



Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development  
**Planning Division**

Website: [www.cityofmadison.com](http://www.cityofmadison.com)

Madison Municipal Building, Suite LL100  
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard  
P.O. Box 2985  
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-2985  
FAX 608 267-8739  
PH 608 266-4635

## MEMORANDUM 4

**TO:** Plan Commission

**FROM:** Planning Division Staff

**DATE:** March 29, 2012

**SUBJECT:** **Committee and Commission Recommendations on the City of Madison draft Downtown Plan (Legistar # 24468).**

[Key 3: Ensure a Quality Urban Environment, Appendix C: Maximum Building Heights-- Bonus Story Criteria, Key 4: Maintain Strong Neighborhoods and Districts, A Call to Action]

The purpose of this memorandum is to convey revisions to the draft *Downtown Plan* recommended by the City boards, commission, and committees to which it was referred (see table below). In an effort to facilitate the Plan Commission's discussion, this memorandum only includes changes to the *Plan* that were recommended by these bodies related to the sections of the *Plan* on tonight's agenda. It does not include general discussion or background information. For instance, the BID Board approved a 13-page report on the *Downtown Plan*, that is available in Legistar, but only those portions with actual recommendations are included in this memo. Complete minutes of each of the referral bodies' meetings are available on Legistar.

BOARD/COMMISSION/COMMITTEE	DATE OF FINAL ACTION
Madison Arts Commission [ARTS]	DEC. 13, 2011
Board of Park Commissioners [PARKS]	DEC. 14, 2011
Landmarks Commission [LANDMARKS]	DEC. 19, 2011
Committee on the Environment [ENVIR]	DEC. 19, 2011
Transit + Parking Commission [TPC]	JAN. 11, 2012
Sustainable Design + Energy Committee [SUSTAIN]	JAN. 23, 2012
Madison Central Business Improvement District (BID) Board [BID]	FEB. 02, 2012
Economic Development Committee [EDC]	FEB. 15, 2012
Downtown Coordinating Committee [DCC]	FEB. 16, 2012
Long Range Transportation Planning Committee [LRTPC]	FEB. 16, 2012
Board of Estimates [BOE]	FEB. 20, 2012
Urban Design Commission [UDC]	FEB. 29, 2012
Pedestrian-Bicycle-Motor Vehicle Commission [PBMVC]	FEB. 29, 2012

This memorandum includes referral body recommendations by section of the *Plan* for only those sections listed on the Plan Commission’s agenda for this meeting and will be discussed time permitting, namely:

- Key 3: Ensure a Quality Urban Environment
- Appendix C: Maximum Building Heights-- Bonus Story Criteria
- Key 4: Maintain Strong Neighborhoods and Districts
- A Call to Action

Recommendations with a **heavy outline** around that row in a table indicates that staff agrees with and supports that particular recommendation.

**KEY 3: ENSURE A QUALITY URBAN ENVIRONMENT** (pages 35-46)

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
35	Obj. 3.1: We support this objective recognizing that the view shed contributes to the visitor perspective and that views are one of our many assets. [DCC]	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE - This is a comment affirming what the plan says.
35	Obj. 3.1: Change the order of the objectives in Key 3 to move Objective 3.1 to be the third objective in Key 3. [EDC]	NO CHANGE – Subsequent objectives build on this one and staff believe they are presented in a logical order.
35	Obj. 3.1: Preserve views of, to and from the Downtown that <del>reflect the natural topography and enhance views of the skyline, Capitol, lakes and other important vistas</del> <u>are on the premier corridors and primary viewsheds. The rest of the views are secondary.</u> [EDC]	NO CHANGE – Staff believe it is important to provide more information as to the reasons for preserving the view corridors.
35	Rec. 35: Recommend flexibility in implementation to achieve the objective and remove the blanket requirement of setbacks and stepbacks so that implementation will balance innovation with the maintenance of the viewshed. [DCC]	NO CHANGE – The recommendation in the plan is a general statement of the kinds of tools available to achieve the objective and does not propose a “blanket requirement of setbacks and stepbacks.”
35	Rec. 36: Recognize that not only are the tops of buildings important, but the street level facades also contribute to the positive experience and are important. [DCC]	NO CHANGE – This recommendation is in the section addressing views and is intended to be a statement about how taller buildings can positively contribute to views of the skyline.
38	Obj. 3.2: “Provide a dynamic and flexible mix of land uses <u>and densities</u> that enable ample opportunities...” [DCC]	SUPPORT

