

From: [Stouder, Heather](#)
To: [Grady, Brian](#); [Laatsch, Kirstie](#); [Zellers, Benjamin](#)
Subject: FW: Plan Comm. Agenda Items 8-10: Oppose the Mowdown of 700 block East Johnson!
Date: Monday, June 04, 2018 2:09:42 PM

FYI

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

From: Michael D. Barrett [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 04, 2018 1:54 PM
To: Mayor [REDACTED] Mike Rewey
[REDACTED] Stouder, Heather <HStouder@cityofmadison.com>;
Cc: Monks, Anne <AMonks@cityofmadison.com>; Knepp, Eric <EKnepp@cityofmadison.com>; Phillips, Robert <RPhillips@cityofmadison.com>; Dryer, David <DDryer@cityofmadison.com>; Pat Schneider
[REDACTED] Dean Mosiman [REDACTED]; Bill Novak [REDACTED];
[REDACTED] Isthmus Davidoff [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Mike Ivey
[REDACTED] Marc Eisen [REDACTED] Yogesh Chawla [REDACTED] Cap
[REDACTED] Times [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Joe Tarr [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] All Alders [REDACTED]
Erdman, Natalie <NERdman@cityofmadison.com>;
mscanlon@cityofmadison.com; Wolf, Karin <KWolf@cityofmadison.com>;
[REDACTED] Brad
Klinge [REDACTED]
Subject: Plan Comm. Agenda Items 8-10: Oppose the Mowdown of 700 block East Johnson!

Dear Plan Commissioners,
We oppose, in the strongest terms, the wholesale destruction of our classic old neighborhoods as proposed in your "Imagine Madison" Comprehensive Plan Update. (That is, we strongly oppose today's Agenda Items 1 & 2).

-The language is deceitful
-It permits tear downs of entire--beloved--neighborhoods -It permits densities and styles and functions appropriate to Fitchburg, not our classic working class vernacular historic hoods.

We refer you to the Schenk-Atwood-Starkweather-Yahara Council's letter and testimony, especially regarding the deceitful language. For the most part we agree with their findings (especially flagging up the deceptive language that changes zoning definitions allowing twice the densities, for the same term without informing the citizenry of the trickery).

But SASY's statement does not go nearly far enough.

It is apparent that you are seeking to jam as much density and cars into already dense--and healthy--neighborhoods as you can get away with.

While we have long advocated for greater density ourselves--in numerous neighborhood and city-wide plans over our three decades in Madison--we have also advocated for judiciousness in its application. Appropriateness and nuance are key. This plan lacks both.

Your plan permits blanket tear downs of existing healthy neighborhoods within SASY's boundaries. And, yes, if it is permitted, it will be done.

We oppose anything that undermines our historic working class vernacular hoods. Not just SASY. All of our older

neighborhoods. The Marquette Neighborhood Association successfully fought to have their part of the plan changed to reflect the neighborhood's residential & commercial & historic character & mix preserved. SASY and other hoods should be treated similarly. Indeed, we hereby apply our comment about the 700 block E. Johnson development to the entirety of the isthmus's older, classic neighborhoods. Most especially, the ones that don't have historic designations. The vernacular--working class architecture--is every bit as important as rich people's Victorians. This isn't just about preservation for nostalgia's sake. These are neighborhoods that have stood the test of time. Their human-scale is instructive in how to live convivially in a dense environment. (We note with a chuckle how Veridian loves to reference our older hoods in their cheesy imitations out in cul-de-sac-land!)

YES, we support the goals to limit sprawl. But that does not require the destruction of existing healthy neighborhoods. Indeed, using the Regional Plan Commission's official land use scenario planning tool (or whatever it is called), I (Mike) was able to accommodate the entirety of the projected 160,000 new residents without expanding the Urban Service Area *at all*. But note: I did not add *any* density to existing, built-up, classic neighborhoods. I simply directed new, urban densities along underutilized lands--strip malls & sheds & surface parking--along main thoroughfares (Mineral Point Rd, Park St, E. Washington, University Ave., Stoughton Rd., etc). The land use program was very limited-- ham-fisted even--and would not let users plug density in other underutilized highway strips. But the larger point being, there is a surfeit of opportunities to densify areas where the new density is needed, would be welcomed, would generally be beneficial and would require no tear downs of anything but sheds, would fill in surface parking, etc.

