



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Approved ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 26, 2014

5:00 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room 300 MMB (Madison Municipal Building)
PLEASE NOTE LOCATION CHANGE

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Chairperson Boucher called the meeting to order at 5:06 pm

Present: 10 -

Mark Clear; Victoria S. Selkove; Julia Stone; Eric E. Steege; Mark R. Greene; Joseph W. Boucher; Patricia (Pat) A. Schramm; Edward G. Clarke; Matthew C. Younkle and Scott J. Resnick

Excused: 2 -

Peng Her and John Strasser

Also Present: Mathew Mikolajewski, Office of Business Resources Manager; Jule Stroick, Neighborhood Planner; Peggy Yessa, Office of Business Resources; Dan Kennelly, Office of Business Resources

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Stone, seconded by Selkove, to Approve the Minutes of the January 15, 2014 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers are described in the relevant items below.

INTRODUCTIONS

Chairperson Boucher introduced new EDC member, Eric Steege.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

Mr. Steege said he is a member of the Regent Neighborhood Association.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- 1 [32635](#) AMENDED Adopting the University Avenue Corridor Plan and the goals, recommendations, and implementation steps contained therein as a supplement to the City's *Comprehensive Plan*.
- A motion was made by Clear, seconded by Resnick, with a friendly amendment by Mr. Younkle, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the PLAN COMMISSION: To approve the plan

and ask the Plan Commission to reconcile the University Avenue Corridor Neighborhood Plan with the Comprehensive Plan.

The motion passed by voice vote.

A motion was made by Clear, seconded by Resnick, with a friendly amendment by Mr. Younkle, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the PLAN COMMISSION: To approve the plan and ask the Plan Commission to reconcile the University Avenue Corridor Neighborhood Plan with the Comprehensive Plan.

The motion passed by voice vote.

Discussion:

Registered speaker, John Schlaefer, thanked Ms. Yessa for her work interviewing the businesses in this area for this plan. He said the plan was 3.5 years in the making and reflects a balance of density and pedestrian friendly streetscape. There are two commercial nodes: 1) Highland Ave and University Ave and 2) Walnut Street and University Ave. Historically this area had more business variety and more businesses than are present today.

Mr. Schlaefer said the Regent Neighborhood Association knows businesses need patrons from outside of the neighborhood and the term "neighborhood-oriented businesses" means more kinds of businesses to patronize.

Ms. Selkove asked for his response to the email from former Alder Robbie Webber.

Mr. Schlaefer noted the email calls for greater density and pedestrian friendly streets, which are in the University Avenue Plan (UAC). Business owners were engaged in the plan. Gold Leaf Development is the largest property owner in this area and they attended the open house and received mailing about meetings.

Chairperson Boucher asked about the plan's recommendation for lower building height.

Mr. Schlaefer said 3-story buildings are allowed under current zoning of the properties. The UAC plan recommends a maximum of 5 stories instead of the 6 stories that current zoning would permit under a conditional use application. Parking for new developments is recommended to be underground.

Mr. Clarke asked what should the EDC do when the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning call for more density and building height than the UAC Plan?

Mr. Schlaefer responded lower density is recommended in the two areas and is not a zoning code change recommendation. It is a Comprehensive Plan change. The neighborhood does not want University Avenue to become a canyon. They cited the development on the 800 block of Williamson Street as a model that would be desirable for this area.

Mr. Clarke asked for input on the EDD Staff report.

Mr. Mikolajewski said staff discussed the UAC Plan differences from the Comprehensive Plan and felt it was not a significance difference. A request to build a five story building is still a Conditional Use application to Zoning, regardless of what is in the Neighborhood Plan. Current zoning permits three (3) stories with up to six (6) stories as a conditional use within the Comprehensive Plan. The UAC plan says up to five (5) stories.

Registered speaker, Jon Miskowski, said the UAC plan is a balance of density, future and existing uses and congestion.

A motion was made by Alder Clear, seconded by Alder Resnick, to recommend approval of this plan.

Ms. Stroick said city planners were involved in this plan at the beginning of the process and it was then taken over by the Regent Neighborhood Association.

