too much of the planning is still centered on the automobile. The 2017 plan is still 1960's mindset with a mild 2040 sensibility. Be bold, take risks and plan for bikes, walking and livable vibrant neighborhoods instead. This is what people want, especially millennials (and some Gen X'ers like me). This would actually slow sprawl and shorten city service mains for same population - which makes tax sense. We should be a city and not a giant suburb. Don't plan with developers in mind, only listen to ordinary citizens who are the end users. Thanks for your hard work!	Y
632	West	Cross Country	see the area immediately adjacent to the neighborhood connection (Rockstream and Ambleside) to be single family or designated in the plan to be on the lower end of the density threshold allowed... and step up to higher densities closer to the Maple Grove corridor. I definitely believe in neighborhood connectivity, but I'm not sure the street connection makes sense across the greenway. It also doesn't seem that feasible? If anything, there should be a multi-use path to get over to Maple Grove faster..... (Steve King - Alder)		Y
647	South	Olin Park	All properties in this area should be acquired by the city for additional park lands.		Y
648	South	Park Street	This area could support higher density and 4 to 6 floors if combined with the adjacent properties on Park Street to create larger parcels with 1 to 2 floors of shared parking on lower levels. Need a master planned development here that elevates the main retail/commercial level and creates a grade separated ped/bike crossing over Park Street.		Y
649	South	Park Street	This entire block should developed as a single master planned parcel. This area could support higher density and 4 to 8 floors if combined with the adjacent properties on Brooks Street to create larger parcels with 1 to 2 floors of shared parking on lower levels. Need a master planned development here that elevates the main retail/commercial level and creates a grade separated ped/bike crossing over Park Street.		Y
650	South	Wingra Creek Triangle	This entire triangle of land in TID 42 needs to be master planned with emphasis on ped/bike access. Why not continue the planned Cannonball ped/bike trail that will soon go through the parkland east of the school. Continue this ped/bike trail north of the Wingra Creek ped/bike trail and into this triangular area to serve the high density mixed use/residential that is planned to be build in this area.		Y
651	South	Park Street	Six to eight floors in this area with underground parking would provide nice panorama views of the area.		Y
662	West	Hill Farms, Hilldale		As a resident of the Hill Farms Neighborhood, I'm pleased with the zoning surrounding the new state office building. Assuming things actually get built, the hope is that increased density will continue to make hilldale a vibrant shopping district and improve retail and dining options for everyone in the neighborhood.  As the city expands I worry that it gets hemmed in by the suburbs and can't geographically expand any further. I'm no fan of sprawl but with the way the revenue system is set up as I understand it, if the city stops growing, we'll be in bigger trouble financially. If sprawl is going to happen, I'd prefer as much of it as possible be within the city limits of Madison.	Y
663	Central	Downtown	I would like to see more park space in the downtown area.		Y
664	Central	Downtown	Need a great waterfront park that connects downtown to Lake Monona and serves as a regional draw and community gathering place that celebrates our heritage and fosters new investments		Y
665	Central	Marquette Neighborhood	Multi-family units in this district should be allowed to create accessory dwelling units as conditional uses.		Y

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map**  
**June 23, 2107**

666	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood	The Romney apt. Unit would devastate this neighborhood and ruin the entire feel of this bay creek community. It would add significant amounts of traffic to a school friendly community and take away from the calm feeling of a neighborhood and make it a congested feeling! OPPOSED 100%		Y
667	Central	Monona Bay		Right now my apartment is on the list of residential addresses that can't buy a city residential parking permit. Because of this, my apartment building is able to charge exorbitant prices for parking passes in their parking garage and their tenants have no other parking options. I need to have a car downtown to go to classes and work my second job as well as my job off campus in Fitchburg and I know a lot of people in the same situation. There either needs to be more street parking available so everyone who wants a parking permit can buy one, or regulation on private parking structures so they can't force us to pay quintuple the price of a city permit.	Y
668	Central	Downtown	It's nice to see that some of the downtown area is now more of a residential area in 2017, rather than just "downtown". This allows more people to live there and enjoy downtown, yet it is also important to keep downtown full of stores and activities rather than just apartments.	There is no color/area for campus on the 2017 map	Y
669	Central	UW Campus	Keep campus as campus. I enjoy having my own part of the city dedicated for students, while having easy access to the city if I want to go out and enjoy other opportunities Madison has to offer.		Y
670	Central	Vilas, Dudgeon-Monroe	The Monroe/Vilas neighborhood looks like it will be changing from a 1-2 story residential neighborhood to a 1-3 story residential neighborhood. I am not familiar with the effect that a minor zone change like this would have on a community, but I am concerned that it may increase the number of rental properties in this neighborhood that is working hard on building a sense of community and family-friendly activities for residents that own property and live there (which is ironic because I rent and do not own a home). This zone increase did not occur in the Randall		Y
671	South	John Nolen Dr Corridor	Relocate the Capitol City ped/bike trail behind the commercial properties in the easement for the MMSD sewer pipes from Olin Avenue to the beltline. This will create a better experience for users of the trail. No longer will need to stop for traffic at the intersection with John Nolen Drive and Rimrock Road.		Y
673	South	John Nolen Dr Corridor	Relocate Madison Traffic Engineering and build multi-story condo/office/retail structure on parcel.		Y
674	South	John Nolen Dr Corridor	Redevelop VFW property with multi-story condo/office/retail building. Could possibly incorporate VFW in portion of new building.		Y
675	North	Oscar Meyer	High density mixed use. Allow for taller buildings with lake and downtown views.		Y
676	North	Packers Ave	High density mixed use.		Y
677	North	Sherman Ave	Allow for slight more density.		Y
678	North	Northgate Shopping Center	High density mixed use. Right now it's mostly unused parking which is just dead space. It would be nice if any future development linked up with an Oscar development so it's not two isolated islands but one connected community. It would be nice if the city created incentives to do a full one redevelopment of this and the Oscar site.		Y
680	North	Packers Ave	Current zoning seems odd since there are a bunch of storage units there that aren't even staffed. Literally zero employment with the exception of the warehouse which doesn't employ much. Medium to high density mixed use would be ideal. Same for storage area across the street and by Roth St.		Y
681	North	Packers Ave	Medium to higher density zoning ideal with some mixed use. Maybe a common alley along the RR tracks. It's very cumbersome to have people backing out onto Packers with the speed and volume of cars. Alley would be much safer and more efficient and create a natural setback from the tracks.		Y
682	North	Loftsgordon Ave	LMR-MR zoning would be nice to see here. There are multiple homes in this area that are in very poor condition. Allowing for more density would encourage redevelopment. There are a few across the street as well.		Y
683	North	Sherman N.A.	LMR zoning would be ideal. There are some areas in here where you could create missing middle housing and still be in scale with the neighborhood.		Y
684	North	Brentwood Village	MR zoning with incentives from the city would be great. This area has been somewhat blighted. Not kept up very well and very underutilized. There is a great asset just across the street that isn't being taken advantage of and there could be walkable amenities in the shopping center nearby which is somewhat blighted as well and needs redevelopment.		Y
685	North	Northside Town Center	This mall is a dead space. Way too much parking. Seems like many businesses struggle or don't add much to the area. It would be nice to have people living, working, and shopping in this area. Residents could take advantage of Warner and have convenient access to rest of the city. Ideal redevelopment spot that's way underutilized at the moment. It would be better is zoning allowed for building heights above 6 stories. There is no view to block and it's a big enough area to support taller buildings without imposing on the area and it would capitalize on lake and downtown views. The latter of which only seem available to wealthy people. FYI.		Y