But it seems that your planners, much like the development community, is fixated on the isthmus to solve all your density issues. Instead of tearing down what makes our older neighborhoods cool, desirable--and yes, profitable--why not direct the developers to make their own cool out in stripmall-land?

Hipster Planning for Legoland: Ok, so the city *finally* got religion on density. HALELUJAH! Density is all the rage now, apparently. (After decades of being sneeringly dismissed by our elected and planning professional betters, we chuckle.) Unfortunately, this plan lacks any sense of nuance or appropriateness, applying a one-size-fits-all zoning to durable, modest, eclectic, vibrant, non-corporate, time-tested neighborhoods which have evolved, slowly, parcel-by-parcel, individual-by-individual, with great attention to fitting things in in a way that adds value--aesthetically, functionally, economically--to neighboring properties as well as to the parcel itself. Appropriateness is the watchword. Something entirely missing from this document. You need to go back to your Jane Jacobs and learn about the necessity of maintaining the look, feel, function of old neighborhoods. It isn't about denying the new. Where appropriate, OK. But new development in old hoods needs to be considered, reconsidered and considered again.

Conditional use is anathema to your top-down, know-it-all, hipster planners who want their plug-n-play lego look. But conditional use is the only tool existing neighbors have to defend their neighborhood from wholesale destruction. Lego planning will just bulldoze existing neighbors right out of the 'hood, with no recourse. These are the very people who made the neighborhood the desirable place that it is. And now you want them gone? How many times do we have to learn, re-learn, and learn again that Urban Renewal is a complete & utter failure--socially, environmentally, economically, culturally, artistically?

Yet, WE ARE NOT NIMBYs!!!! Please keep in mind that we are not always popular with our neighbors. Why? Because we don't oppose density--where appropriate. Our neighborhood has been the target of a lot of new developments; many sites within a block of our house. We have actively *supported* most of these developments--much to the irritation of our neighbors (though most came around once the thing was in). WE ARE NOT NIMBYs! But please keep in mind that each of these developments were built upon *appropriate* sites: A gas station, a rusted Trachte warehouse, a 1960s cinder block hut surrounded by a half-acre of parking. They were either abandoned, or nearly so. They did *not* mow down current residential areas, nor did they knock down historic commercial buildings.

They were *appropriate*.

(Ok, maybe there were some design issues lacking, but density-wise, absolutely appropriate.)

They were part of the continuing evolution of the neighborhood. Very much in keeping with Jane Jacobs's thought that the new should be moderate in scale, respectful of the existing neighborhood fabric--not wholesale destruction--and respectful of the neighborhood as a whole.

The one nearby development we did oppose, Kennedy Place, knocked down buildings that were representative of the East Side working class vernacular, notably the East Side Workingmen's Club building (not sure of name, 1800 block of Atwood). They were beloved, structurally sound and kept an evolving neighborhood grounded in its working class heritage.

We perfectly understand the zeal to limit sprawl and keep population growth within current city limits. We're happy the city finally got religion! But the plan calls for too much disruption and destruction of already dense areas that are very healthy as-is.

We are in opposition to the thinking that ham-fisted density is the answer. Imagine Madison needs more imagination. More nuance. More understanding of the appropriate vs. inappropriate. It needs to go back to the drawing board. Because you didn't listen.

Please apply our comment opposing the destruction of the 700 block of East Johnson St. to our opposition to this Comp Plan update. We want that comment included here and the entirety of the comment to apply to the entirety of the isthmus (not just the 700 block of E. Johnson), and frankly, any of our older hoods.

Sincerely,
Michael D. Barrett and Pamela S. Barrett
[REDACTED] Sommers Ave.
Madison, WI 53704

The proposed destruction of the 700 block of East Johnson (June 4, 2018 Plan Commission Agenda Items 8-10) is an abomination and we oppose it in the strongest terms. This city has a very bad record of destroying the very neighborhoods that we cherish, starting with what it did to the Greenbush Neighborhood lo those many decades ago. It doesn't matter that you weren't responsible for it. It doesn't matter that it was long ago.

