

## Community Meetings, 9/11/08

### Goodman Center Summary of Comments

Participants chose to remain in one group. They were asked to identify any issues of concern to them regarding current zoning regulations, and to identify any positive and/or negative impressions regarding the proposed zoning districts, based on the presentation.

- Concerned about tear-downs and ‘scrape-offs’ – values the existing smaller houses in the City.
- Can’t comprehend how the zoning code manifests into built reality. The environment should be bikeable/
- What if the market can’t deliver what we want – i.e., buildings pulled to the sidewalk, parking to rear? Will we wait for as long as it takes the market to deliver this? Will typical chains agree to this pattern?
- Proposed categories make sense – easy to understand
- Proposed districts recognize the importance of neighborhoods – some definitions can be sharpened.
- How do we strike a balance between preservation and progress?
- Concerned with separation between subdivision standards and zoning code
- Access to transportation, employment, and food supply is key for low-income residents
- Shift from petroleum-based fuels will require sweeping changes in land use and transportation. Urban agriculture and live-work opportunities should be promoted and allowed in all districts.
- The City is ignoring the more progressive parts of the Comprehensive Plan
- Need a flexible code because we can’t predict the future
- Mixed-use should include manufacturing and employment uses, not only retail and residential
- Suburban neighborhoods should be “illegal” (nonconforming) as the 1966 Code made traditional neighborhoods illegal.
- Outcomes of zoning should be more accessible; understandable
- Proposed districts make more sense than existing ones.
- Zoning should not protect suburban character
- Zoning should discourage patterns that require automobiles
- Concerned with perpetuating existing suburban districts without encouraging them to progress
- The Zoning Code is a license to make money.
- If you force the Eastmoreland neighborhood to imitate the Isthmus you lose the nuance that distinguishes them
- The Code should protect peoples’ ability to live as they choose.
- Neighborhoods should provide for people with a variety of incomes

# City of Madison - Zoning Code Rewrite

---

- (Staff comment) Very thorough – has sparked a great debate.
- (Staff comment) If you can determine what you want in your neighborhood plan, the new Code will help you achieve it.

## Overture Center, 9/11/08 Summary of Comments

### Group #1

#### Issues and Concerns

- Zoning enforcement – R3 – identifying number of people living in/together (near the university is “detective work”)
- Zoning Board issue – “Spring Court” (in Spring Harbor).
- Examples of lakefront “over-development.”
  - Divided into (2) 43’ lots.
  - 6,000 SF on a 55’ lot...
- Enforcement = R2 (60-70’ lot widths) (old Town of Madison).
- Character of the neighborhood – Historic?
- Get more lake protection through overlay
- Development of University Avenue
- How to make it a great city
  - E. Washington improvements
  - Keep height limits downtown
  - See the lakes
- Downtown is very accessible
- Urban infill more on the horizon
- Co-housing – 39 units – adds to quality of the neighborhood
- City could become too large – can’t lose walkability
- Infill = less dependent on auto oriented lifestyle

### Group #2

#### What do you like about the proposed districts?

- Neighborhood friendly.
- Different styles and types of neighborhoods.
- Mixed-use
- Mix/diversity
- Multiple transportation options.
- Walkability
- Diverse housing types/multi generational

#### Dislikes/Concerns?

- Dissension
- Changing character
- Haves and have-nots
- Communication
- Commercially “spotty” – strip/hwy oriented
- Transition on corridors

#### Proposed Districts

- “Not enough parking” vs. urban design.

## City of Madison - Zoning Code Rewrite

---

- Garages – outlaw “snout-houses.”
- Suburban forms inconsistent with Natural Step.
- Madison is a regional urban center – don’t push retail out – there is a need for suburban patterns in right locations.
- Sustainability
- Thoughtful big box development – green

### **Procedures**

- Neighborhood pre-meetings
- Notify renters
- Notice O.K. – go beyond legal distance – everyone who shares borders (e.g., traffic)
- Applicants should know neighborhood likes/dislikes in advance.
- Issues:
  - Traffic
  - Alternative uses
  - Green space
  - Trade-offs (e.g., height vs. construction quality)
  - Developer pay notice
- Notify adjoining neighborhood associations
- Developer should pay for notice
- Demolition permit