

Additional Comprehensive Plan Generalized Future Land Use Map Comments Received Since March 9, 2017

Marquette Neighborhood: Statement from Linda Lehnertz

Marquette Neighborhood: Email from Lauren Azar

Marquette Neighborhood: Email from Jody Whelden

Marquette Neighborhood: Email from Mike Soref

Marquette Neighborhood: Email from Nancy Rogge

Marquette Neighborhood: Statement from David Mollenhoff

Marquette Neighborhood: Email from Sharon Kilfoy

Bay Creek Neighborhood: Email from Carrie Rothburd

The Marquette neighborhood has been accepting of density increases. The 2010 census reflects a total of 863 housing units in Census Block 3 (essentially from the bike path to Ingersoll to the lake). Of the 817 occupied units, 204 were owner-occupied and 613 were rentals. Since 2010, about 275 units have been added (all rentals, including those that will open in 2018) on Williamson and within ½ block of Williamson on the side streets. This is an overall increase in density of 31%, and a 45% increase in rental units, since 2010. From 2003 to 2010, 161 units were added (about 39% condos and about 57% rentals). A rough comparison from 2003 to today reflects *approximately a 62% increase in density*.

The neighborhood is not concerned with density in and of itself, except for the impact it has on affordable housing. Less density could result in more 2-bedroom, and even 3-bedroom, units for families.

The concern with density in residential areas is due to an expansion of the types of building forms permitted, building forms inappropriate to an old neighborhood with houses on small lots. For example, LMR allows for small multi-family buildings (it is unclear as to what “small” means, especially since CMU can include such buildings, but the Zoning Code defines this as 4-8 units) and even allows for large multi-family buildings and courtyard buildings as conditional uses. LR allows for a small multi-family as a conditional use, but does not allow large multi-family and courtyard buildings. Thus, density, and whether an area is LR, LMR or MR, becomes important in order for an area to remain in a less dense category and avoid the possibility of building forms that could destroy the look and feel of the neighborhood.

Density in the commercial areas, primarily Williamson Street, is also important because of the building forms – primarily the increase in height. Although the FLU designations do not control the actual height, zoning designations have such control, the FLU heights will almost certainly indicate to developers the potential height for a conditional use request.

The table provided in the March 9th compilation of map change requests, page 20, is illustrative for purposes other than density.

Projects cited in the compilation as examples of higher densities (with zoning changes and more details regarding heights)

- 301 S Livingston, 2006, ordinance change from C2 to PUD
2-4 stories per Planning but assessor commercial property record states 2-3 stories, located on bike path
- 310 S Livingston (was 306), 2011, ordinance change, from C2 to PUD
4-5 stories, 5th story has a significant setback, on bike path
- 704 Williamson, 2014, conditional use
6 stories (a 7th story was added as a minor modification), absolutely no explanation
- 730 Williamson, 2016, ordinance change, from TSS to PD

4-5 stories, the 4 story building along Williamson is the original Olds Building, the 5 story building is along the bike path
739 Williamson, 2016, ordinance change, from TR-V1 to PD
4 stories (actually 3 ½ stories since set into hillside), and included renovation of a home built in 1984
3-4 stories, 808 Williamson, built in 2006, PD
3 stories along Williamson, 4th story has a significant setback
3-4 stories, 820 Williamson, built in 2004, PD
3 stories along Williamson, 4th story has a significant setback
3-4 stories, 902 Williamson, 2014, TSS, conditional use
3 stories along Williamson, 4th story has significant setback
3-4 stories, 1115 E Wilson (301 S Ingersoll), 2006, ordinance change from M1 to PD
Along E Wilson/ bike path, not part of historic district
3 stories, 320 S Baldwin, 2009, ordinance change from C2 and R4 to PD

All of these projects were approved as conditional uses or as Planned Developments. Should conditional uses and Planned Developments be the standard by which a FLU map designation is determined?

With respect to height, the Williamson Street frontage has generally been respected with a 3-story front façade and any 4th story is stepped-back – except for one aberration, 704 Williamson. The taller buildings in the table are outside of the historic district – they are along the bike path/E. Wilson.

If the Plan Commission believes that 3-4 stories are appropriate along Williamson, then it does not make sense to potentially allow 5 or 6 story buildings, at least in the 800-1500 blocks. The 3-4 stories are much more compatible with BUILD II and with City ordinances that require new structures in historic districts be “visually compatible.” And this could be easily accomplished by using NMU rather than CMU. NMU rather than CMU for commercial, and LMR rather than MR for residential, fit the neighborhood as it is, but also allow for future growth that is in keeping with neighborhood character.

As stated in *Isthmus 2020 Committee Report, A Guidebook for a Model Isthmus*: “... development in Isthmus Neighborhoods should complement, reinforce, and restore existing traditional neighborhood features” and planning “for neighborhoods should be focused on neighborhood character more than simply seeking a higher density.”