The same process is in play here. Indeed, the destruction has continued unabated with the current destruction of Miffland and other cherished places. You've long tried to rip up Marquette, including in the latest Comp Plan update. Fortunately they pushed back hard. It remains to be seen if you will be successful against Atwood and Tenney-Lapham. To approve this travesty--in the heart of the isthmus--will set in motion a wave of destruction against the very places that have added so much value to our city. And not just monetary. Mostly, it is about our collective (re-)gained wisdom in how to live convivially in an urban neighborhood. It was an art lost in those decades after WW II. Our re-discovered capacity to live together is just now coming to fruition.

What you have before you is the complete opposite of our newfound conviviality. Indeed, it's just Fitchburg shoe-horned into our beloved isthmus. And yes, if this is approved, the rest of East Johnson will be bulldozed as well. Adjoining streets will become increasingly isolated and vestigial until it becomes "obvious" that they, too, must succumb to the same fate. Having once been on the Urban Design Commission, I know that once one developer is allowed to do something, the rest come rushing in to demand the same. So anyone reading this in the Tenney-Lapham neighborhood should expect that this will be just the beginning of a trend that eventually will reach your backyard, and then, yes, your very house (yes, I'm talking to you if you live on Gorham, Dayton, or Jean, or Sydney or other nearby streets; i.e., this is NOT just an issue for E. Johnson).

To give an idea of where we are coming from, consider this: We have owned rental property just two blocks down, on the 900 block of East Johnson, since 1991. We stand to gain monetarily--and significantly--if this proposal goes through. But we aren't in this primarily for the money.

When we bought, the isthmus was considered to be a throw-away neighborhood. City policy was in on the destruction. At the time the city was pushing to knock down half of the 800 block for parking. The city was so excited to get the bulldozers rolling that they were even going to pay for it. The old timers were good with it, too. How better to compete with the malls than to provide lots of free parking, right?

But we fought it and won. With the specter of tear-downs lifted, we went about building a cool neighborhood--parking be damned because "plenty of parking" damns a place--along with others with the same ideas.

The 80s & early-90s market signaled rust belt wreck as well; houses like ours sold for *less* than they went for a

decade before. Real estate agents wouldn't even show us houses in Tenney-Lapham. But those of us who resisted the conventional wisdom had an idea of creating a more sustainable community, starting with embracing the human-scale of classic old neighborhoods like Tenney-Lapham. There is nothing more sustainable than preserving old houses. (Did you know that the #1 source of landfill waste is construction waste, much of that from tear downs?) In our case, through a lot of sweat equity and investment of life savings, we turned the slumlord special into a very comfy/cozy and beloved home that we lived in for several years, then successfully managed it for the enjoyment of excellent & responsible tenants for the decades to come. Sustainability is when the same abode serves as shelter for many generations; ours has served five generations. Because we keep a good roof and siding on it, it surely will serve another ten generations. Or more. On the topic of sustainability, when proposals like this come before you, we usually hear about how much more efficient the new apartments will be compared with old houses. That is just straight up BS. It is only the case when neglectful slumlords make no energy efficiency upgrades at all. Even then it takes 65 years to recoup the energy expended tearing down the embodied energy of the old structure and building the new. Yes, SIXTY FIVE YEARS! Contrary to the Madison slumlord conventional wisdom, we upgraded the insulation and mechanicals to our old house to the point that it now *exceeds* the energy performance of the shiny new cardboard apartments that you keep approving. Their minimal insulation and contractor-grade mechanicals (read: bottom-feeder efficiency) result in drafty, moldy 35-year tear-downs. Thus, new is *not* greener. They just get torn down quicker.

Old houses and their strong bones can easily be retrofitted for generations of healthy, comfortable living. If you approve this, you cast a pall over every property in the area: Why bother upgrading/maintaining an old house it is just going to get torn down in a few years?

In the early 90s, we also helped lead the rejuvenation of the neighborhood association and other local organizations. We helped turn a neighborhood sliding toward rustbelt tragedy into something that is now cherished by tenants, homeowners and visitors alike (have you ever read the Airbnb reviews of old places in the area?).

Why do you want to tear it down?

There has always been this bias against old houses and old neighborhoods among The Very Important of Madison. We suspect that a lot of it has to do with the very fact that our isthmus neighborhoods keep proving to be strong enough--pesky enough--to push back against you and your developer friends. Mow down the classic, human-scaled, and you drive those politically pesky (but caring & considerate) eastsiders away into diaspora, much as your predecessors did to the Italians and others they viewed as undesirable in the 'Bush. With the eastsiders gone, Fitchburgers newly resident, the bulldozers can roam free across the isthmus unimpeded by any neighborhood political pushback.