Chairperson Boucher said the EDC has no clue as to the economics and tax consequences of this plan.

Alder Clear said there is no easy answer. Neighborhood plans and the Comprehensive Plan are often in conflict. The Council also grapples with this.

Chairperson Boucher said this is clearly difficult to measure. The EDC's mandate is to comment on the economic development aspect of this plan.

Ms. Stone asked why the change from 6 to 5 stories is a conflict?

Ms. Stroick said this would change the Comprehensive plan from High Density residential (HDR) to Medium Density residential (MDR).

Mr. Schlaefer said at the meetings the neighborhood residents went block by block as to their preference for building height.

Ms. Stroick said the UAC will go to the Plan Commission on April 7th. The Landmarks Commission, Art Commission, Urban Design Commission and Board of Estimates have recommended approval of this plan. The Public Works Commission did not recommend approval.

Ms. Selkove said the EDC needs to go back to the Council with specific information on these neighborhood plans or else not see these plans at all.

Mr. Clarke agrees and said metrics are needed.

Alder Resnick said knowing what the neighborhood wants gives developers guidance for projects.

Mr. Clarke said if this plan reflects what the neighborhood wants then on what grounds does the EDC criticize it at all? But is this good for economic development for the City? He likes the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Younkle also struggles with the non-alignment with the Comprehensive Plan.

Chairperson Boucher said in fairness to the neighborhood, the EDC does not ask for economic development information. The EDC does not ask for the impacts. The Mayor wants to increase the tax base. Each neighborhood plan seems to want less in revenue. We don't know how much less or more. We expect staff to have the answers.

Alder Resnick is respectful of EDD staff time and resources. On the whole this is a strong report and reflects what the neighborhood wants.

Mr. Younkle made a friendly amendment to the motion, seconded by Ms.

Selkove, accepted by Alder Clear and Alder Resnick, to approve the plan and asked the Plan Commission to reconcile the UAC Neighborhood Plan with the Comprehensive Plan.

Alder Clear noted businesses do need some amount of parking for their patrons.

The motion with the friendly amendment passed by voice vote.

Alder Resnick left the meeting at 5:43 p.m. A quorum was still present.

Present: 9 -

Mark Clear; Victoria S. Selkove; Julia Stone; Eric E. Steege; Mark R. Greene; Joseph W. Boucher; Patricia (Pat) A. Schramm; Edward G. Clarke and Matthew C. Younkle

Excused: 3 -

Peng Her; Scott J. Resnick and John Strasser

2 [31606](#)

Neighborhood Plans

Mr. Greene reviewed his list of items and noted parking should be added to the list. The list is not exhaustive or comprehensive. He suggested if economic development goals are not addressed in a neighborhood plan the EDC may not want to review the plan. If there are economic development goals then the strategies to meet the goals should be included in the neighborhood plan. He envisions this as the start of the dialogue.

Ms. Yessa and Mr. Mikolajewski agreed that there is currently no check list for review of neighborhood plans.

Ms. Selkove said the Planning staff have some of these items are already in plans.

Ms. Stroick said some of the information is easier to harvest than other information, such as demographics, transportation and ridership, and trends. Income data and spending are harder data to harvest. The Economic Development staff interviews businesses and gathers information and observes how businesses are doing. Economic metrics on TIF and Façade Improvement Grants are also available.

Mr. Kennelly said the EDC wants an economic fiscal impact of implementing a plan. This can be done with more effort. Usually the physical aspects of a plan are discussed, not the fiscal impacts.

Mr. Greene asked what is the EDC ultimately concerned about? Is it the revenue impact on the bottom line?

Mr. Kennelly asked if the economic impact is for the city as a whole or the neighborhood? For example, the Hoyt Park Neighborhood Plan includes a major commercial corridor and has regional implications.

Ms. Stone said she has no sense of if residents of a neighborhood and the businesses are working together on a plan.

Mr. Clarke noted:

1. Most neighborhood plans are done by residential neighborhood associations, not the businesses.
2. Economic development is not easy. People do not understand what economic development is. If a residential neighborhood does a plan, then the

EDC needs to have a perspective and template for them to follow. Is this where economic development should be done?