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

686	North	1st Street	MR zoning is ideal along this block on 1st St. It's a very busy section right there and the current mix of housing doesn't seem to fair well against that traffic. Anything put here needs traffic in mind and maybe an alley servicing it to avoid car backing out. That would also be ideal along E. Wash where applicable. A major detriment for people choosing to live on E. Wash is backing out into traffic. Madison lacks effective alleys in general. If alleys are designed and maintained the right way they are safe and enhance the value of areas.		Y
687	North	Packers Ave @ Northport	Incentives for redeveloping this area are key in addition to the whole north side which unfortunately seems to be at a disadvantage to the rest of the city because of the TIF laws. The area around the airport should be a high priority for the city since it's the first thing people see when they arrive. A lot of Packers Ave looks dumpy. Not a good first impression.		Y
688	North	Berkley Oaks N.A.	Higher density with some mixed use. Area is very worn down.		Y
689	North	Packers Ave @ Northport	Zoned employment but it doesn't seem like many people work here. This would be an ideal spot for business only no mixed use but what's currently there needs to be redeveloped or re-purposed.		Y
690	East	Agriculture Dr	This would be a great place for urban agriculture. Close to the Dept of Ag and the Dane County UW-Extension office.		Y
691	North	Northport Dr	Needs to be redeveloped. Getting worn down.		Y
693	North	Mendota Elementary School	This area needs a face lift. Especially seeing that an elementary school is right down the block. This section looks disheveled to say the best. People choose not to buy in the Mendota district because this area is not appealing or inviting.		Y
694	North	Mendota Mental Health Institute	It's probably unlikely that these buildings will be used for SI purposes several decades from now, It's a beautiful area and there should be a plan in place to preserve the current wildlife area and a plan for what should replace the buildings when the time comes. LMR-MR zoning with some mixed uses would be ideal in the long run.		Y
695	North	Northport Dr	MR zoning and redevelopment. The face lift really didn't seem to change much. It's still that old style 60s-70s land use which just doesn't seem to hold up well over time.		Y
696	Central	Willy Street	Our most treasured neighborhoods are becoming victims of their own success. Six story buildings along Williamson Street are way too tall, we are losing the ability to know our neighbors with all the cloistered tall developments. We're led to believe the crush of density is saving development from happening in farm fields, but the truth is they're BOTH happening, and the radical growth in the old neighborhoods is pushing long term residents out of their homes, making it much less desirable for young families, and we're losing people who will spend the time and energy maintaining the historic buildings which have created the sense of place here. The healthy resident mix is tipping too far toward short term tenants who do not have the same commitment to caring for and advocating for a place.		Y
697	North	N.A.	MR density		Y
698	West	Monroe Street	There should be more medium use residential housing on Monroe as new restaurants go in and there is also good bus transportation.		Y
699	Central	Law Park	Put the park over the top of John Nolan Drive and build the Frank Lloyd Wright boathouse. within the park.		Y
700	West	West Towne	Park possible here? Open field currently, bike path will go through here eventually.		Y
702	West	UW Research Park	This lot should be CMU too.		Y
704	Central	Isthmus	Is it possible to please have higher-density, safe, affordable multi-family housing closer to the Isthmus? Thank you.	Thank you for this draft land use map.	Y
705	Central	Tenney-Lapham	Regarding the Tenney Lapham Neighborhood area -- I would like to see more single-family owner-occupied homes along the smaller residential streets and Gorham, and LMR/MR/RMU concentrated along short stretches of Johnson St. and along East Wash. My husband and I just bought a house on Washburn and love it, but across the street from us are three completely run-down, student-occupied multi-unit buildings with loads of trash in the front yards. I've attended a number of Tenney Lapham Neighborhood Association meetings and there is certainly a generational divide between more long-term inhabitants of the neighborhood and younger professionals (like my husband and me), in terms of residential density and mixed-use areas, but one way to effect a good compromise would be to center the high-density, mixed-use commercial spaces in particular areas, like along the 700-900 blocks of Johnson St. and along East Wash, and promote single-family owner-occupied residences elsewhere.		Y
706	South	Park Street	I am writing to encourage the city to change the land use standards for redevelopment of the commercial part of South Park Street		Y
709	Central	Willy Street	I think that 6 stories on Williamson St is ideal. City needs density and stepping down from 14-10-6 is perfect. Thanks for applying vision to planning rather than trying to please any particular group of citizens.		Y