We've always had to fight you from a defensive crouch. At some point, don't you think you should stop attacking us? Instead, why don't you embrace the very neighborhoods that have made Madison Madison and not Des Moines. Have you ever seen the wrecked neighborhoods of similar era in Des Moines? Or Peoria? Or Milwaukee? Or Kansas City? Or Rockford? Or any other formerly-dignified & livable Midwestern tragedy? Most of the cool neighborhoods are gone. The vestiges that remain are wrecks.

"Obvious" tear downs. Why do you continue to inflict this Midwestern narrow-minded prejudice against the old upon Madison? Why are you so against cohesive, community-oriented neighborhoods? And yes, the neighborhood scale and architectural vernacular--*sizeable* porches!

sizeable balconies, *real* yards!--of our older neighborhoods are what allow community to thrive. You obviously prefer anonymous pod-living:

from anonymous apartment to anonymous elevator to anonymous subterranean parking to anonymous ramp to anonymous highway, to anonymous office park, never once having occasion to interact with neighbors. Fine. That's why we have Fitchburg. Go there. But the life of an atomic particle zipping from pod to pod is not what we want. We want community.

There is plenty of already-wrecked and underutilized space along East Washington, Packers Ave, Cottage Grove Road, University Ave, & beyond that is ripe for putting up this sort of development. Hundreds of sites across Madison with acres of parking surrounding a cinder block hut, just *begging* to be re-developed. Indeed, we participated in the early-90s Tenney-Lapham plan that envisioned the revitalization of East Washington (and ridding ourselves of it's hideous car lots) that we are now seeing & enjoying. With that opportunity still abundant--and with neighborhood support--why rip at the fabric of a successful, human-scaled neighborhood? Do you even realize that the residents of those E. Wash towers really, REALLY like to stroll nearby old-school streets like East Johnson?

You didn't, did you? East Johnson, as it is, right now, is an asset that accrues to the new development on East Wash. Believe me, we know, we're in the biz.

Keep Fitchburg in Fitchburg! SAVE THE HEART OF MADISON!

Sincerely,
Michael D. Barrett and Pamela S. Barrett
[REDACTED] Sommers Ave.
Madison, WI 53704

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Grady, Brian](#); [Laatsch, Kirstie](#); [Zellers, Benjamin](#)
Subject: Comments on City of Madison Draft Comprehensive Plan - More Evaluation of the Land Consumption and Impacts of the County Airport
Date: Monday, June 04, 2018 4:02:27 PM

I would like the Comprehensive Plan to provide more discussion about the land consumption and impacts of the Dane County Regional Airport. The draft plan simply mentions the "airport" but provides no further discussion. The continued presence of the county airport within Madison has a significant effect on planning the city.

My comments on the 2006 comprehensive plan noted the county airport removed 7,000 acres or approximately 20% of the land area of Madison from residential use. This area was enough to contain the cities of Monona, Stoughton and Verona with combined populations of over 27,000 people.

What area of Madison does the new Comprehensive Plan remove from residential development to accommodate the county airport?

How many of current jobs in the city are held by residents versus those that commute from outlying suburbs? Shouldn't we be encouraging commuters to live in the city?

Having been involved in the lobbying for improved noise abatement procedures for the county airport, I know its operations have [many adverse impacts on city residents](#). These include noise impacts, creation of undesirable neighborhoods, reduced property values, increase sprawl, and promotion of the least efficient form of transportation contributing to global warming.

Madison recently proposed an "economic opportunity zone" around the county airport since it is surrounded by families living in poverty. With over 67,000 people living within 3-miles of the county airport, many city residents and schools are impacted by its operations including noise from commercial flights and fighter jets from Truax Field. The recent proposal to locate a squadron of louder F-35 jets at Truax Field will worsen noise impacts and quality of life on the eastside of Madison.