Specific Map Change Requests

The neighborhood appreciates Planning’s review of neighborhood proposals and its willingness to support some of those proposals. The remainder of this document addresses proposals that have not already received Planning support.

600-700 Williamson (north)

Staff comments

- * While this area was not specifically discussed in detailed comments received from Marquette residents, note that BUILD II places most of these blocks in "Zone IV," which allows up to seven floor buildings if certain conditions are met. So long as the Plan Commission agrees, staff will include language in the Comp Plan specifying that Comp Plan building form standards are not meant to reduce recommended building heights included in more specific adopted neighborhood plans.

Rebuttal

Not so. BUILD II limits the front of the 600 block to 3 stories to preserve the Capitol view. Further, the Downtown Plan, adopted by the Council effective 7/23/2012 as a supplement to the Comprehensive Plan, identifies the Capitol view from the 700 block of Jenifer Street as a view to be protected: "taller buildings on some sites within priority viewsheds (such as those at lower elevations) may not diminish important views and viewshed studies should be prepared to evaluate their impact."

The back half of the 600 block and the back half (along the bike path) of the 700 block are Zone IV under BUILD II. The maximum height is 7 stories/85 feet, whichever is less. (As a reference, the 706 Williamson project was approved by the Plan Commission at 75 feet in height, or an average of 12.5 feet/story.) It is possible, but unlikely, that 7 stories could be built without exceeding 85 feet in height. And this is only an issue for the small back-half of the 600 block – the 700 block has a landmarked property, a new residential building, and a relatively new residence building. These uses are not going to change in the next 10-20 years.

The front half of the 700 block north along Williamson is Zone III under BUILD II. The maximum height is the lesser of 5 stories/54 feet.

800 and 900 Williamson (north), front half only.

Staff Comments

1. Staff agrees that this area should remain CMU. Note that the MNA recommendation cites the Williamson Street BUILD Plan II (BUILD II) as allowing flat-roofed three story buildings for the area. This recommendation is limited to the Williamson Street frontage. The plan also recommends four story buildings for the back of the block, if affordable housing or structured parking is part of the project.
3. BUILD II recommends 3-4 story buildings in this area, which is well within the CMU range. This block is similar in nature to the 800 block immediately to the west, in terms of both the surrounding context and the types of existing buildings on the block. The 600 through 900 blocks between Williamson and Wilson are a prominent place within the community, on par with other CMU areas within the city, like the Atwood/Winnebago area. They are also four contiguous full block areas surrounded by right-of-way, which lessens the impact of redevelopment on surrounding residential uses. Within the overall context of the Generalized FLU map and how categories are assigned, CMU tends to be used for larger contiguous areas, while NMU is more often used for smaller areas and/or areas that back up directly to the LR use.

Rebuttal

Staff correctly references BUILD II, except 4 story buildings at the back of the block are to be stepped back such that the 4th story cannot be seen at sidewalk level from the opposite side of the street (and there are minimum setbacks specified).

Neighborhood comments were focused on the front half of the block, not the back half.

The Comprehensive Plan, including the map, needs to be consistent with neighborhood plans. See the *Process for Considering Limited Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan*, prepared by the Planning Division, adopted by the Plan Commission in 2011.

CMU height of up to 6 stories greatly exceeds BUILD II standards (3 stories on the front half) and is not consistent with the neighborhood plan. NMU, at up to 4 stories, although exceeding BUILD II, would harmonize with the plan.

The front half of Williamson is part of the historic district. The staff recommendations, page 21, discuss how the map "is not, and should not be, the main tool for implementing preservation policy. Extending the FLU map to try to fully implement preservation ordinances and plans stretches it beyond its broader purpose." This is true, to some extent. But the neighborhood is not asking for the map to fully implement preservation ordinances: it is only asking that the map be comparable to reality. Why should the FLU map have 6 stories as a possibility when 6 stories is not "visually compatible" with surrounding historic resources (which, at most, are 3 stories, except for the Olds Building)? Whether 4 stories of NMU is visually compatible can also be a question, a question that the map cannot resolve. But at least 4 stories is significantly closer to what might be deemed visually compatible.

Further, the differences between NMU and CMU designations relate to density/height rather than use.

- The building forms are the same, except (1) a podium building is not allowed in NMU, and (2) a residential/commercial conversion is not allowed in CMU.
- The purposes between the two mixed-use districts are blurred. NMU is defined under the current Comprehensive Plan as "clusters of relatively small convenience shopping and service uses that serve as activity centers and gathering places for the surrounding neighborhoods or districts." CMU is defined as "a relatively high-density mix of residential, retail, office, institutional and civic uses in a compact urban setting ... and are intended to include a much wider range of non-residential activities."
- NMU and CMU are primarily defined by density/height, not by use. The first 4+ blocks of Monroe Street are NMU. Yet that area has many businesses that attract more than the surrounding neighborhoods (e.g., Orange Tree, Trader Joe's).
- The 800 block has residences (about half of the street front), a local bar and a fence company. These uses are primarily local uses, not uses of the wider community. (Yes, the fence company serves the wider community but does not get a substantial number of visits from that wider community.)
- Both NMU and CMU can be zoned TSS.

