From: Zellers, Ledell
To: Stouder, Heather
Cc: Ken Opin[redacted]
Subject: Comp Plan agenda items 17-18: Plan Commission July 30, 2018
Date: Sunday, July 29, 2018 1:27:20 PM

Hello Heather,

Some good work has been done on the Comp Plan since the last Plan Commission meeting. My thanks to both you and your staff. I have a few recommendations and a couple of questions.

#6 Second sentence...start with "Additional setbacks and architectural features...

#12 Action b needs the sentence you are suggesting for action d. That's where I was pointing out an issue...that's where there are serious parking issues and big impacts on neighboring residents. Things would go through approval process more smoothly and with less outcry if this issue were addressed.

#56. Add Downtown Plan to the text to read: "Update the zoning code and height maps to better link with the City's..."

P. 89 under "d", is it intended and clear that "road reconstruction" is included in places where there needs to be increased erosion control? That is a place where there can be massive amounts of run-off during large storm events (as I have witnessed on streets being reconstructed this spring/summer and which are very close to Lake Mendota).

P. 90 under "d" remove the word "already".

P. 127 Transportation section
Why is there no mention of bicycle or pedestrian transportation (other than a passing reference under State of Wisconsin paragraph)? If this section is intended to be a regional only section, it should probably say that. And even if so, regional bike networks should probably be referenced.

p 161 Urban Footprint. This description is better. Thanks for working to improve it. A few comments:
- Under "Public Input Results - Website": Second paragraph, second sentence...include number of respondents to which the "Two-thirds" is referring.
- Under "Public Input Results - Community Meetings and Resident Panels": Second paragraph, 4th sentence, include the number of participants. Same for number of Resident Panel members participating in the exercise.

Is the section "Consistency Between Sub-Area Plans and the Comprehensive Plan" up to "Adopted Sub-Area Plans" being recommended to be entirely replaced by the language in our packet? I'm not clear on what is in and what is out in this section.

I'm understanding that the footnote re historic districts will be on both the FLU map (p. 16) and the growth priority areas map (p. 16). Is that your intent? I think

it is, but if not, that is my request. (Growth priority area bubbles include several historic districts and it is not the intent that historic districts be targeted for growth.)

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 – with Staff Responses
July 30, 2018

a) #6 Second sentence...start with "Additional setbacks and architectural features...
Staff response: *Agree – can add as suggested.*

b) #12 Action b needs the sentence you are suggesting for action d. That's where I was pointing out an issue...that's where there are serious parking issues and big impacts on neighboring residents. Things would go through approval process more smoothly and with less outcry if this issue were addressed.
Staff response: *Agree. The new sentence could be moved to LU&T 5b, right before the last sentence in the existing paragraph for 5b.*

c) #56. Add Downtown Plan to the text to read: "Update the zoning code and height maps to better link with the City's..."
Staff response: *Agree – can add as suggested.*

d) P. 89 under "d", is it intended and clear that "road reconstruction" is included in places where there needs to be increased erosion control? That is a place where there can be massive amounts of run-off during large storm events (as I have witnessed on streets being reconstructed this spring/summer and which are very close to Lake Mendota).
Staff response: *Staff feels this is worded adequately, but if the Plan Commission wants to clarify "building and street construction," that would be fine.*

e) P. 90 under "d" remove the word "already".
Staff response: *Agree – can remove as suggested.*

f) P. 127 Transportation section red-line document. Why is there no mention of bicycle or pedestrian transportation (other than a passing reference under State of Wisconsin paragraph)? If this section is intended to be a regional only section, it should probably say that. And even if so, regional bike networks should probably be referenced.
Staff response: *This Transportation section was added to this appendix to cover topics required by State statute that are not otherwise discussed in the Plan. The section is intended to be a supplement to transportation topics found in the LU&T chapter, just as we have a supplement to the Land Use portion. Staff feels there is not a need to add in anything about the regional bike network in this appendix. Land Use and Transportation Strategy 8 covers pedestrian and bicycle priorities highlighted through the Imagine Madison process.*

g) p 161 Urban Footprint. This description is better. Thanks for working to improve it. Under "Public Input Results - Website": Second paragraph, second sentence...include number of respondents to which the "Two-thirds" is referring.
Staff response: *There were 334 participants through the website survey. This can be added as suggested.*

h) p 161 Urban Footprint. Under "Public Input Results - Community Meetings and Resident Panels": Second paragraph, 4th sentence, include the number of participants. Same for number of Resident Panel members participating in the exercise.
Staff response: *148 participants in community meetings, and 63 participants on Resident Panels. These can be added as suggested.*

i) Is the section "Consistency Between Sub-Area Plans and the Comprehensive Plan" up to "Adopted Sub-Area Plans" being recommended to be entirely replaced by the language in our packet? I'm not clear on what is in and what is out in this section.
Staff response: *Yes. The new page completely replaces the first section on p. 124, up to "Adopted Sub-Area Plans."*

j) I'm understanding that the footnote re historic districts will be on both the FLU map (p. 16) and the growth priority areas map (p. 16). Is that your intent? I think it is, but if not, that is my request. (Growth priority area bubbles include several historic districts and it is not the intent that historic districts be targeted for growth.)
Staff response: *Yes, that is the intent. Please see recommendations for #5 and #136. Footnotes will be added to the GFLU Map and the Growth Priority Areas Map referencing the maps of historic districts.*