Besides discussion of the impacts of the county airport, there should be a discussion of cities that chose to relocate their airports out of the city and redevelop the old sites for residential use. For example:

[Austin, Texas](#)

Located just three miles from downtown Austin and the Texas State Capitol and two miles from The University of Texas at Austin, Mueller is perfectly positioned to become an energetic new hub for central Austin. The ambitious effort to redevelop Robert Mueller Municipal Airport into a mixed-use urban village in the heart of the city has helped Austin chart new directions. Mueller is envisioned as a sustainable community that is meeting extensive goals in housing and economic development.

[Denver, Colorado](#)

In 1995 when the opening of Denver International Airport meant the closing of Stapleton

International Airport, Denver had the unique opportunity to transform 7.5 square miles of runways, concourses and terminals into a beautiful new community. It would be the largest urban in-fill redevelopment in the country and, to this day, one of the largest in-fill projects ever.

A few local references:

www.nomadisonairport.org

www.boycottdane.org

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the draft Comprehensive Plan.

Steve Klafka

--

Steven Klafka, P.E., BCEE
Environmental Engineer
Wingra Engineering, S.C.
[REDACTED] South Paterson Street
Madison, WI 53703
[REDACTED]

www.wingraengineering.com

Since 1991


From: [Laatsch, Kirstie](#)
To: [Zellers, Benjamin](#)
Subject: Additional Feedback on External CiviComment
Date: Wednesday, May 30, 2018 11:45:08 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hey, Ben –

We received a few new comments on the external CiviComment. Since we're without the M drive, I thought you probably have some time to think of responses to the comments. Please see below.

karirandrje May 30 2018 at 1:28AM

Given the proximity of this triangular site to a major highway interchange, existing commercial and industrial uses nearby, and an active train track, it makes much more sense to allow additional commercial and/or industrial uses here rather than residential.



sjkrausk May 29 2018 at 3:56PM


How will you provide this feature for new housing backing the 2000 block of Carey Ct on E Washington? The city plan calls for increased density on that very shallow set of lots and I do not think you could provide privacy fencing, vegetation and especially prevent shading of the existing Carey Ct houses if you increased to 3 story buildings. I think you should restrict buildings on the 2000 block of East Washington (on the N side) to two stories.

Transitions Between Redevelopment and Existing Development

There are some general strategies that should be considered to lessen impacts on surrounding properties so that their use is not substantially impaired by redevelopment projects. These strategies can include:

1. Building setbacks to lessen massing and shadow impacts;
2. A landscape buffer to shield the ground floor from adjoining properties;
3. Fencing to improve backyard privacy;
4. A side yard and/or rear yard setback.

Neighborhood, corridor, or special area plans may create location-specific design standards that articulate what transition measures are needed in which areas of the city. Ultimately, determination as to whether a development proposal has an appropriate transition to existing development is up to the Plan Commission when the project requires a conditional use approval or the City Council when a rezoning is required, subject to relevant standards established in the zoning code.



sjkrausk May 29 2018 at 4:04PM

If this is truly going to help speed up transportation options along the E Washington corridor, that is great. However, you are increasing housing density and parking in the 2000-2100 block of E Wash, E Mifflin, Carey Ct, E. Dayton, which are already competitive with residents by parking use by East High students and Options employees. Residents of these neighborhoods need priority street parking if housing density increases and the public market comes in at 1st and E Washington. People already treat our neighborhood as a park and ride district, which it is not. We need to keep people from using our corridor as a park and ride option.

enance Facility

bus storage and maintenance and lacks the infrastructure to of electric buses. A new facility is enting BRT and an expansion of unserved areas. The existing bus needs to be upgraded to improve service, and other elements.

emand for redevelopment along hat demand is likely to increase proved. BRT corridors should be id for the preparation of detailed is should not only cover building ment investments in transit, but estrian and bicycle infrastructure ple to get to BRT stations.

rsue the of rapid transitl ple are able to and access vital munity health and ces." l participant

struction ark Street and University Avenue d to Campus Drive, are slated for ext decade or so. The City should ure BRT service to avoid having ire.

What is "Bus Rapid Transit"?