Although the BUILD II 3 stories on the front half of the block is well within the CMU range, it is also within the NMU range. Developers are likely to see the Comprehensive Plan maximum heights as the height they may seek with a conditional use request.

The 600-900 blocks are not a prominent place within the community. Unlike Atwood/Winnebago, there are not a series of attractions, such as a lot of small shops and small eateries and a theater. What has been developed is residential, some with first floor commercial uses that are morphing into huge restaurant/bar spaces.

Residential area 600-1400 blocks, south of Williamson

Staff Comments

6. Staff agrees that this area should remain LMR. The map note mentioned by MNA has been included on the FLU map since the original draft was released in April 2017.

Rebuttal

The draft map dated 2/1/2018 reflects a line drawn at the 1000 block. West of the line is the note number 4 designation: "The "house-like" residential character of this LMR area should be retained, and any limited redevelopment should generally maintain the current single-family/two flat/three flat development pattern."

East of that line there is not a number 4 designation. The neighborhood strongly believes that any area designated LMR, whether north or south of Williamson, should have the note #4 designation.

The current Comprehensive plan states:

The Medium-Density designation is also applied to portions of some established neighborhoods that are composed primarily of "house-like" residential buildings, although there may also be a scattering of apartment buildings. In these areas, the medium-density designation reflects the large number of houses that were originally built as multi-unit, duplex, two-flat, or three-flat structures, or have subsequently been converted to contain several dwelling units. In these situations, it is recommended that these areas continue to maintain the "house-like" character, and the designation is not intended to encourage further conversion or replacement of existing housing with apartment-style buildings, except as may be specifically recommended in an adopted neighborhood or special area plan.

900-1100 blocks Williamson (north), front half

Staff Comments:

7. This area was HDR in the 2006 plan, which was adopted after the 2004 BUILD II plan (and well after the Third Lake Ridge Historic District was created in 1979). The HDR designation in 2006 would seem to indicate that there was a desire to redevelop the area given that existing conditions for parcels fronting Williamson did not fit within the HDR category. The existing conditions for portions of this area do fit the standards for the new LMR category if the Commission's goal is to reduce the likelihood of a redevelopment project being proposed in this

area. The south side of the 900 block (letter A on the map) is comprised mainly of one- and two-unit homes and could be changed to LMR. The south side of the 1000 block (B) contains some more intense development, such as the Third Lake Ridge condominiums (20 units in a 3.5 story building), along with several mixed-use buildings (Nature's Bakery at 1019, Tellurian at 1051). Some existing structures on this block fit better within LMR and some within MR. It has been staff's goal to keep the FLU map general and not map individual parcels, so the Commission would need to discuss whether maintaining MR or changing to LMR is most appropriate for this block. The south side of the 1100 block (C), the west half the north side of the 1100 block (D), and the north side of the 1000 block (E) of Williamson are all similar to the 900 block in terms of current building form and could be changed to LMR if the Commission's desire is to reflect existing conditions. It may be appropriate to extend NMU further to the west on the north side of the 1100 block (F) due to the commercial and mixed-use buildings existing on the block.

Rebuttal

The neighborhood did not have any idea that HDR meant redevelopment in connection with the 2006 Comprehensive Plan. These blocks are part of the historic district and the intent was always to maintain them as residences, or small redevelopments, as evidenced by BUILD II which has a maximum 2 ½ story height. Any redevelopment would require Landmark approval of the demolition(s), and Landmarks would need to weigh in on the proposed structure.

In general, much of these blocks consist of single family, two-units and several three-units and 4-units. Single family, two-units and three-units are not permissible buildings forms in the Medium Residential district. Overall, the density is approximately 20 units/acre.

Block "A" contains 15 lots: 11 zoned TR-V2, 1 zoned PD, and 2 zoned TSS. The PD property was designated PD when an old house was moved and placed in the back yard. The two properties zoned TSS are one-story homes converted to commercial use (a restaurant and a glass studio). Density is under 17 units/acre.

Block "B" contains 9 lots: 4 zoned TR-V2, 4 zoned PD, and one zoned TSS. The TSS property is the location of Nature's Bakery, built in 1914 as a commercial building and residence. The four PD properties are: (1) two buildings on one lot, a Commonwealth tax-exempt property; (2) an infill project rehabbing two homes and adding two carriage house residential properties in the back; (3) a 20-unit condo project, which is a 3-story project (not 3.5 stories) designed to appear as a 2 ½-story project; and, (4) a property with 15 single-rooms, a Tellurian tax-exempt property. Density is 36 units/acre. Without the 15-bed Tellurian facility, density would be 26 units/acre. The neighborhood should not be adversely impacted by supporting uses such as half-way houses. Further, Block "C" should be changed to LMR and it would be odd to have one block in the middle bumped up to a higher density level.