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
39	Delete Rec. 41: <del>Concentrate ground floor commercial uses at mixed use neighborhood nodes identified in this Downtown Plan, rather than dispersing them throughout the area. [BID]</del>	SUPPORT IN PART – It could be clarified that this recommendation is intended to specifically allow commercial uses at defined locations within areas identified as primarily residential on the Generalized Future Land Use Map.
39	Rec. 41: Flexibility should be stated rather than assumed. [DCC]	SUPPORT – See the recommendation in the row above.
41	Obj. 3.3: Provide a <u>flexible</u> framework for building scale that <u>encourages innovation and growth while</u> reflecting the existing or planned character of the area in which a site is located and considers the larger Downtown context. [EDC]	SUPPORT
41	Obj. 3.3: Incorporate language that would designate an area in the Downtown to allow unrestricted building height and to approach the State to ask to exceed the building height limits to allow for greater corporate buildings in the Downtown. [EDC]	NO CHANGE – Staff do not support changing the City’s 45-year-old Capitol View Preservation Ordinance, or the 22-year-old State Statute for an area of unrestricted building height.
41	Rec. 44: Establish maximum building heights as shown on the Maximum Building Heights Map and incorporate them into the Zoning Ordinance to provide variety and reflect and enhance the varied topography of the Downtown. <u>Maximum building heights may be exceeded through the Conditional Use process or the Planned Development District process.</u> [EDC]	SUPPORT IN PART – Although staff believe that establishing maximum building heights can be an effective tool to achieve the objectives outlined in the plan and has been used effectively in the Downtown Design zones, many concerns have been raised about providing flexibility for exceptional projects that exceed the designated height. Staff believe that flexibility to consider these projects would be available through a request to amend the maximum building height map that will be included in the new Zoning Code. However, several commissions have recommended that the PDD (similar to the current PUD) process continue to be available to exceed the maximum building height. Staff believe that the PDD process is a legitimate alternative but notes the lack of predictability and longer development review process that is associated with that approach. Staff recommend that if the PDD process is recommended, that new PDD standards related to building heights could be developed and that the bonus story options be eliminated since they will no longer be necessary. Finally, staff believe that the Conditional Use process should not be available to exceed the maximum building height since that would leave the final decision to the Plan Commission and not the Common Council where staff feels such decisions should be made.

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
41	Rec. 44: The new PPD (old PUD) in the proposed zoning code should allow for the modification of all bulk standards including heights. [UDC]	SUPPORT IN PART – This is covered in the row above.
41	Rec. 45: Staff should further clarify areas where setbacks, stepbacks and/or built-to line requirements are intended [DCC]	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – These requirements have been mapped in the draft zoning maps for the Downtown as part of the Zoning Ordinance rewrite.
41	Rec. 46: Remove and incorporate into Rec. 45. [DCC]	NO CHANGE – These address distinctly different bulk standards and if combined would result in a long recommendation that would be less clear.
43	Consider more ways to activate the street such as, sidewalk width, parallel park and micro parks. [SUSTAIN]	SUPPORT – This could be added to the narrative.
43	The vibrancy of the Capitol Square needs to extend to the outer ring as well with attention to active uses and pedestrian amenities. [UDC]	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – This is specifically addressed on page 86 of the plan.
43	Obj. 3.4: Continue a comprehensive “complete streets’ streetscape design approach for Downtown streets to reflect their place in the community and ensure that they are beautiful, interesting, engaging, functional, safe, and comfortable public spaces. [EDC]	SUPPORT
43	Rec. 48: <del>Enhance the special character of West Washington Avenue, including the preservation of wide terraces with mature canopy trees. Incorporate both sides of West Washington Avenue into a Mifflin special area study and consider creation of a boulevard on W. Washington Avenue.</del> [EDC]	NO CHANGE – The point of this recommendation is to be specific about keeping the wide terraces and canopy trees and not creating a boulevard that would require the reduction of the terraces, removal of street parking, or preclude creation of marked bicycle lanes as recommended elsewhere in the plan.
45	Add Rec.: <u>Carefully consider the type and placement of street trees on retail streets so as not to obstruct store entrances or visibility of storefronts or signage.</u> [BID]	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff support this in concept, but believe some qualifiers would be appropriate (such as “unduly” obstruct the visibility of storefronts or signage) to emphasize that street trees are important and the approach needs to balance competing needs, but that not having street trees is not an option.
45	Recommendation 52 and 54 - Add retail signage considerations as a factor influencing placement of street trees. [DCC]	SUPPORT – This is covered in the row above.
45	Rec. 55: Consider developing a soil standard for street trees so that they are more protected. [SUSTAIN]	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – This is a specific implementation recommendation.