**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

710	Central	Marquette Neighborhood	Plans should respect the community process that developed plans for neighborhood. I do NOT support changes to increased height and mass to the Marquette Neighborhood. Continued tear down and building is eroding the context for the 3rd Lake Ridge.		Y
711	West	Vilas, Dudgeon-	The predominate housing structure east of Mills St, south of St James Ct, west of the rear yards of Monroe Street, and north of Erin Street is single-family. This area should be preserved as a single-family area. Change Bear Mound Park to		Y
712	Central	Brittingham	Change to LR along Brittingham Park and W Main Street (to the south and east). LMR to MR along Proudfit.		Y
713	Central	Isthmus	more density on isthmus	this is really hard to read/comprehend	Y
715	Central	Downtown	of the Jackman building and their tenants, as well as many residents of Capitol Lakes, and residents on Wilson Street all strong oppose expansion of the downtown Public Safety Building. We ask that the city play a role in discouraging the addition for 4 additional floors on top of the building. This is short-sighted and not in the interests of downtown Madison nor the inmates. We ask the city to encourage the county to look at a greenfield site which will offer better programming and care for the inmates. Also, it will allow the Public Safety building to be used for something that truly benefits the city of Madison in its downtown core. Major local developers have offered to buy the Public Safety building. We should jump on this opportunity.		Y
716	Central	East Washington Ave	Why are the heights allowed along Williamson St. not all the same? Does this really matter? Approval to exceed these height restrictions seems to be made quite frequently. Especially with the new developments.		Y
718	Central	Willy Street	4 stories on Willy St (west of Baldwin) retains the historic character. If the zoning changes to dramatically increase the density//height I am concerned the city will send an economic message that new development is preferred over preservation and reinvestment in the historic district.		Y
719	West	Tweenbush	are very much against this increase in density change. This 3 block neighborhood is comprised of a very tight knit group that feel very strongly this area needs to remain as it is in order to keep the feel of welcoming to the arboretum and Wingra Creek area. Further as members of Greenbush in general we are opposed to the changes from LR to LMR for most of the Greenbush Area. This change directly changes the hard work the neighborhood is putting into trying to preserve the single family homes in this area. In fact there is currently funding for "forgivable loans" from the city to try and return some of these homes to single family dwelling? It just doesn't make sense for the city to push that and then try to change the future land use designation.		Y
720	Central	Marquette Neighborhood	built for railroad workers and the people who live here currently are not wealthy. Over the years, we have debated with folks who wanted to build multi-unit buildings, all of whom have declined to do so. We currently have one 3-unit in the area, an old flat building on Dewey. This is a neighborhood where we are being priced out of where we live by rising assessments, putting us in the position of needing to sell at some point and move to the outskirts of Madison where housing is cheaper. What I see happening then is apartment buildings. I know we are not in the historic district but we try to keep our improvements to scale. And Willy Street is starting to look very ugly. Please no taller buildings that what is already on a block. Taking away front and side yards really diminishes the character and livability of the street.		Y
721	West	Pioneer NDP	Consider designating an appropriate 1-2 acre portion of this parcel for Urban Agriculture.		Y
722	East	Cottage Grove NDP	Consider rezoning some portion of this parcel, which is currently owned by the city and leased to a farmer, to Urban Agriculture for local food production.		Y
723	East	Yahara Hills	Rather than add this to the Yahara Golf Course, especially given the difficulty of supporting the "golf enterprise" in the City, consider rezoning this area for Urban Agriculture.		Y
724	North	American Center	Consider identifying 5-10 acres of this 60-acre parcel that would be appropriate for Urban Agriculture and re-zone accordingly.		Y
725	North	Airport	Consider re-zoning some portion of this city-owned parcel for Urban Agriculture.		Y
727	North	Airport	Consider designation some portion of the city-owned parcels involved in the Center for Industry & Commerce for Urban Agriculture.		Y
728	West	Far Southwest Junction	Consider designating an appropriate portion of this 45-acre city-owned parcel for Urban Agriculture.		Y
729	West	Neighborhood	Retain the UW's West Madison Agriculture Research Station as support for local agriculture.		Y
730	East	Agriculture Dr	Consider retaining some portion of this city-owned "Bio-Ag" project area north of Fen Oak Drive in Urban Agriculture to support local food production in this development area.		Y