Block "C" contains 18 lots: 5 zoned TSS and 13 zoned TR-V2. The 5 TSS lots are: (1) a one-story coffee shop; (2) a one-story association for the deaf; (3) a long-standing theater, one-story and set back such that it is not really visible from the street; (4) a restaurant in a converted house; and, (5) a residential home with 2 units. Density is 13.7 units/acre.

Block "D" and Block "F" (the entire north 1100 block) has 11 lots: 5 zoned TR-V2, 3 zoned PD, and 3 zoned TSS. The PD lots are: (1) two lots owned by Commonwealth that are two-story

homes and are tax exempt; and, (2) a condo building with 8 units, including two (maybe one) commercial, built in approximately 1999. The TSS lots are: (1) a gas station; (2) a small first floor restaurant and two residential units in a building built in 1889; and a realty business and one residential unit in a building built in 1905. Other than the gas station, the block is residential with a few first-floor low intensity business uses. Density is 13.7 units/acre.

Block "E" has 16 lots: 3 zoned TSS and 13 zoned TR-V2. The TSS lots are: (1) a 1-story pet store; and, (2) 2 lots, the front lot being a house with a first floor vet and 2 residential units above, with another building in the back and is a 2-unit residential property. Density is 19 units/acre.

Schley Pass-Dewey Court- East Wilson

Staff comments:

10. The housing mix in this area ranges from small-lot single-family up to the 9-unit Port St. Vincent de Paul building, with some two- and three- unit buildings. The small area of MR at the corner of Wilson and Few is to reflect the multifamily buildings that exist there today (and also includes a metal shed and one story cinderblock and brick building). Changing a 2006 LDR area to 2018 LMR is not a statement reflecting preservation status, or a statement that redevelopment is expected/encouraged, or a statement about housing affordability, but rather reflects a review of 2006 LDR and MDR areas for inclusion in the new LMR category. The TR-C4 zoning of the area allows for one-, two-, and three unit housing, and can be appropriate to implement either the LR or LMR categories. The East Rail Corridor Plan (2004), with some additional Council recommendations adopted in January 2005, does recommend a neighborhood conservation district be established for this area, but the neighborhood conservation district study completed in 2011 did not result in its creation (see Legistar 22456). In any case the LMR designation is appropriate for the existing density range and housing mix in this area.

Rebuttal: Medium Residential at the corner of Few and East Wilson:

9 lots: 5 TR-C4, single family; 2 TSS (1 1-story office and 1 1-story shop); 2 TR-U1 (2 10-unit affordable housing buildings with efficiencies averaging 560 sq/ft). The 2 10-unit properties are currently a conditional use in the TR-U1 district (multi-family dwellings greater than 8 units require conditional use approval).

Single family is not a permissible building form in MR, nor are 2-unit properties. The 2 10-unit properties could be a conditional use building form in LMR, per the FLU FAQs.

There are 3 1-story properties, 2 1.5 stories properties, and 4 two-story properties (the 2-story properties include the 2 10-unit buildings). MR heights are 2-5 stories, thus 5 properties of the 9 do not fit within the MR category. LMR heights are 1-3 stories, so all building heights come within LMR.

Overall density of the section is 25 units/acre. This comes within the LMR density of 7-30 units/acre.

Allowing building heights of 5 stories surrounding these single family homes would isolate these residents. The map category should not be required to reflect 2 properties, owned by the same owner, that only currently qualify as a conditional use (built in 1995).

Rebuttal: 1227 E Wilson to Dickinson

Staff comments reflect that a conservation district was not created. True, but the Study report stated that a district would not be needed if zoning could protect the area. The study was undertaken, at least in part, to provide long-term protection for the area. The Study report reflects that the application of the new zoning district would provide that protection and that "by rezoning properties to more appropriate base zoning districts, it may not be necessary to create a neighborhood conservation overlay district as an additional regulatory layer." One item proposed, and acted upon, was to change the zoning to TR-C4, which limits the number of dwelling units to 3 units. As reflected in Map 2 of the Study Report, most of the area is single family homes. Densifying this area is not appropriate and contradicts the will of the Council as expressed by its adoption of the Study Report.

The area has 56 one-family homes, 10 2-units, 2 3-units, and 1 8-bed rooming house. The 8-bed rooming house is a half-way house. Density with the rooming house is 14.6 units/acre. Excluding the rooming house, and the lot, density is 13.5 units/acre. FLU map designation should not be determined because of one outlying use, especially when that use is for the social good.

All properties are 2 stories or less, except for 5 properties that are 2 ½ stories (4 of the 2 ½ story properties are on S Baldwin.).

Although this area generally could fit within either the LR or LMR categories, the LMR allows for building forms that are not compatible with an area that is primarily single-family homes: LR permits 3-units, single family attached and small multi-family buildings only as a conditional use, while under LMR these forms are granted by right, plus LMR allows large multi-family and courtyard buildings as conditional uses.