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is an enhanced bus-based public transportation system that delivers faster service with more amenities than "standard" bus service. The best BRT systems integrate as many of the following features as possible:

- Dedicated lanes/alignment
- Off-board fare payment
- All-door boarding
- Platform-level boarding
- Priority treatment for buses at signalized intersections - traffic lights stay green as buses are approaching
- High-capacity articulated vehicles
- High-quality stations
- More widely spaced stations - generally about a half-mile apart, rather than a quarter-mile or less for typical bus service
- Faster service
- More frequent service
- Prominent branding to differentiate BRT from standard bus routes

d. TIF and BRT

Tax Increment Financing (TIF) is one of the few tools that the City has to fund economic development and infrastructure outside of using general debt or the general fund. With BRT's potential to spur redevelopment, there may be an opportunity to capture value from redevelopment projects and apply it to making the infrastructure improvements needed to implement BRT within some Tax Increment Districts. TIF funds can help finance land costs and certain non-assessable infrastructure costs associated with BRT construction. Any investment in BRT infrastructure will be limited to eligible project costs and balanced with supporting other expenditures within a Tax Increment District (TID). Please see the Economy and Opportunity Element for a definition of TIF.

Kirstie Laatsch

Planner | City of Madison

Department of Planning + Community + Economic Development

klaatsch@cityofmadison.com | 608.243.0470

www.imaginemadisonwi.com | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#)

June 4, 2018



To: Natalie Erdman Brian Grady, Jeanne Hoffman,
Chris Petykowski, Heather Stouder

From: The Marquette Neighborhood Association Board
RE: Sustainability and the Comprehensive Plan

Dear City Employees:

We understand that the complete Draft Comprehensive Plan Update, including a chapter entitled "Green and Resilient", will be introduced at the May 1 Common Council meeting, with the expectation that adoption by the Council will occur in late July or early August.

We also know that a set schedule for "neighborhood feedback" on the draft plan has not yet been identified but that the May 9 Board of Parks Commissioners Meeting, the May 21 Sustainable Madison Committee and Committee on the Environment Meeting and a June 4th Plan Commission meeting are all opportunities for our members to voice their opinions. We ask that our board is actively informed of these, and other meetings. We may be contacted at mnaboard@marquette-neighborhood.org.

We have a number of committees that work on issues related to historic preservation, canopy trees, green space and transportation; and our neighborhood is particularly passionate about sustainability and the many ways it is defined. We admire cities that have incorporated these ideas into ordinance form, as Portland, Oregon has with its " Green Streets Policy."

Our board urges you to consider sustainability—walkability, bike-ability, improved traffic connectivity, air quality, aquifer health, storm water management, art, green space, public spaces and canopy trees to be in equal in importance to other aspects of the Comprehensive Plan.

Finally, we support the fine work that has been accomplished by the City of Madison, the Sustainability Plan and the Pollinatore Report, for example. Our board values this long-term vision-setting work and is hopeful about the future of our city.

Please keep us informed and please consider the priorities of the Marquette Neighborhood, which are priorities that we believe align with what makes Madison a great place to live.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lynn Lee". The signature is written in dark ink on a light-colored, textured background.

Lynn Lee
President
Marquette Neighborhood Association

Cc: Alder Marsha Rummel
MNA Traffic Committee

MNA Board Members
SASY Board President – Brad Hinkfuss
TLNA Board President – Patty Prime

Plan Commission
Meeting of June 4, 2018
Agenda Items 31 and #2, Legistar 51391 and 51349

Strategy 2: Preserve historic and special places that tell the story of Madison and reflect our racially and ethnically diverse cultures and histories (page 76).

The following sentence should be removed:

“Community feedback received during the Imagine Madison process indicated a preference for increasing density in already developed areas over lower-density development on the edge of the city.”

Community feedback did support increasing density in already developed areas. As explained on page 39: “When asked which areas of the city are most appropriate to accommodate future growth, 81% of Resident Panel survey respondents and 91% of community meeting respondents preferred land in already-developed areas. Similarly, about two-thirds of website survey respondents advocated for an even higher amount of infill and redevelopment than the city has seen since adoption of the city’s last Comprehensive Plan in 2006. 20% of website survey respondents felt that aiming for a 50/50 mix was appropriate.”

However, that does not mean that there was support for placing that increased density in historic districts. Historic districts cover a very small percentage of Madison’s area -- I believe it is something like 2%. That leaves 98% of the already developed City area that can share in increased density. As has already happened, increased density has occurred in historic districts and will continue to occur. But to use this sentence in Strategy 2 gives preference for redevelopment over preservation.