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

731	Central	Tenney-Lapham	Consider proactively preserving (perhaps with Urban Ag zoning) the community garden on this site.		Y
732	East	Eastmorland	Consider zoning this area for Urban Agriculture to preserve the McCormick Avenue Greenway community garden here.		Y
733	East	Eastmorland	Consider zoning this area for Urban Agriculture to preserve the Starkweather-Olbrich Greenway Garden here.		Y
734	North	Commercial Ave	Consider zoning this area to Urban Agriculture to preserve the McCormick Avenue Greenway Garden there.		Y
735	South	South Madison	Consider rezoning 2009-2015 Baird Street, currently leased by the CDA, to Urban Ag to preserve the Garden Area there.		Y
736	Central	Triangle Neighborhood	Consider noting and preserving the Triangle Garden Area leased by the CDA.		Y
737	East	SASY	Consider zoning the Right of Way along East Main Street between Second and Fourth Streets for Urban Agriculture to preserve the gardens being tended there under an agreement with the City.		Y
738	East	SASY	Consider designating the Right of Way along St. Paul Avenue as Urban Agriculture to preserve the Atwood Community Center and other gardens there.		Y
739	East	Marsh Road NDP	Consider zoning this city-owned parcel for Urban Agriculture to preserve the Twin Oaks Subdivision garden there.		Y
740	Central	Willy Street	Consider rezoning this triangle area at the junction of Blair Street to Park & Open Space to preserve the landscaping arrangement on this city-owned parcel.		Y
742	East	Northeast Neighborhoods	This is the Northeast Neighborhoods Planning Area, approved by the Common Council in 2009 and adopted as a Supplement to the 2006 Comprehensive Plan. The plan was a special joint effort that incorporated the City's adopted Sustainability principles into land use planning with the following goals: 1) reducing dependence on automobiles, 2) reducing energy consumption, 3) reducing water consumption, 4) increasing on-site stormwater infiltration and 5) delivering city services in an energy efficient manner. Is this still the plan that will guide development in this area? Is there any way to indicate in the Future Land Use Map that this area has a special set of requirements?		Y
743	Central	Marquette Neighborhood	Put a dog park here!		Y
744	Central	Willy Street	Put a library here!		Y
745	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood		I oppose these developments for two reasons: 1) Lakeside Street is a unique historical area of our city that should be preserved as it is. 2) Parking and traffic flow in general are already problematic. Adding so many more residents would only exacerbate that.	Y
748	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood	I'm in favor of increasing the density of this parcel to MR, since it will bring more services to the neighborhood, and it is a great spot for higher buildings on the hilltop. I live less than a block from the parcel and would welcome more density and height.		Y
749	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood	Increasing height and density in this historic commercial strip is a great idea. I look forward to this block returning to the hub of services it was years ago. I live 2 blocks away.		Y
750	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood	A definite NO for MR proposed (Romnes Center). It's already too big and is a blight on the neighborhood. Also, a NO for the NMU on West Lakeside near Franklin School.		Y
752	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood	I am concerned about the rezoning of 540 W Olin Ave, Madison, WI 53715. Very few buildings in the Bay Creek neighborhood exceed three stories, and I am concerned about zoning to allow 5 story buildings. We recently purchased our house due to the amazing neighborhood within Bay Creek, and I feel that developing buildings larger than 3 stories ruins the neighborhood feel.  Additionally, if the City ever decided to sell the land at 540 W Olin Ave I would NOT feel comfortable with a developer owning the land with this updated zoning. I feel a developer would try to maximize profit and the number of units and floors, which is a battle I want to avoid. I support the development of Park Street, but I do not want "luxury" apartments in the middle of the neighborhood because I feel they lessen the community. My husband and I moved to Bay Creek from Downtown because we wanted to live near neighbors who are invested in the community and will stay for years - not just rent and leave when their lease is up.		Y
754	Central	East Washington Ave	With the increase in activity there is a strong need for safe pedestrian and bicyclists crossings in this area. Because of the speed of traffic and cars running lights, using a signalized crosswalk isn't even safe. Reduce posted speed limits, add a large visible ped/bike crossing such as the one on University Ave on campus.		Y

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

758	Central	Willy Street	5-6 stories on Williamson St is counter to every plan and ordinance to date. I hope this is part of an approximation involved in grouping different categories and not the direction of the Planning Dept. I thought we're building towers on East Wash and the rail corridor so that we don't have to build them next to our homes?		Y
762	South	Park Street	much as 90 units/acre and to 5 stories. I would limit to more like 50-60 units/acre and max of 3-4 stories. Changing the densities without giving adequate attention to transportation, parking and other human needs issues will result in changing the character of the neighborhoods and ultimately, the city.  I don't agree with proposed NMU plan 70 units/acre - instead prefer lower density of 50-60 units and max of 2-3 stories high.  I disagree with the proposal to have a building as high as 10-15 stories on Park Street where Jade Garden currently		Y
763	South	Tweenbush	I so NOT think that this strip of single-family homes (bounded by Wingra Creek, Haywood & Delaplaine) should be changed from LDR to LMR. If you look at the future land use map just west and south of this area, there are no changes to the single family homes that line Wingra Creek & continue into the Bay Creek neighborhood that abuts Fish Hatch. In contrast, the areas that are previously and still shaded LMR are already 4-8 unit apt buildings. The change on this map from LDR to LMR focuses specifically on increasing the density of a very nice few blocks of owner-occupied single-family homes. In terms of the neighborhood, this area provides a core of stability that would be negatively impacted by changing it to LMR. I am OPPOSED to this change.		Y
765	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood	Please leave this beautiful area of lakeside st alone.It is a park like setting enjoyed by the whole neighborhood.It would create more traffic and parking problems on a already busy street. We all love this area don,t destroy it. Thank you Proud Lakeside Street Home Owner!!		Y
767	South	Tweenbush	The CMU designation allowing up to 130 units per acre is a LOT. That it is creeping down Delaplaine and Haywood Avenues is NOT good. Both high density and multiple story buildings jammed next to these residential areas, and changed zoning for Delaplaine Ct will change the nature of these neighborhoods permanently. You are destroying real neighborhoods to cram in higher density buildings and making developers happy. JMHO	The CMU designation allowing up to 130 units per acre is a LOT. That it is creeping down Delaplaine and Haywood Avenues is NOT good. Both high density and multiple story buildings jammed next to these residential areas, and changed zoning for Delaplaine Ct will change the nature of these neighborhoods permanently. You are destroying real neighborhoods to cram in higher density buildings and making developers happy. JMHO	Y
782	South	Tweenbush	Our neighborhood, bounded by Delaplaine, S Brooks, Haywood and Mills, is mostly owner owned single family one and two story homes. We know each other and care for one another. Our two blocks provides stability for the short-term residence of the apartment buildings south along Haywood and future high rise housing at 8 Twenty S Park. Allowing three story structures to replace our neighborhood of single family homes would eventually replace our stabilizing presents with more short-term focused housing.		Y