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
45	The plan at minimum recommends that the City develop an urban forest plan for the downtown area including the square. [UDC]	SUPPORT IN PART – While staff agree that an urban forest plan could be developed, the Capitol grounds and adjacent street trees are under the jurisdiction of the State.
Gen'l.	Add a new Rec.: <u>Position downtown as quality urban and retail environment by expanding, and maintaining a standard of excellence for downtown safety, cleaning, maintenance, snow removal, and landscaping.</u> [BID]	NO CHANGE – This is a specific operational recommendation. (note: this was originally in key 2, but moved to key 3)

**APPENDIX C: MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHTS-- BONUS STORY CRITERIA** (pages 127-130)

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
<p><i>Note: There are recommendations in the preceding table that would allow the PDD process to be able to be used to exceed the maximum building height. If that recommendation is incorporated into the Downtown Plan, staff believe that bonus stories are a moot point and recommend that Appendix C be deleted from the plan. If this change is not endorsed, the following recommendations should be considered.</i></p>		
127	There was a question about if the removal of the word “local” in the last paragraph would disallow bonus stories in D/E/F. [LANDMARKS]	SUPPORT IN PART – This could be clarified that this is intended to be a general statement and not an absolute, but staff feel that the word “local” should remain.
130	Remove bonus area G (Lamp House) from the Downtown Plan. [LANDMARKS]	SUPPORT
Gen'l.	Regarding bonus stories the UDC believes that more criteria for awarding them need to be developed than those presently in the plan. The quality of material and superior design should be included, as well as transportation contributions (not just parking, but also for example. TDM, Community Car, etc. though parking off urban lanes to eliminate driveways would be good ), added urban amenities, as well as preservation solutions for historic structures should all qualify for the decision on bonus stories, with a threshold of some number of the criteria achieved for awarding the bonus. [UDC]	NO CHANGE – Staff attempted to develop bonus story criteria that would relate primarily to mitigating the impacts of the additional building height on the surrounding areas. Staff do not believe that it is appropriate to use additional building height as a generic incentive used to promote a wide range of policy objectives.

**KEY 4: MAINTAIN STRONG NEIGHBORHOODS AND DISTRICTS** (pages 47-60)

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
48	Second paragraph: Add “cultural” to entertainment... [ARTS]	SUPPORT
49	Rec.56: Reserve street frontages around Capitol Square, and on King Street, South Pinckney Street, East Wilson Street, and the 100 blocks of West and East Main Streets for non-residential uses on the ground floor, focusing on retail, <u>cultural</u> , and entertainment uses. [ARTS]	SUPPORT
49	Recommendation 56: <del>Reserve</del> <u>Encourage non-residential uses, focusing on retail and entertainment uses, on the ground floor of</u> street frontages around Capitol Square, and on King Street, South Pinckney Street, East Wilson Street, and the 100 blocks of West and East Main Streets. <del>for non-residential uses on the ground floor, focusing on retail and entertainment uses.</del> [BID]	SUPPORT – Note that staff prefers leaving the “focusing on retail, cultural, and entertainment uses” as the closing phrase of the sentence as shown in the row above.
49	Rec. 59: Update the Urban Design Guidelines for Downtown Madison that currently apply to portions of the Downtown Core <u>to encourage creativity and flexibility and architectural quality</u> and incorporate them into the Zoning Ordinance. [EDC]	SUPPORT
49	Rec. 61: Preserve “triangle (flatiron) blocks” at the corners of Capitol Square including flat-iron building <u>forms</u> for smaller-scale, active urban uses, such as entertainment, restaurants, shopping and cultural activities. [EDC]	SUPPORT
49	Recommendation 61: <del>Preserve</del> <u>Encourage smaller scale, active urban uses, such as entertainment, restaurants, shopping and cultural activities, for</u> “triangle (flatiron) blocks” at the corners of Capitol Square including flat iron buildings <del>for smaller-scale, active urban uses, such as entertainment, restaurants, shopping and cultural activities.</del> [BID]	SUPPORT
49	Rec. 62: Preserve and rehabilitate landmarks, <del>potential landmarks, and other significant older structures, including flat iron buildings.</del> [EDC]	SUPPORT IN PART – NO CHANGE – Staff suggest that this recommendation remain unchanged at this time. However, if the Downtown Preservation Plan is updated as was recommended during the Key 7 discussion, this recommendation should be changed if necessary to reflect the recommendations of that plan.