The following sentence should be modified:

“Madison will need to find the balance between encouraging redevelopment and infill while protecting *the qualities that made existing neighborhoods appealing to begin with.*”

This strategy is not about protecting “existing neighborhoods.” It is about preserving and protecting historic and special places. The sentence should reflect that goal and be changed to:

“Madison will need to find the balance between encouraging redevelopment and infill while protecting *and preserving historic and special places.*”

Add language regarding the value of historic preservation

The language does not discuss the importance of historic preservation, other than in economic terms (heritage tourism; keeping material out of the landfills; not wasting the embodied energy contained in the building; and, less expensive rental opportunities).

Language should be added to address the importance of protection and preservation of historic and special places. For example, the introduction to the Green and Resilient section talks of Madison’s long-standing commitment to protecting the natural environment and that the natural environment must be respected and preserved. Strategy 4 recognizes how parks “improve the

health and well-being of residents” in addition to parks contributing to the City’s economic well-being. Similar language should be added to the preservation and protection of historic and special places.

Even state statutes recognize the importance of historic preservation: the City is required to regulate “all historic or archaeological landmarks and all property within each historic district to preserve the historic or archaeological landmarks and property within the district and the character of the district.” Wis. Stats. 62.23(7)(em)

The following phrase should be removed:

“This is important to ensure that the ordinance achieves the community’s preservation priorities **in balance with modern construction methods and materials.**”

The Comprehensive Plan is to provide general guidance, not specifics. Perhaps, as part of the ordinance rewrite, comparable language might find its way into the ordinance – which is where it belongs, should the Landmarks Commission and Council find such language appropriate. I understand that staff is supporting this change.

Neighborhood Plans

Page 17 discusses the purpose of the GFLU map.

In such instances, it is important to refer to other Elements of this Plan and other city plans and ordinances (such as adopted neighborhood plans, the historic preservation plan, historic preservation ordinance, and urban design districts), when considering whether development is appropriate for a given parcel. It is not the intent of the GFLU Map to encourage more intense development in all MR, HR, and mixed-use areas **without consideration** for other adopted plans and regulations. Similarly, it is not the intention of this Plan that any existing multifamily that may be in the “Low Residential” district must be transitioned to single-family or duplex development.

“With consideration” is not the same as saying development needs to be “consistent with” other adopted plans.” In a few places in the draft plan, consistency with adopted City plans is required (LR areas, campus areas expanding into adjacent neighborhoods, adding land to the Central Urban Service Area), implying consistency with adopted City plans is not required in other areas. In several other places, CMU and RMU, building height is discussed as “subject to” recommendations in adopted City plans.

This is in contrast to the existing Comprehensive Plan. A few examples include:

Objective 1 (Ensure that urban development within the City of Madison is consistent with the City’s goals and objectives for land use and community development), policy 2: “Approve development and redevelopment projects **only if such projects are consistent with** the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan, Peripheral Area Development Plan, City-adopted detailed neighborhood development plans and similar special area plans.” (Page 2-12, emphasis added)

Objective 26 (Guide future urban development in identified City growth areas through adoption and implementation of detailed neighborhood development plans that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan), policy 2: “Require new development in City growth areas to **be consistent with the goals, objectives, policies and implementation recommendations of adopted neighborhood development plans** and the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan.” (Page 2-25, emphasis added)

Or see the *CITY OF MADISON 2010-2011 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW PROCESS FOR CONSIDERING LIMITED AMENDMENTS TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN*

The City of Madison Comprehensive Plan specifies that land use approvals should be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and that significant changes in land use or development intensity should also **be consistent with the more-detailed recommendations in an adopted neighborhood plan**. (Emphasis added)

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=1771539&GUID=8F742167-14D8-443D-AC41-7A09473E2C57>

Consistency is addressed to some extent on page 124. But that language discusses how the land uses in the Comprehensive Plan are intended to be consistent with adopted City plans – it does not explicitly state that development needs to be consistent with adopted City plans. Further, adopted City plans are described on page 124 as providing “more-detailed land use and design recommendations than are mapped more precisely [than the GFLU map]. Again, nothing is said about development complying with those adopted plans.

The need for new development, and redevelopment, to be consistent with adopted City Plans should be clearly stated on page 17, where the impact of the GFLU map is discussed.

Respectfully submitted,
Linda Lehnertz