Alder Clear and Mr. Younkle left the meeting at 6:04 p.m. A quorum was still present.

Present: 7 -

Victoria S. Selkove; Julia Stone; Eric E. Steege; Mark R. Greene; Joseph W. Boucher; Patricia (Pat) A. Schramm and Edward G. Clarke

Excused: 5 -

Peng Her; Mark Clear; Matthew C. Younkle; Scott J. Resnick and John Strasser

Mr. Mikolajewski said fiscal considerations are not considered when developing a neighborhood plan.

Chairperson Boucher asked if it is easy to obtain the assessed value of an area.

Ms. Stroick said it is easy to obtain.

Chairperson Boucher asked what is the value when it is ultimately developed?

Mr. Mikolajewski explained a neighborhood plan is adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan. What zoning allows can be changed by applying for a conditional use permit in certain instances.

Ms. Selkove asked if a neighborhood does not want economic development what should the EDC do? What about the economic wellbeing of a neighborhood?

Chairperson Boucher has met with local newspaper writers and asked them why they do not write about the economics of plans or developments. He wants to know what is the difference between projects A and B?

Ms. Selkove noted the broader measure of a neighborhood's economic health may not be tax revenue; rather employment rate, or affordable housing availability.

Mr. Clarke said Madison will grow; the Comprehensive Plan says where it will grow. Some neighborhoods are healthy as is but not the City. How do local impacts affect the broader vision for the City?

Mr. Steege said the Comprehensive Plan and economic expectations could be benchmarked.

Mr. Clarke likes the idea of benchmarking. Could we get the dollar value for implementation of the Comprehensive Plan?

Mr. Steege said then we could then bring this down to the neighborhood level.

Ms. Selkove said this approach could alienate neighborhoods.

Ms. Stone has no problem with neighborhoods doing their own plans. The EDC should not argue with their vision.

Chairperson Boucher says growth in the suburbs exceeds that in Madison. The City and schools need to grow. Look at Milwaukee it is rotting in the middle. Neighborhood plans cannot ignore tax revenues before and after.

Ms. Stroick said the Warner Park neighborhood residents found their market study helped to mold what is feasible in their neighborhood. The Park Street Corridor Plan was divided into segments to create development potential by blocks. Looking at just the possible number of units and square footage would not be helpful.

Mr. Clarke suggested at the April EDC meeting the EDD staff and the Planning staff share their thoughts on the core issues; such as, determining if this is a neighborhood resident plan or a business development plan? The EDC needs to help frame the plans. A big data dump is not necessary.

Ms. Selkove suggested a neighborhood plan review chart be created with the first column listing existing conditions; the second column listing what might change and the third column listing the factors and considerations.

Mr. Steege said to standardize the plans so there is an apples to apples comparison.

Mr. Mikolajewski said in 2016, work on a new comprehensive plan will start.

Ms. Schramm asked if neighborhood boundaries are locked in?

Mr. Clarke said the University Avenue Corridor Plan is a street plan not a neighborhood plan.

3 [33265](#) EDC Committee and Subcommittee Rules of Order

Chairperson Boucher explained this is unique to the EDC. Ms. Yessa said this is not new; just a renewal of past motions.

A motion was made by Mr. Clarke, seconded by Ms. Selkove, to allow the Chairperson of the EDC and any of its subcommittees to participate in discussions, make motions, second motions and vote on all motions.

The motion was passed by voice vote.

4 [17637](#) EDC Chairperson's Report

Chairperson Boucher said he wants to move on from the EDC. He suggested if anyone had names of potential EDC members to submit them to staff.

Ms. Stone said regardless of the number of EDC members currently appointed and serving, the EDC meeting quorum is seven.

5 [21360](#) EDD Director Report

Mr. Oliver could not attend this meeting.

Business Items

6 [27862](#) Introduction of New Items from the Floor

None.

7

[27863](#)

Upcoming Meetings

- April 16, 2014
 - Agenda to include discussion on neighborhood plans.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Clarke, seconded by Boucher, to Adjourn. The motion passed by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m..