From: Zellers, Ledell
To: Stouder, Heather
Cc: Ken Opin [redacted]; King, J Steven
Subject: Re: Comp Plan - Second email
Date: Monday, July 16, 2018 9:54:45 AM

Hi Heather,

An addendum to the comments/suggestions/questions below.

Comment/request #136 - Says no but under PC edits shows that a footnote will be added. What will the footnote say? Shouldn't this be in the "Y" section?

Comment/request #158 - Delete this item and/or note it is being addressed/incorporated under comment #33 or include in the "Y" section. Leaving this as is misleads.

Comment/request #178. - Delete this item and/or note it is being addressed/incorporated under comment #85 or include in the "Y" section. Leaving this as is misleads.

Also, looping back to:

Comment/request #6 - we need similar language for Community Mixed Use and Regional Mixed Use. The UDD8 for E. Washington did a good job of recognizing the need to have things like setbacks and stepbacks when adjacent to the smaller scale residential neighborhood. We need to include that recognized need in the Comp Plan.

Thanks.
Ledell

Alder Ledell Zellers
608 417 9521

To subscribe to District 2 updates go to: http://www.cityofmadison.com/council/district2/

From: Zellers, Ledell
Sent: Sunday, July 15, 2018 9:21 PM
To: Stouder, Heather
Cc: Ken Opin ([redacted]); King, J Steven
Subject: Comp Plan

Hi Heather,

I have several Comp Plan comment/suggestions/questions. I have not yet reviewed the "N" grid items but I don't anticipate having a many comments about those. I expect to get additional comments to you tomorrow morning.

Comp Plan comments/suggestions/questions:

P. 15 Growth Priority Areas - third column not complete...chopped off.

P 124 Consistency Between Sub Area Plans and The Comprehensive Plan - needs further clarity in regard to sub area plans in existence at the time this Comp Plan is passed. Perhaps a final sentence at the end of the first paragraph that says: "If an inconsistency is identified between this Plan and a sub-area plan which is in existence when this Plan is adopted, the sub-area plan prevails. Additionally, either the sub-area plan or this plan will be amended so they are consistent."

P 124. Does any of what is on page 124 and 125, other than the minor bits shown on the track changes pages in our packet, remain in the plan? I assume the "Adopted Sub-Area Plans", "Sub Area Plan Retirement" and "Overlapping Sub Area Plans" sections remain?

Comment/request #12 - under staff recommendation it does not mentions parking, only traffic...needs to acknowledge the big problems with parking...

Comment/request #15 - Strategy 6 should read: "Accommodate growth through infill and redevelopment. Redevelopment should be integrated into corridors and transitioning mixed-use centers and undeveloped but planned mixed use centers as identified on the Growth Priority Areas map with less growth emphasis on established mixed use centers."

Comment/request #33 - The language suggested doesn't do it for me. It needs to acknowledge in some way the bias in the way the questions were asked (not including the downsides of infill (e.g. gentrification)...only the upsides and the fact that such a very small percentage of residents even took part in the Urban footprint exercise which in itself results in unreliable and likely skewed results. Maybe say something like: " While this Plan does not recommend a halt to development on the City's edges, respondents to questions using the Urban Footprint template did show a preference for infill rather than edge development. However, when offered an option they showed a preference for development on transportation corridors and places like East and West Towne rather than generalized infill. In addition we must acknowledge the small number of respondents (under 1% of Madison's population) to these questions and that the questions did not recognize potential downsides to infill, including gentrification. Nor did the questions acknowledge the many ways edge development could be done in such a way as to mitigate negative impacts, such as increasing the density of such development."

Comment/request #48 - I'm not clear how/where you are intending to incorporate this. Please explain

Comment/request #51 - I'd like to see the text you are proposing to capture this.

Comment/request #52 - in the staff recommendation add a sentence prior to the last sentence to say: "However respondents were not queried on how they prioritize preservation of Madison's historic resources in relation to infill location and when respondents did indicate preferred location for infill they showed a preference for transit corridors and non-historic parts of the city."

Comment/request #71 and 72 and 74 - these seem fairly significant not to have actual language which has been endorsed by PC.

Comment/request #114 - should be clear the applicable neighborhood should be part of the review process. Maybe add: "The neighborhood covered by the plan will be engaged in the

review and determination of whether the plan is still applicable."

Comment/request #117 - Explain please

Comment/request #121 - Suggest changing second sentence, from "is reduced" to "may be reduced" and taking out the words "seen as" in 4th sentence.