At a minimum, the area should be protected by note #4: "The "house-like" residential character of this LMR area should be retained, and any limited redevelopment should generally maintain the current single-family/two flat/three flat development pattern." The Monroe Street area (approximately the area just south of the 1600-1800 blocks) currently is LDR, as is this area. The Monroe area is slated to become LMR, as is this area. However, the Monroe area is receiving the benefit of note #4.

Merry-Buell Street

Staff Comments:

13. While staff did not base FLU categories on a calculation of existing net density, this area is slightly over 15 du/acre. The MNA memo requests using Map Note #4 for this area. Staff agrees that this would be appropriate if the area remains LMR. However, it would be redundant if the area is changed to LR, as requested - the note is currently only applied to some LMR areas.

Rebuttal

The area has 45 lots with 43 buildings. Of those buildings, 35 are 2 stories or less, 7 are 2.5 stories and 1 is 3 stories. Only one building does not fit within the LR parameters.

As could be assumed from the number of stories, most homes are single family (20) and 2-units (18). There are 4 3-units, and 1 22-unit. The 3-units are permissible under LR as a conditional use, so there is only the apartment building that does not fit within the LR parameters. (The apartment is zoned TR-U2, and even under this designation it would be a conditional use if built today.)

At a minimum, the area should be protected by note #4: "The "house-like" residential character of this LMR area should be retained, and any limited redevelopment should generally maintain the current single-family/two flat/three flat development pattern." The Monroe Street area (approximately the area just south of the 1600-1800 blocks) currently is LDR, as is this area. The Monroe area is slated to become LMR, as is this area. However, the Monroe area is receiving the benefit of note #4.

The average density of this area is 13.7 units/acre. The average density without the 22-unit apartment building and its land is 11.4 units/acre. Even if the 2 vacant/parking lots areas are removed from the calculations (in addition to removing the apartments), density would only be 13.4 units/acre.

Although this area generally could fit within either the LR or LMR categories due to the density overlap, LMR allows for building forms that are not compatible with an area that is primarily single and two-family homes: LR permits 3-units, single family attached and small multi-family buildings only as a conditional use, while under LMR these forms are granted by right, plus LMR allows large multi-family and courtyard buildings as conditional uses.

Rutledge-Morrison

Staff Comments

8. With the creation of the LMR category, there are some areas from the 2006 MDR category that are more appropriate for LMR, and there are some areas from the 2006 LDR category that are appropriate for LMR. The MNA comments state that the area is "Low-Density Residential (0-15 units/acre) and nothing has changed since 2006." However, mapping the LMR category in already developed areas is almost exclusively used in areas that have not changed since 2006 – the mapping is less based on whether an area has changed and instead based on whether existing development in the area fits better within the new LMR category than the MR or LR categories. LMR was not created as a less dense version of MDR, but rather a category that encompasses the "missing middle," which includes small-lot single family, two-/three-/four-unit structures and small multifamily buildings. This Missing Middle can overlap somewhat with the lower end of MR and the upper end of LR. In this particular case, the dwelling unit mix and building forms within area #8 are virtually identical to area #6. The primary difference is that area #6 was mapped as MDR in 2006 and area #8 was mapped as LDR in 2006. The mix of small-lot single-family, two-unit, three unit, on up to four-, five-, and six-unit buildings in area #8 is an ideal example of what the LMR category is

meant to cover. When we look at building mix, Dickinson Street is a pretty clear dividing line - there are far fewer multi-unit buildings east of Dickinson, making the area east (and south of Marquette/O'Keefe) more appropriate for LR, and the area to the west of Dickinson more appropriate for LMR.

Rebuttal

Although it may make sense for LMR to equate to "missing middle" housing structures, it does not make sense in an established neighborhood. Most of this area is old housing stock that has been converted into flats or is single family homes. About 70% of the housing fits into the single family or two-unit categories, and about 20% is 3 and 4-units. Only 7% of existing housing stock is 5 or more units (and only 2% is over 5 units). The LMR allows at least 8 units as a right, and even more as conditional use. This is not an area where 8 or more units should be allowed. Much of the area is within a historic district. Whether or not density falls within the exact density parameters of LM (though I can calculate this, time ran short), this is not an area to encourage more of the missing middle.

Jenifer Street Market Area

Staff Comments:

14. Staff believes it is not feasible to expect that this area could be redeveloped as single- and two family units, and therefore recommends that the 2006 Comp Plan NMU designation be maintained, as is shown in the current 2018 FLU Map. However, if there is a desire to limit future business-related traffic into the neighborhood, a reclassification to MR could be discussed.

Rebuttal

The current note #1 should continue to apply to the Jenifer Street/Division district. Appendix 2.1 of the Land Use Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan states:

"Note 1: This is currently the site of a long-established ice cream production facility located within a predominantly residential neighborhood. If this site is redeveloped at some future time, a mix of residential development and neighborhood-serving commercial or employment uses is recommended rather than redevelopment with a new industrial use. The existing grocery adjacent to the ice cream plant is a significant amenity to the surrounding residential area, and a neighborhood grocery should be retained as part of any future redevelopment. Buildings should be generally compatible in scale with existing residential and commercial buildings in the area."