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

792	South	Tweenbush	<p>of St. Mary's Hospital along Haywood Drive). We became "Tweenbush" not because we were seeking a separate identity - but because we were literally cut off from the rest of Greenbush as a result of the Hospital removing two blocks of single family homes along Delaplaine and Erin Streets and replacing them with a parking structure and medical office building. That was 10 years ago, and until recently, we remained a strip of single-family homes lining the north side of the corridor connecting the Arboretum to Park Street -- between Bay Creek to the South and Greenbush to the north (ergo Tweenbush)."</p> <p>Last year, Tweenbush absorbed another big blow when, in its quest for more affordable housing, the City approved a zoning change to carve up our easternmost block -- the one bordered on the east by Park Street. The City enthusiastically approved further demolition of our neighborhood for two buildings (four and five-stories) that will comprise 8Twenty Park).</p> <p>After my neighbors and I undertook a great deal of advocacy effort to maintain the character and nature of the neighborhood we love, I am deeply dismayed that the City, which acted to preserve a row of single-family homes on the current construction block (on 900 block of Haywood along the Brooks Street side of that block) — seems to be proposing another course reversal.</p> <p>With the proposed doubling in height and density for Tweenbush in “Imagine Madison,” it appears that City has quickly turned away from its preservation intention for our tiny neighborhood. Why would the City view our 1.5 story wooden cottage homes built in the 1930s -- with the same lens it views the four-plex and six-plex brick apartment rectangles that were built in the 1950s and 1960s across the street? Those blocks are unlike us. However, our Tweenbush blocks DO have a great deal in common with the residential blocks that run along the Wingra Creek canal. These are 1.5 story cottages that also line a public corridor. The City should view our remaining Tweenbush blocks in the way it views Wingra Creek</p>		Y
793	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood	<p>that decision, my husband and I were drawn to the many young families and the warm familiarity among neighbors in this special part of Bay Creek. I am discouraged and concerned to learn that the Romnes Apartments could be replaced by a significantly larger structure.</p> <p>I worry that a large apartment building would bring heavy traffic and would make the area unattractive to young families who wish to access the Monona Bay and Bernie's Beach. With Franklin School just down the road and many, many bikers using Lakeside Street to go around the Bay, I fear that heavy traffic could be a serious safety concern. Similarly, South Shore Drive is a beautiful street that is well-used by bikers and runners and parents with children in strollers; more traffic on this street would diminish the accessibility and appeal of our neighborhood's best asset.</p> <p>Parking is another concern: when the Lakeside Coffee Shop or Franklin School host events, parking is scarce and I worry that many more residents of a large apartment building would make it impossible for those of us who rely on street parking.</p> <p>Most importantly - the Romnes Apartments sit in the heart of a neighborhood, not an extension of the downtown and a five story building would dramatically and negatively change the vibe here.</p> <p>I do not understand why it is necessary to rezone this particular area, when so close by along Park Street there are buildings that would benefit from revamping.</p>		Y
794	North	Isthmus	Way too much HDR everywhere. Traffic congestion will keep getting worse.		Y
799	South	Park Street	<p>The plan calls for up to six story mixed use buildings on the east side of Park Street in the 500 block of Park Street. A 6 story building on that block would cast a permanent shadow on the homes in the 500 block of West Shore Drive and would block out views of the sky since the buildings would be very close together. In addition, such density would add substantial traffic to Park Street which is already bumper to bumper at morning and evening commuting times. If the cars associated with residential development on Park Street were to be routed onto either Drake or Emerald Streets, the additional traffic would move onto West Shore Drive which is already heavily used by runners and bikers. It is a bike boulevard.</p>		Y