Comment/request #122 - 128 - please give a better idea about what you are proposing to incorporate and where.

Please let me know if you have questions about any of the above.

Best,
Ledell

Alder Ledell Zellers
608 417 9521

To subscribe to District 2 updates go to: http://www.cityofmadison.com/council/district2/

Comprehensive Plan Suggestions and Questions from Alder Zellers
July 16, 2018

Comment/Request #5 - Page 15 Growth Priority Areas - third column not complete...chopped off.

Staff response: Paper copies didn't include the second page; Legistar and the emailed PDFs include the second page.

Page 124 Consistency Between Sub Area Plans and The Comprehensive Plan - needs further clarity in regard to sub area plans in existence at the time this Comp Plan is passed. Perhaps a final sentence at the end of the first paragraph that says: "If an inconsistency is identified between this Plan and a sub-area plan which is in existence when this Plan is adopted, the sub-area plan prevails. Additionally, either the sub-area plan or this plan will be amended so they are consistent."

Staff response: Staff does not support this language. A blanket statement that sub-area plans are always prioritized could result in numerous unintended consequences. Staff has tried to reflect sub-area plans when updating this Plan, but the proposed language would prioritize all sub-area plans over this Plan, including sub-area plans that were adopted 30 years ago and NDPs that have growth principles that are out of step with some Comprehensive Plan principles. There will be some inconsistencies, given the differences in scale and scope of sub-area plans and the Comprehensive Plan. This language is also a substantial change in how the City and Plan Commission has conducted previous project reviews, where different plans covering the same area are weighed as part of a comprehensive project review.

Page 124 Does any of what is on page 124 and 125, other than the minor bits shown on the track changes pages in our packet, remain in the plan? I assume the "Adopted Sub-Area Plans", "Sub Area Plan Retirement" and "Overlapping Sub Area Plans" sections remain?

Staff response: The redlined part of page 124 would be edited as shown; other parts of page 124-125 would remain as shown.

Comment/request #12 - under staff recommendation it does not mentions parking, only traffic...needs to acknowledge the big problems with parking...

Staff response: Add a reference to parking: "Such plans should include an analysis of existing and projected traffic and parking issues and methods that could be used to mitigate such issues."

Comment/request #15 - Strategy 6 should read: "Accommodate growth through infill and redevelopment. Redevelopment should be integrated into corridors and transitioning mixed-use centers and undeveloped but planned mixed use centers as identified on the Growth Priority Areas map with less growth emphasis on established mixed use centers."

Staff response: Staff does not support editing Strategy #6 in this manner. Such an edit makes Strategy #6 substantially similar to Strategy #5, would necessitate rewriting all of the introductory commentary to the strategy, and also require the deletion of Action 6a. Staff feels Action 6a is important to pursue, and this action has thus far been supported by the PC. Staff feels it would be contrary to many strategies and actions in the Plan to change the meaning of "Established Centers" to indicate that there is "less growth emphasis" on these areas.

Comment/request #33 - The language suggested doesn't do it for me. It needs to acknowledge in some way the bias in the way the questions were asked (not including the downsides of infill (e.g. gentrification)...only the upsides and the fact that such a very small percentage of residents even took part in the Urban footprint exercise which in itself results in unreliable and likely skewed results. Maybe say something like: " While this Plan does not recommend a halt to development on the City's edges, respondents to questions using the Urban Footprint template did show a preference for infill rather than edge development. However, when offered an option they showed a preference for development on transportation corridors and places like East and West Towne rather than generalized infill. In addition we must acknowledge the small number of respondents (under 1% of Madison's population) to these questions and that the questions did not recognize potential downsides to infill, including gentrification. Nor did the questions acknowledge the many ways edge development could be done in such a way as to mitigate negative impacts, such as increasing the density of such development."

Staff response: Staff does not support this language. Staff has provided other text changes to describe the general nature of the growth prioritization exercise. The growth prioritization results were consistent with feedback (a preference for infill/redevelopment) throughout the 18-month Imagine Madison process.

Comment/request #48 - I'm not clear how/where you are intending to incorporate this. Please explain

Staff response: Revise the 2nd sentence of E&O action 6b to read: "Madison's consistently strong real estate market produces a strong demand for contractors in the construction and building rehabilitation sectors.

Comment/request #51 - I'd like to see the text you are proposing to capture this.

Staff response: Insert sentence after 3rd sentence in C&C action 1c to read: "Restoration of historic assists can be an important part of context-sensitive design (see C&C Strategy #2, Action c)."