Respectfully Submitted,
Linda Lehnertz

From: [Stouder, Heather](#)
To: [Zellers, Benjamin](#); [Grady, Brian](#)
Subject: FW: Marquette Neighborhood - Comp Plan Changes
Date: Sunday, March 11, 2018 4:11:48 PM

Ben and Brian-

Please copy as a handout for PC on Monday and add to the Legistar file. Thank you!

Heather

From: Lauren Azar [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, March 11, 2018 2:03 PM
To: Stouder, Heather <HStouder@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Rummel, Marsha <district6@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Marquette Neighborhood - Comp Plan Changes

Heather -

I live at [REDACTED] and I own a rental property at [REDACTED]. I have lived in this neighborhood for 31 years and have invested significant amounts into both properties because it is an historic residential neighborhood with an unique and quirky character. Indeed, I and my ex partner were key in getting the Jenifer-Spaight area designated as a historic district. I have served on the City's Plan Commission and recognize the difficult choices that must be made.

I have reviewed the proposal for 2018 Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the Marquette Neighborhood. While I applaud the City's efforts to increase density, I oppose the proposed Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan for 2018. The City can increase density in this neighborhood without destroying its character.

While there are components of the MNA March 5th proposal that I believe are inconsistent with the neighborhood plan, **the MNA plan is a good compromise**. Among other things, it increases density without permitting towering buildings that are contrary to and will overshadow the historic flavor of the neighborhood.

Please adopt the MNA proposal.

Lauren Azar
[REDACTED]

From: [Stouder, Heather](#)
To: [Zellers, Benjamin](#); [Grady, Brian](#)
Subject: FW: Zoning for Willy St
Date: Monday, March 12, 2018 8:16:21 AM

Please add to the Legistar file and distribute to PC this evening. Thank you.
Heather

From: Jody Whelden [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, March 11, 2018 5:42 PM
To: Stouder, Heather <HStouder@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Zoning for Willy St

Dear Heather-

Adding more density tall buildings to Marquette Neighborhood, on Willy Street and along the lake would be destroying a neighborhood. I oppose it. Find another way to accommodate population growth.

I oppose making Marquette Neighborhood into a city atmosphere of tall buildings. This will drive out families, neighborhood schools and displace the writers, historians, university professors, creative, art, and culturally diverse culture which current feeds the city.

I support a plan to enhance parts of the city that need enhancement and provide housing where a new neighborhood is needed.

Thanks for adding me to the opposed list.

Warmly,

Jody Whelden
[REDACTED] Morrison Street 53703

--

Rev. Jody Whelden, BCC
Speaker & Author
Heart Centered Intuitive Living
[REDACTED]

From: [Stouder, Heather](#)
To: [Zellers, Benjamin](#); [Grady, Brian](#)
Subject: FW: Future Land Use Map--Marquette Neighborhood
Date: Monday, March 12, 2018 1:28:54 PM

Please add to the items for PC this evening.
Thank you!

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Soref [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2018 1:08 PM
To: Stouder, Heather <HStouder@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Rummel, Marsha <district6@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Future Land Use Map--Marquette Neighborhood

I am a Marquette neighborhood resident. I support the Marquette Neighborhood Association's request for changes to the Future Land Use Map.

Mike Soref
[REDACTED] Rutledge Court

From: [Stouder, Heather](#)
To: [Zellers, Benjamin](#); [Grady, Brian](#)
Subject: FW: Comp Plan changes for Marquette neighborhood
Date: Monday, March 12, 2018 2:03:09 PM

Please include in PC items. Thanks!
Heather

From: Nancy Rogge [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2018 1:57 PM
To: Stouder, Heather <HStouder@cityofmadison.com>; Rummel, Marsha <district6@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Comp Plan changes for Marquette neighborhood

Hello Heather

I am a long time resident of the Marquette neighborhood, and own two properties that I live in and rent, at [REDACTED] Buell St and [REDACTED] Rutledge, as well as own and run my local business. I have lived here for 25 years and have no plans to leave for the next few decades! I do appreciate the difficulty in providing high density housing for urban centers, and I believe the MNA plan is a reasonable compromise. Please don't allow tall buildings to be built that will forever change the nature and character of our neighborhood, the reason it is so desirable in the first place!

Thank you for your time.

--

Dr. Nancy Rogge
Community Critters
[REDACTED]

*** Please note I check email only once daily on weekdays. If urgent issue please call***

The future of the Marquette Neighborhood is in doubt

Submitted by David Mollenhoff for the Plan Commission meeting on March 12, 2018 (Legistar44190)

The 2013 APA award

In 2013 the American Planning Association (“APA”) named the Marquette Neighborhood one of ten “Great Neighborhoods” in America. They gave us this award for decades of planning to enhance and preserve the character of the neighborhood. The APA also lauded our efforts to fight against densification and demolition.

