

# CAPITOL

NEIGHBORHOODS, INC.  
MADISON, WISCONSIN

April 13, 2011

Mr. Doug Nelson, Chair  
City of Madison Economic Development Committee  
Madison Municipal Building  
P.O. Box 2983  
Madison, WI 53701

Re: Economic Development Committee

Development Process Improvement Initiative – Report February 16, 2011 (Redline version with commission, committee and board amendments)

Dear Mr. Nelson,

We have had an opportunity to review the latest version of the report. There have been a number of changes which we feel enhance the report and will make the recommendations more effective. We are in support of the amendments proposed by the Landmarks Commission, Urban Design Commission and the Plan Commission and urge the EDC to adopt these amendments.

We have prepared some brief comments for the items which appear in the matrix prepared by staff as well as a couple of small editorial suggestions.

**The Case for Improvement:** Staff has drafted a new introductory section which we believe is an improvement over the prior version and we urge you to adopt it.

**Development Approval Process Flow Charts – page 15**

As we have noted previously the graphics suggest that the pre-application phase is included within these timeframes. This is not reflective of reality as obviously project development, let alone neighborhood engagement, doesn't occur within these time frames. A change to shift the "Timeline" statements so that they do not extend over the Pre-Application phase is recommended to insure that readers are properly informed.

**Footnote 14 on page 19:** The footnote is in reference to examples of standardized processes for review which have been adopted by Neighborhood Associations. Appendices I & J to two neighborhood

information forms not to a process. CNI has a written and tested review process which could provide a basis for this goal.

<http://capitolneighborhoods.org/pdf/cni-protocol-%20adopted%20chapter%20breaks%20proof.pdf>

**Goal B.3 (p.21)** In the paragraph under the goal the first word should be changed to 'Encourage' to remain consistent with the change made in the wording of the goal.

**Goal F.1 (p. 29)** We do not believe that there are overlapping jurisdictions within the commissions as each has different ordinance standards for review and brings different expertise to their review. As we've stated before we believe this goal should be deleted. As an alternative we suggest that the goal could be changed to direct staff to review the authorities of the various commissions for possible overlaps where the commissions are implementing the same standard.

**Goal F.2 (p.29)** We agree with all of the commissions who have reviewed the document that this goal should be deleted.

**Goals G.7.e, G.8.e & G.9.a (p. 31-33)** The changes to these goals adopted by the Plan Commission are appropriate and should be retained. Specifically regarding sub item iv. the single referral should be seen as a goal and not as an absolute.

**Goal G.10 (p. 33)** We agree with the commissions which believe that this goal should be deleted. Arbitrarily limiting all commissions to a single referral or referral only at the request of the applicant will not produce an efficient process.

**Goal K.2 (p.38)** The rewording of the third paragraph prepared by staff is appropriate.

Thank you for your consideration,

Development Review Oversight Committee

Capitol Neighborhoods

Peter Ostlind – Chair

Ledell Zellers

Bert Stitt

Scott Kolar

Tom Geier

Erik Paulson

Joe Schnick

Brenda Konkel

Adam Plotkin

Fred Mohs

Bill Patterson

Peggy LeMahieu