Comment/request #52 - in the staff recommendation add a sentence prior to the last sentence to say: "However respondents were not queried on how they prioritize preservation of Madison's historic resources in relation to infill location and when respondents did indicate preferred location for infill they showed a preference for transit corridors and non-historic parts of the city."

Staff response: Staff is hesitant to call out one thing that survey participants were not queried about when there were so many things that participants were not queried about.

Comment/request #71 and #72 – Comments 71, 72, and 74 seem fairly significant not to have actual language which has been endorsed by PC.

Staff response: Staff has not yet met with the Engineering Division to work on additional language for #71. Staff feels that #71 and #72 are not controversial.

Comment/request #74 – Comments 71, 72, and 74 seem fairly significant not to have actual language which has been endorsed by PC.

Staff response: #74 deals with integrating an action from an already-adopted plan and is not controversial.

Comment/request #114 - should be clear the applicable neighborhood should be part of the review process. Maybe add: "The neighborhood covered by the plan will be engaged in the review and determination of whether the plan is still applicable."

Staff response: The original question was about who decides whether the Plan reflects current City priorities. The drafted reply addresses that comment. The current language reflects previous feedback from the Plan Commission to not include details on how a plan retirement process would be carried out.

Comment/request #117 - Explain please

Staff response: See comment #88. The "reduce landfilled waste" strategy language had been included in an initial staff draft, but was changed due to a suggestion from another department. However, Planning Staff feels that the current (May 1) language is too complicated. If something is being used, it is not waste.

Comment/request #121 - Suggest changing second sentence, from "is reduced" to "may be reduced" and taking out the words "seen as" in 4th sentence.

Staff response: Staff feels that "While overall VMT is reduced" is accurate and should be maintained in this Plan. Staff suggests deleting "As seen".

Comment/request #122 - please give a better idea about what you are proposing to incorporate and where.

Staff response: Add age distribution trends to page 3.

Comment/request #123 - please give a better idea about what you are proposing to incorporate and where.

Staff response: Development by Decade map on page 134 is adequate to address housing age; add a new map of housing value in the maps appendix.

Comment/request #124 - please give a better idea about what you are proposing to incorporate and where.

Staff response: Staff is still discussing how to best integrate these topics into the Plan.

Comment/request #125 - please give a better idea about what you are proposing to incorporate and where.

Staff response: See #94 regarding power generation. See page 153 for libraries. Community facilities is addressed via the Capital Improvement Projects map on page 149. After further review of statutory requirements, additional information is not needed for some of the issues.

Comment/request #126 - please give a better idea about what you are proposing to incorporate and where.

Staff response: Planning Staff will meet with the Economic Development Division to address this and anticipates adding text under the E&O Element.

Comment/request #127 - please give a better idea about what you are proposing to incorporate and where.

Staff response: Staff will add this information to the Land Demand Analysis in the Land Use Supplement appendix.

Comment/request #128 - please give a better idea about what you are proposing to incorporate and where.

Staff response: See previous reply to this issue – language to that effect will be added to page 5.

Comment/request #136 - Says no but under PC edits shows that a footnote will be added. What will the footnote say? Shouldn't this be in the "Y" section?

Staff response: Staff will change this to a "yes" for the next version of the spreadsheet and clarify that the PC did not want to add historic districts to the FLU map, but add a footnote cross-reference instead. Language to be added is: "Please see the Culture and Character Element, Strategy #2 for maps of the City's historic districts."

Comment/request #158 - Delete this item and/or note it is being addressed/incorporated under comment #33 or include in the "Y" section. Leaving this as is misleads.

Staff response: Staff will change the recommendation to reference #33.

Comment/request #178. - Delete this item and/or note it is being addressed/incorporated under comment #85 or include in the "Y" section. Leaving this as is misleads.

Staff response: Staff will change the recommendation to reference #85.

Comment/request #6 - we need similar language for Community Mixed Use and Regional Mixed Use. The UDD8 for E. Washington did a good job of recognizing the need to have things like setbacks and stepbacks when adjacent to the smaller scale residential neighborhood. We need to include that recognized need in the Comp Plan.

Staff response: The comment in question was to add language to NMU. The same language could be added to CMU, RMU, and other FLU categories, but staff feels that action LU&T 5b is adequate to address all three mixed-use categories and all other land use categories instead of repeating the same language in all FLU land use descriptions. The Plan favors statements in one place over repetition in multiple locations to maintain a concise plan. Staff would prefer to eliminate the NMU language in favor of the blanket statements on pages 36 (the LU&T5b text) and 38 (accompanying call-out, graphic and photo).