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
50	<p>While this section rightly celebrates State Street as a premier street, lively, and vibrant, it a) does not recognize the economic fragility of businesses with an insufficient, unstable market that lacks enough residents and workers with enough disposable income, and b) places too much emphasis on keeping things the same, with an unhealthy concentration of very small commercial spaces. <i>[BID]</i></p>	<p>NO CHANGE – The plan provides the capacity for 4,000-5,000 new dwelling units and 4-5 million sq. ft. of new commercial space accommodating thousands of new residents and workers. Rec. 24 supports retail uses “requiring relatively larger floor areas” within the Downtown, which the plan accommodates in the State Street area (see paragraph 2, sentence 2). However, staff believe that the collection of smaller floor plates along State Street is a major contributor to its uniqueness and should be retained. As the city’s premier street, its vibrancy also depends on attracting users who are not Downtown residents or workers and its mix of smaller specialty establishments is an important part of State Street’s attractiveness to a wider market.</p>
50	<p>Without more density of resident and worker customers with disposable income, and the ability to have larger commercial spaces, downtown cannot generate enough revenue to maintain State Street businesses and infrastructure at a high level, or to support expensive historic preservation or rehab of functionally obsolescent commercial spaces. <i>[BID]</i></p>	<p>NO CHANGE – See the recommendation in the row above.</p>
50	<p>As recognized in the 1999 State Street Strategic Plan, “State Street is a highly dynamic district.” It must be encouraged and allowed to evolve just as retail, uses and users evolve. State Streets current character was not its original character, and the street has not always consisted of only small, narrow commercial spaces. For example, if a Downtown Plan had been written in 1952 with the aim of keeping the commercial spaces and choices the same, it would need to encourage retention of large spaces for auto supply stores, a farm store, a gas/service station, paint stores, and “big box” stores (department stores were the original big boxes- everything under one roof). <i>[BID]</i></p>	<p>NO CHANGE – Staff believe that the plan will allow State Street to continue to evolve.</p>

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
50	<p>Objective 4.2. <u>As a premier Madison destination, the State Street district should continue to encourage a vibrant, diverse, dynamic mix of uses and users, a human scale and unique sense of place, and evolution as a shopping, dining, entertainment and cultural destination. existing character should be supported, with no major changes to the street's function or scale envisioned. Ground floor spaces should be reserved for retail and eating/drinking establishments while additional office uses on upper floors should be considered. Many of the buildings are historic or architecturally significant and should be retained. [BID]</u></p>	<p>SUPPORT IN PART – Staff agree with the proposed new language, but recommend that it be merged with portions of the original recommendation that: 1) the existing character should be supported, with no major changes to the street's function or scale envisioned, 2) ground floor spaces should be reserved for the uses identified, 3) that additional office uses on upper floors should be considered, and 4) that historic or architecturally significant buildings should be retained.</p>
50	<p>Obj. 4.2: As a premier Madison destination, the State Street district should continue to encourage a vibrant, diverse, eclectic dynamic mix of uses and users, a human scale and unique sense of place, and evolution as a shopping, dining, entertainment and cultural destination that links Madison's heritage with Madison's future. [EDC]</p>	<p>NO CHANGE – See the recommendation in the row above.</p>
50	<p>Rec. 64: Support the retention, <u>expansion</u>, and establishment of <u>a mix of locally owned, regional, national, and international small businesses; with a flexible range of business sizes including destination retail. [BID]</u></p>	<p>SUPPORT IN PART – Staff agree with providing for the establishment and expansion of locally owned businesses, as well as their retention, but believe support for local businesses merits a stand-alone recommendation. Staff recommend that an additional recommendation be crafted addressing the desirability of including non-local businesses in the retail mix.</p>
50	<p>Rec. 65: <u>Support property owners who wish to Preserve and rehabilitate significant older structures, including flat iron buildings, especially through programs that make this economically feasible and that provide flexibility for innovative, adaptive re-use. [BID]</u></p>	<p>NO CHANGE – Staff do not believe that programs are necessarily needed in all cases, nor do staff feel that flexibility is something that necessarily needs to be highlighted regarding the preservation of existing buildings.</p>
51	<p>Obj. 4.3: <u>The Mifflin District is an area that offers the opportunity for significant growth in downtown Madison. Because of its proximity to UW-Madison, State Street, government, and cultural amenities, it can evolve into a multi-use district that consists of residential and commercial/employment uses that allow for a dense, dynamic, urban district. [EDC]</u></p>	<p>SUPPORT IN PART – Staff believe that this objective could be rewritten to capture the essence of the EDC recommendation, but be phrased more as an objective and less as a rationale.</p>
51	<p>Rec. 66: <u>Develop a special area plan to provide more detail on the types of development and economic opportunities for the Mifflin district, including a marketing plan. [EDC]</u></p>	<p>SUPPORT IN PART – Staff believe that once a firm direction is established for the Mifflin district that a more detailed implementation strategy should be developed, which may or may not include a marketing plan.</p>