But now the 2018 Comprehensive Plan proposes to double the density and in some cases triple the heights of buildings in major portions of our neighborhood. I believe this plan would irretrievably alter the wonderful sought-after character of our neighborhood.

In fact, if the Future Land Use (FLU) goes through *without* the extensive amendments we have requested, the plan will:

- Transform most of Williamson Street into a canyon of six and five story buildings
- Degrade our widely-recognized unique character
- Make housing less affordable
- Prevent the development of a tree canopy
- Destroy the Third Lake Ridge Historic District
- Make it hard to attract families with children and keep open the Marquette Elementary School
- Exacerbate traffic and parking problems

Our neighborhood’s long history of thoughtful planning

Arguably, no neighborhood has taken neighborhood plans more seriously or invested more citizen time preparing them. Here is a summary of our neighborhood plans:

- 1970 A 120-page comprehensive citizen-prepared plan
- 1994 Marquette-Schenk-Atwood Neighborhood Plan
- 2001 Marquette Neighborhood Center Master Plan (Williamson Street BUILD, Phase 1)
- 2004 East Rail Corridor
- 2005 BUILD II (Design Guidelines and Criteria for Preservation of Williamson Street)

Why did we do this? Because thoughtful plans are one of very few effective tools capable of guiding conflicting pressures that roil our complex Isthmus neighborhood.

Inconsistency with neighborhood plans and ordinances

The City’s plans to densify and increase building heights in our neighborhood are wildly out of step with recent City publications.

For example, *The Isthmus 2020 Committee Report, A Guidebook for a Model Isthmus* clearly states that “... development in Isthmus Neighborhoods should complement, reinforce, and restore existing traditional neighborhood features.” The Comprehensive Plan fails that test.

That publication also said, “Planning for neighborhoods should be focused on neighborhood character more than simply seeking a higher density.” The Comprehensive Plan fails that test.

The ordinance for the Third Lake Ridge Historic District clearly states that all new buildings in the district should be “visually compatible” with surrounding buildings. Five and six story buildings are hardly compatible with this standard.

Inconsistency with Comprehensive Plan goals

The Comprehensive Plan embraces 10 fundamental goals several of which are clearly at odds with what the plan would do to our neighborhood:

One of the fundamental goals is to encourage neighborhoods that have “a unique character and strong sense of place.” Who can argue that the Comprehensive Plan would preserve our character and sense of place?

Another fundamental goal urges us to “value” our “historical assets.” The Comprehensive Plan fails that test because it would clearly encourage developers to go beyond the “visually compatible” standard in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District. Significantly, this Historic District covers most of our neighborhood between Blair and the Yahara River, so the potential damage from the Comprehensive Plan will be extensive.

City leaders should recall that *all five* of Madison’s local historic districts total less than 1% of city land area, and yet how much they contribute to Madison’s vaunted attractiveness! This is why these tiny patches of city land must be optimally protected against character-destroying development of the Comprehensive Plan.

Design principles that I believe should govern the application of the Comprehensive Plan

I respectfully suggest that the following design principles should be used to determine what land use categories are applied to neighborhoods:

- The Comprehensive Plan should require and encourage a diverse spectrum of unique neighborhoods including several close-in, relatively low density, child-supporting neighborhoods. The Marquette Neighborhood deserves to be included in this special category.

- No neighborhood should be densified, penalized, for any of the following reasons:
 - a. Because they have been generous in allowing high-intensity socially-desirable functions such as Port St. Vincent, Tellurian, Wisco, and Commonwealth properties.
 - b. Because they have allowed projects to be built as PDs and conditional uses. Such projects are almost always much larger, taller, and denser than buildings allowed by conventional zoning.

For staff to ratchet up our land use intensity categories because we have accommodated buildings under these circumstances is hardly fair.

- There are clear limits to the amount of new dense development a neighborhood can absorb before its widely-recognized defining characteristics are irretrievably lost. We do not want to be a victim of a Comprehensive Plan that nudges our neighborhood beyond its tipping point.

- Future development should be consistent with the development standard embedded in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District, viz, visual compatibility with contiguous development. If most buildings in this district are two stories, what is the value of a plan that allows five and six stories and much greater densities?

- Neighborhood development plans should recognize that increased density is not the friend of affordable housing or a neighborhood’s child population.

Please support specific recommendation submitted separately by Linda Lehnertz

Earlier today you received her recommendations for amendments that are essential to maintain the character of the Marquette Neighborhood. Seldom will you see such extraordinarily high quality work from a citizen. I strongly agree with her recommendations and hope you will too.

Submitted by David Mollenhoff, March 12, 2018

From: [Stouder, Heather](#)
To: [Zellers, Benjamin](#); [Grady, Brian](#)
Subject: FW: Comprehensive Plan Effect on Willy St
Date: Monday, March 12, 2018 3:20:31 PM

For distribution to the PC. Thanks!