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

800	East	Cottage Grove Rd	Our section of the city does not have easy, walkable access to a grocery store. Please strongly consider placing a grocery store in the Royster Clark development.		Y
802	South	Tweenbush	This proposed change is a travesty of your "strategy" for valuing neighborhoods. The neighbors who live in Greenbush south of the hospital spoke eloquently about what makes their community special when they opposed the rezoning of block between Delaplaine and Haywood and the destruction of homes that might have been renovated and returned to single-owner-occupancy dwellings as called for in the Greenbush neighborhood plan rather than plowed under to serve an arguably devious development plan. (As elsewhere in our south neighborhoods, neighbors did not oppose low-income housing; they supported a low-income development of appropriate scale to existing homes. They expected support from city planners who instead supported the developer.) This neighborhood--the gateway to the arboretum--needs to stay LR, to preserve its life, its character, its residents, and its bit of Madison history. That, folks, is how you fulfill your purported strategy of preserving what makes Madison unique.		Y
808	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood	Infill is good but this land is in the center of a neighborhood of single family homes and increases in density should be in keeping with that. 4 or 5 stories would ruin the nature of this very popular area, lower property values and threaten the precious green space so vital to quality of life		Y
809	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood	Romnes is ringed by single-family owner-occupied homes. A structure of two to three stories at this location, doubling the current density, would stick out like a sore thumb and destroy the quiet residential character of the neighborhood at this location.		Y
810	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood	This block is beloved in Bay Creek for its historic character and the use and potential use by neighbors of its shops. Rather than changing the land use to allow for destruction of these buildings and their replacement by four-story structures, we should be looking at changing our historic preservation and conservation district guidelines to protect and preserve these buildings.		Y
813	Central	Willy Street		I do not see information here on proposed heights of buildings on Willy St - but am concerned about ANY increase in building height or volume. We are under immense pressure here from developers - and any new development - especially from the 1000 block to the river should hold the size and height of buildings to the Landmark ordinance & Willy St Build guide lines which protect the scale and volume of this area. This is an entire AREA that has been Landmarked - not because of the buildings themselves - but because of the social history which those buildings tell and the relationship between those buildings. What you should be advocating is a STRENGTHENING OF THE LANDMARKS ORDINANCE not a weakening of it. We have suffered enough development here and all protections afforded to us should be strengthened. Right now, the Landmarks Commission looks at development projects in isolation - not as they relate to the entire area - which makes no sense since it is the relationship between the buildings that is described in the ordinance. What we have created here on Willy St will be destroyed - everything that is unique and funky that draws people here - will be gone - if the city does not act to preserve it. We do not have the infrastructure - parking / buses - et cetera to support any more. A little sugar is great - too much will kill you. We have created something sweet here for everyone to enjoy - it deserves to be protected!	Y
814	South	Fitchburg	Recognizing this area is technically in Fitchburg, it's important to be working with that jurisdiction to make sure land uses are compatible and working toward shared goals -- especially in this area.		Y
815	South	Fitchburg	This may not be a "town island" that will be absorbed into either the Madison or Fitchburg municipality, but it's within our extraterritorial jurisdiction so the City should be actively discussing compatible land use definitions and plans during this process.		Y
816	West	Ice Age Trail	What's happening in this area with respect to the Ice Age Trail? Please make provisions for preserving a corridor for this continentally significant trail system, and implement them! This is an opportunity of national significance.		Y
817	West	Far Southwest	Is there any opportunity in this area for an "urban agriculture district"? It only takes 5-10 acres for an intensively used parcel, and a residential neighborhood could be build around it -- there are examples of this model all across the country, even in areas that don't have such a strong identity with agriculture.		Y
818	West	Far Southwest	Is there any opportunity to rationalize the municipal boundaries between the Cities of Madison and Fitchburg? Highways essentially function as rivers of cars, cutting residents off from services more easily reached by those who live near the city center.	Is this area an opportunity to extend the "green buffer" the City has always desired between its boundaries and its neighbors? If so, protect it.	Y