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
51	Rec. 68: Establish this area as pedestrian friendly. <i>[EDC]</i>	SUPPORT IN PART – NO CHANGE - Staff believe that the plan promotes making all portions of the Downtown pedestrian friendly and this recommendation is not necessary. The affect of the EDC recommendation is to take out the specific recommendation to establish the urban lane.
51	Rec. 69: <del>Prioritize</del> <u>Encourage</u> the redevelopment of 1960s era “zero lot line” residential <del>sites</del> <u>uses</u> . <i>[EDC]</i>	NO CHANGE – Regardless of the future direction of the Mifflin district, staff believe that these developments present opportunities and should actively pursued.
51	The UDC recommended adoption of version 3 for the Mifflin area that was presented at the meeting with the following changes: remove the urban lane and include the concept for the West Washington Avenue frontage shown in version 2 as described in the Letter of Transmittal (dated November 15, 2011) <i>[UDC]</i>	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff can support the UDC’s alternative recommendation to seek large-scale redevelopment of the Mifflin area, but recommends the treatment of West Washington Ave. as presented in the plan be retained. Staff further recommend that if the UDC’s alternative is recommended that the maximum building height along Mifflin Street be 6-stories.
51	The UDC viewed that there were two parts to the area labeled Mifflin that needed separate consideration. <i>[UDC]</i>	SUPPORT – Staff recommend that this be clarified that this references the West Washington Ave. frontage and the area north of that to Dayton Street as the two parts.
51	An additional design zone needs to be established for West Washington with criteria discussed as follows: Mixed use which is the present pattern of the blocks on West Washington Avenue should continue. <i>[UDC]</i>	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff agree that mixed-use structures with residential uses on upper floors could be appropriate along with purely residential buildings, and that building form standards be included in the zoning requirements for this area, similar to the current C4 district that includes different standards for different streets.
51	The UDC believes regarding the rest of the Mifflin District that mixed use is a better characterization of the future of the district. <i>[UDC]</i>	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff recommend language such as: “The Mifflin district will evolve a strong, but more-urban sense of place by introducing significant opportunities for new mixed-use development, with residential use as a component of mixed-use buildings that will provide a wide variety of housing options attractive to a broader mix of residents. This approach proposes that much of the area be redeveloped over time with a combination of larger footprint buildings of up to six stories in height, smaller multi-family buildings, townhouses, and two-and three-flat buildings.”
51	Staff discussed the warehouse/loft form as a concept to be incorporated into the third alternative such form was used in the recent successful Depot project and that mixed use projects might be most successful at the cross streets. <i>[UDC]</i>	SUPPORT