Heather

From: Sharon Kilfoy [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2018 3:04 PM
To: Stouder, Heather <HStouder@cityofmadison.com>; ajstatz2@madison.k12.wi.us; bacantrell@charter.net; jpolewski@charter.net; jshagenow@yahoo.com; ken.opin@gmail.com; Zellers, Ledell <district2@cityofmadison.com>; hiwayman@chorus.net; Carter, Sheri <district14@cityofmadison.com>; King, J Steven <district7@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Rummel, Marsha <district6@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Effect on Willy St

Dear Plan Commission members,

I have lived on the north side of the 1000 block of Williamson St since 1975. The Comprehensive Plan proposes classifying the south side of the 900 block, both sides of the 1000 and 1100 blocks, and the beginning of the north side of the 1200 blocks as Medium Residential (MR) which would allow 90 units per acre and five story buildings! OUCH!!!

This is a terrible future for the street and should not be allowed. Current density doesn't approach this level, so it seems that this is the plan's way of saying "bring on development." I have no doubt this would transform the character of the street. The current Comp Plan is bad news for the neighborhood - and especially for my part of Williamson St.

Staff's response said in effect that *some parts* of the above area could be downzoned to Low Medium Residential (LMR), which would limit development to up to 30 units per/acre and no more than three stories in height. The MNA position - and mine - is that the *entire* area noted above should be protected by the LMA.

I urge you to support the MNA position on the entire plan affecting the historic Third Lake Ridge – and to join us in the effort to continue responsible growth management of what has become a most desirable street – built on the preservation efforts of many who have spent entire lifetimes creating this asset for the entire city.

Thank you for your help in this matter -

Sharon Kilfoy
Williamson St Art Center
[REDACTED] **Williamson**

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Stouder, Heather](#); [Zellers, Benjamin](#); [Eskrich, Sara](#)
Subject: Please circulate to Plan Commission prior to tonight's meeting
Date: Monday, March 12, 2018 2:00:13 PM
Attachments: [Generalized Future Land Use Map Change Request Form-FINAL.pdf](#)
[BCNA Change Request Form Responses continued.docx](#)

Dear Heather and Ben,

Bay Creek Neighborhood Association submitted the attached Change Request Form on March 2, copying our alder. We met with Sara Eskrich on March 7 to review our request, which she voiced support for at that time.

She said she would reach out to Plan staff to let you know of her support. However something must have come up suddenly; when we tried to connect with her this weekend, we learned she had left town and Ben Zellers has not received any word from Sara.

We thus request that you circulate a copy of this letter and our earlier submitted Land Use Change Request form with its attached sheets to the members of the Plan Commission at or before today's meeting and that you provide ample time for discussion of the way in which our request diverges from the IM team's amendment. We further request that you attach our Request Form to the attachments for Legistar Item 44190.

We are largely appreciative of the revisions that the Imagine Madison team is presenting to Plan today. Thank you. There is no longer an Employment District planned for the east side of Gilson Street. **However there is still one significant variation from the Land Use Plan that we requested and that the SMNP recommends.** The IM team has placed the transition from LDR to MDR a little north of Cedar rather than at Cedar Street east of Gilson.

The reason this is significant is that the half block north of Cedar is occupied by single-family homes. There are 5 small homes on the land that you propose to redesignate from LDR to MDR. We feel strongly that this is a mistake and that the Land Use Plan before you today should remain in keeping with the recommendations of the SMNP for this area to preserve the integrity of the LDR residential area. **Gilson Street for the half block north of Cedar should remain LDR.**

While Chapter 4.4 Objective 1 of the Comp Plan aims to "promote housing development and reinvestment that encourages a range of housing choices for all residents" and new housing to meet the changing demands and expectations of a "dwelling unit," could be interpreted to support MDR at this location, with Policy 2 calling for intelligent use of higher housing densities, Policy 3 for efficient land use and other practices that help reduce housing costs, Policy 6 for greater densities and infill for use of land for housing, and Policy 14 for affordable housing, the community south of Olin east of Gilson up to Cedar and west of Gilson throughout the tree streets to the intersection of Beld and Gilson is one of small, single-family homes, a proportion of which are rental. The neighborhood has begun investigating placing a request to assign TIF funding to this area with the city and with its alder.

Keeping Gilson LDR all the way south to Cedar is further in keeping with Comp Plan Policy 7, which insists on infill in a way that harmonizes with existing housing and neighborhoods, something that can only be known by following Objective 1, Policy 13: Fostering the involvement of neighborhood associations, business groups, and nonprofits in the decisions related to housing and land use in ways that balance the goals of participation and production. This has not occurred.

Objective 1, Policy 1 specifically "recommends that all significant changes in land use from existing conditions be consistent with the recommendations of an adopted neighborhood plan." The SMNP lays out clearly that Gilson should remain LDR south to Cedar Street.

Sincerely,

Carrie Rothburd, Alex Novo, Lisie Kitchel, Cindy McCallum for BCNA