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

821	Central	Isthmus	<p>Proposal to establish blackhawkdownhome as a running theme characterizing and sustaining The Bike Path as a safe, vital place reflecting and defining Madison's richly textured past as well as its ongoing interesting present. As a placemaking project this blurs landscape ecology and urban design by visibly and legibly indicating that The Path is cared for, personalized--unmistakably safe--and appropriately/understatedly active space. This proposal embeds the landscape architecture in local cultural practice by inviting neighboring residents to plant native prairie plants along the entire length of Black Hawk's retreat through the isthmus, which runs along the full length of the Atwood-East Isthmus. Since divergent readings of the vegetation and urban space in this corridor result in crime, conflict and contested ideals re effective solutions, establishing a consistent pattern of wayfinding through the corridor will provide a spine that builds in a shared reading of the urban landscape, articulates a connective tissue fusing multiple complementary requirements/objectives (legal, cost, mgmt, neighborly), and serves as a docking-hub for participating neighbors. This project will succeed only to the degree neighbors of every stripe make it a practice to plant prairie plants and gardens as an act of remembrance marking Black Hawk's flight from home to Bad Axe, fleeing with his people ahead of Dodge and Lincoln. As a civic and voluntary gesture it's a measure of acknowledgment of who we are then and now--no signs or ceremonies, no institutionalized inadequate statements, no impossible reparations--just the substantial concrete and unspoken but unmistakable signals, in the form of a legible landscape, that you can get home safe again. It implies but doesn't ask aloud, 'If Black Hawk were alive today, how would he find his way back home to Illinois?' Merging this with 'As a single woman bike commuter, how'll I get home at 1am tonight?' yields a unified solution. (a) For the former question: By reading the landscape, recognizing plant communities and indigenous influence on either leading back to Illinois. (b) For the latter, by signaling consistently that the Bike Path is legible to all not as desolate but as optimal human, as a healthy(safe) public sphere. The corollary: What could I do to honor his fate, his skill, his honor?' Plant native prairie plants, lining his route as sentinels, as silent recognition, as a biocultural memorial day, as a quiet acknowledgment that who we are comes down to how we live, what we practice, whether signal inclusion, honor the very real past, and live so as to take care of those around us--the lone cyclists commuting back at 1am &amp; forth into the world at 7am--I would cultivate an urban space at once hospitable, edible, resilient and inclusive, a landscape qualifying as a shared home, with meaningful roots and cross-fertilizing climate. Historians specifically identify the U.S. actions in pursuing Black Hawk as a defining moment in the development and maturation of the American Nation, as a sort of Rubicon crossed. While one turning point among many, Madison and region has the potential to move Forward together in a generically redemptive fashion. With every confidence 'the right plant in the right place' can configure complementary solutions from competing needs, a liaison/coordinator among the usual and linear array of stakeholders can function to pull everyone onto the same page, meet variable needs, hear people out, identify conflicting goals, and integrate operations in a conversational and anticipatory manner. (Note this proposal meets all three factors (Timothy Beatley identifies in Native to Nowhere)--a sense of belonging, the ability to impact the world around us, and access to</p>	<p>Along the Yahara River Corridor between Lakes Mendota and Monona, several small districts have been zoned for increased density. That's fine, but these districts must be required to design-in thicker greenspace abutting the Yahara River such that real ecosystem function and value is maintained/restored, (and (b) contributions to the public realm on street-sides of the parcels are secured). In short, 2 realities: (1) good design delivers density *and* real green space; and (2) real green space buffers and redeems negative impacts of denser development. It's both-and. By green space I mean native plantings consistent with hyperlocal water regimes and plant communities.</p> <p>The default represented by redevelopment of the Marling site fails to meet any metric of next-generation urbanism insofar as it consists of -- box/lawn/sidewalk/street and box/lawn/path/river, contributing nothing urban or socially healthy to East Washington Ave's public realm, and contributing nothing ecologically sound or socially usable interms of safety factors to the Yahara River Corridor. The opportunity is immense here, as continuity of public space along the lake and river shores could be world-class and is historically-based, and integrating both factors into the designs of development proposals abutting street and river alike can catalyze local urban form in delivering a cooler, more appealing, resilient and climate-adaptive city.</p> <p>I'd specifically like to cite the work of Frances Kuo and Kathleen Wolf in finding that access to greener civic spaces reduces crime and lowers domestic violence rates, while increasing self-confidence and executive function in adolescent girls and boys (respectively), contributing heavily to increased economic activity, human well-being, and safer cities. <a href="http://depts.washington.edu/hhwb/">http://depts.washington.edu/hhwb/</a> <a href="http://lhlh.illinois.edu/all.scientific.articles.htm">http://lhlh.illinois.edu/all.scientific.articles.htm</a></p> <p>In short, the default development framework appears to deliver -- or may result in -- an urban form and urban fabric that shortchanges the public realm, the remarkable ecosystem resources available, and the vision of neighboring residents.</p>	Y
822	East	Yahara Hills	Looks like a good location for a conservation development and/or residential around an urban farm, if neighborhoods are in the long-term plan here.		Y
823	East	Cottage Grove	Please maintain the "green buffer" between the city and it's neighboring municipality wherever possible.		Y
824	East	Cottage Grove	Preserve a "green buffer" between the city and its adjoining municipality here.		Y
825	East	Sun Prairie	Please preserve a "green buffer" between the city and its neighboring municipality here.		Y
826	East	Sun Prairie	Please preserve a "green buffer" between the city and its neighboring municipality here -- the low-density residential development pattern could incorporate a trail system or other greenspace use along this boundary.		Y
827	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood		We residents of Romnes Apartments are keenly interested in any and all proposed changes to its zoning status, particularly any proposed enlargement of the facility. Please keep us well informed regarding the City's plans re Romnes so that our concerns can be taken into consideration. Thank you.	Y
830	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood	Romnes development is beautifully suited to the land it is on now and well integrated into Bay Creek from all sides. Changing it from MDR to MR to allow for up to 5 story construction and doubling its density is thoughtless infill. Anything taller than the 2 stories or perhaps 3 where the land sloped down would be detrimental to the streetscape of the blocks		Y
831	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood	These blocks of shops are quaint and historic and extra care should be take so that can be preserved. They currently house shops that are frequented often by neighbors. If at some point in the future they should prove structurally unsound, the block should still be kept to the two--perhaps three stories that surround it, the height of adjacent single-family homes and apartments.		Y