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
51	Heights of 6-8 stories were discussed by UDC as suitable. <i>[UDC]</i>	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff believe that 4 stories along West Washington Ave. and 6 stories north of that would be appropriate heights to achieve the vision described.
51	Another factor to be encouraged in a redeveloped Mifflin is broadened terraces for more successful large shade trees. Making streets such as Basset more of a boulevard with wide terraces could increase the urban green space. <i>[UDC]</i>	SUPPORT – Staff agree with this recommendation, but suggest clarification that the term “boulevard” does not mean a median-- which staff would not support.
51	Mid-block alleys or urban lanes with pedestrian alternatives can also relocate driveways from street frontages increasing the urban green aspect of the area that redevelop in a greater density. <i>[UDC]</i>	SUPPORT
51	The city should explore ways to have Bedford, Bassett, and Broom be enhance pedestrian linkages with urban amenities and green space. For the present plan this could be incorporated with a policy statement with further development in the transportation planning efforts. <i>[UDC]</i>	SUPPORT
53	Obj. 4.4: The Bassett Neighborhood should continue its predominately residential nature, with an evolving mix of new higher-density buildings carefully integrated with existing older structures that are compatible in scale and character. <del>Limited</del> Neighborhood-serving commercial uses in mixed-use developments would be appropriate at specific locations, such as the intersection of West Main and Bassett Streets. <i>[EDC]</i>	SUPPORT
53	Rec. 70: <del>Consider establishing a Neighborhood Conservation District as identified in the Downtown Historic Preservation Plan.</del> <i>[EDC]</i>	NO CHANGE – Staff believe that a neighborhood conservation district remains a potentially viable tool to help ensure the Bassett neighborhood evolves while retaining its essential character as described in the Downtown Plan and Bassett Neighborhood Plan.
54	Rec. 75: add the word “mixed-use “ in the text to be consistent with the language in the recommendation. <i>[DCC]</i>	SUPPORT

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
55	Obj. 4.7: The Tobacco Warehouse District should continue its revitalization as a residential and <u>corporate</u> office area blending new buildings and restoration of historic structures. Future emphasis should be on strengthening connections to surrounding areas and enhancing the streetscape and open space. [EDC]	NO CHANGE – While corporate offices would certainly be welcomed, staff feel that distinguishing between the type of office users in this manner could limit the area’s potential growth as a center for smaller office users.
57	New Rec.: <u>Develop a special area plan to provide more detail on the types of development and economic opportunities for the Langdon area, including a marketing plan.</u> [EDC]	SUPPORT IN PART – Although staff believe that a specific study of the real estate dynamics of the area could be conducted, staff feel that the recommendations in the Downtown Plan adequately address future development. Also, while staff do not oppose the development of a marketing plan, staff feel this should be initiated by property owners in the area and should not be the role of the City and nor be a directive in the Downtown Plan.
57	Obj. 4.9: Mansion Hill’s historic character is a major asset and establishing a “complete historic district experience” of restored buildings, distinctive streetscape amenities, and a limited amount of new residential development that preserves and reflects these historic attributes should be pursued. The large historic homes provide a diversity of housing opportunities for executives, families, and students. <u>Encourage sustainable rehabilitation of existing housing stock and period architecture and owner occupancy.</u> [EDC]	SUPPORT
57	New Rec.: <u>Urge update of Mansion Hill Plan.</u> [LANDMARKS]	SUPPORT IN PART – The process for creating a new Mansion Hill Neighborhood Plan was started in 2001, but for several reasons (including but not limited to staff resources devoted to the Downtown Plan and other projects) has not been completed. Due to the elapsed time and the recommendations contained in this plan, staff feel that a new planning effort could be started at a future time. Such an effort needs to be inclusive of all property owners, residents, and businesses.

**A CALL TO ACTION** (pages 109-116)

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
115	New Rec. (under Key 8): <u>The city should adopt the Cultural Plan as an implementation step in the Downtown Plan.</u> [ARTS]	NO CHANGE – A draft Cultural Plan is in the adoption process.

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Gen'l.	Consider moving this section to the beginning of the document or as a separate piece. <i>[SUSTAIN]</i>	NO CHANGE – Staff feel that if this section was at the beginning of the document the recommendations would not make sense since all of the supporting explanation would occur after this section.
Gen'l.	At the end of the plan – there should be a more complete summary or chart listing all recommendations and who would work on them – consider listing the Common Council of the recommendation requires a policy adoption. <i>[SUSTAIN]</i>	NO CHANGE – The intent of this section is to highlight the more complex recommendations that can be major undertakings and will require project-specific follow-up planning efforts to refine the vision and develop detailed implementation plans. If all recommendations were listed, this section could almost double the length of the document.
Gen'l.	The Call to Action incorporate every recommendation in the Plan, and that each action item identify the City AND private sector resources/partners needed to achieve success. <i>[DCC]</i>	NO CHANGE – See the recommendation in the row above.