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

835	West	Westgate Mall	any real nudge towards replacing this sad wasteland of a mall. Proximity to mass transit and parks, with walkable retail and services nearby, makes it a perfect location for higher-density condominium and rental development, which can be mixed with new retail and commercial space that moves away from the current outdated sea of asphalt parking and sad strip mall. The city should use whatever powers it has in taxing, zoning, land use planning to encourage getting the right mix of quality development at this site, and encourage the regeneration of other increasingly outdated strip mall properties on this corridor.	I hope the new land use districts avoid archaic "suburban" requirements like minimum parking quantities for commercial zones. The outer reaches of the city already have enough depressing expanses of empty parking... we don't need more. Encourage concentrated new development as much as possible along mass transit corridors. No more giant apartment complexes and strip malls in green fields with minimal bus service!	Y
838	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood	The proposal to upgrade the Romnes development from MDR to MR to allow for up to 5 story construction is destructive to Bay Creek's visual appeal. Anything taller than the 2 stories now present in this neighborhood would be both visually unappealing and obstructive to already difficult traffic intersections.		Y
839	South	Bay Creek Neighborhood	Greater than 2 story buildings should not be allowed in the current parcel of land where the Romnes apartments are. This is a residential area with a neighborhood feel. Lakeside is already a busy street because it allows people to go around the bay and get to John Nolen. Many people rely on street parking (as does my family), and a large apartment complex would exacerbate this problem. I also anticipate that traffic would significantly worsen, endangering the bikers, runners, and walkers that use S Shore Dr, as well as Lakeside St. Large apartment complexes would fundamentally change the character of this neighborhood, likely in a negative fashion.		Y
B	General	n/a		why are MR and HR number of stories overlapping?	Y
C	General	n/a		We need to stop focusing on new development and focus on <b>redevelopment</b> , building up and improving transportation. We should be supporting farmland preservation programs to ensure our farmers markets and food sources and not annexing and paving over our farmland.	Y
D	General	n/a		I think land use is the single most important factor in determining how our city looks and functions in the coming years. We need to <b>stop allowing suburban-style development</b> on the fringes of Madison. Leave that for the suburbs if they want. It's expensive to service these areas and exacerbates transportation issues. We can build all the transit we want, but for it to be successful, we need to have neighborhoods with enough density to support mass transit.  I'd like Madison to audit sections of the city on an economic cost-return model. What areas of the city are draining resources because low density doesn't return enough to the tax base to support services and infrastructure? Let's mathematically make sure we aren't zoning to allow for more of these areas.	Y
E	General	n/a		Generally speaking, the Draft map fails to show nearly enough high density residential between <b>Midvale (or even Whitney) and Milwaukee</b> . Every arterial street in the city should allow for mixed use and high density residential development. In particular, Monroe, Williamson, Regent, Midvale, Mineral Point, Milwaukee and others should allow for very dense development. Push density toward the core, particularly along frequent transit routes.	Y
F	General	n/a	What do the legend items stand for? If you would like feedback please make this more user friendly.		Y
G	General	n/a		I feel very strongly that the current zoning and land use district as it related to personal storage is completely outdated and need significant changes. Most notably, other progressive cities (see Charlotte, for example) allow personal self storage to be located in adaptive re-uses of existing retail buildings that are no longer in demand, but well located in proximity to their customer base. Madison's land use and zoning code are 100% too restrictive in this regard....personal self storage should be allowed as a conditional use in almost any zoning district related to employment, retail, industrial or mixed-use districts. Some cities actually have combined apartment buildings/storage buildings. Self storage does not only mean long ugly buildings with 100s of roll-up doors, and it is time that Madison recognized this. I am surprised at how slow Madison has been to recognize this, because Madison usually has a history of being a leader on these concepts, but apparently not with respect to personal storage units....time to get with the 21st Century, Madison!!	Y
H	General	n/a		Way too much single-family residential. This zoning only serves to protect the wealth of homeowners, and excludes everybody else. Very regressive.  Also, its foolish to segregate commercial and higher density residential uses. Except for heavy industrial areas, everything should be planned to be mixed use. For example, south side of E Wash and University Research Park are planned as commercial, but should be mixed use.	Y
I	General	n/a		stupidity.	Y

**Online Comments on Future Land Use Map  
June 23, 2107**

J	General	n/a		No idea how to use this map. No idea why it matters to city land use if I am transgender. Who has made these decisions? Isn't it cute that you are asking for comments about a fait accompli? You must feel very self important.	Y
K	General	n/a		This map is really hard to navigate, and the key might be helpful to someone in civil engineering but I don't know what all those codes mean, how do I get that information? Is there a place to go to see the maps in a larger format, physical maps please let me know carol.pope@wisc.edu	Y
L	General	n/a		(This map is hard to use.). So I'll say that I am strongly in favor of maintaining and supporting owner occupancy or low density duplexes and fourplexes such as currently exist in areas of Vilas and Greenbush currently zoned that way. Let's not do back-door urban renewal on the most picturesque historic neighborhoods in Madison. Maintain existing stock when possible, don't kowtow to developers' interests. PS..I'm disgusted by the proliferation of apartments for rich students and tech workers even as affordable housing and section 8 housing remain scarce. Think values, not just profit.	Y
M	General	n/a		Council. While the Agriculture (A) district may serve as a place-holder for future development, its purpose is also "to support the continuance of agriculture and rural character within outlying agricultural areas. In addition. the A district is intended to support local food production and community health by encouraging community and market gardens and other small-scale agriculture operations within city limits." The Urban Agriculture district is also important, given its purpose "to ensure that urban garden and farm areas are appropriately located and protected to meet needs for local food production, and to enhance community health, community education, garden related job training, natural resource protection, preservation of green space, and community enjoyment." You'll see that we've noted many of the locations where agriculture is taking place throughout the city, and would ask that it be more pro-actively designated and protected in the Future Land Use Map. This might be a worthwhile topic to discuss with our Comp Plan Work Group this summer. Nan Fey, Chair	Y
N	General	n/a		The idea of always expanding, always getting bigger is wrong. Then we are like a cancer. Madison needs to think about population control. Constantly increasing population is dooming Madison's infrastructure. Available monies are NOT keeping pace with population growth and WILL NOT in the future. Failure to recognize this will cause a much larger	Y
O	General	n/a		Add color coding legend to bottom of this web page so we can faster read maps.	Y
P	Unknown	n/a	Please leave in place the distinction that the 2006 rezoning has made in our neighborhood between the north and southern portions, with higher density in the north and an emphasis on single family residences in the south. We have been working to get more owner-occupancy in our neighborhood, and this represents a big step away from that, to large, rental buildings that are fine on Park and other big streets, but not inside the core of the neighborhood. Thank you for your consideration.		Y
Q	General	n/a		I'm a believer in the Strong Towns philosophies, as written by Chuck Marohn. Fringe growth tends to deplete city finances, as well as harm our natural and agricultural integrity. Better before bigger. I believe Dane Co will be hosting climate refugees before 20more years go by.	Y