



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Approved PLAN COMMISSION

This meeting can be viewed LIVE on Madison City Channel, cable channel 98, digital channel 994, or at www.madisoncitychannel.tv.

Wednesday, May 23, 2012

5:30 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room 300 (Madison Municipal Building)

ZONING CODE REWRITE WORKING SESSION

Note: This Session will NOT be televised.

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Present: 8 -

Steve King; Marsha A. Rummel; Chris Schmidt; Nan Fey; Eric W. Sundquist; Michael W. Rewey; Bradley A. Cantrell and Tonya L. Hamilton-Nisbet

Excused: 3 -

Michael G. Heifetz; Anna Andrzejewski and John L. Finnemore

Staff Present: Rick Roll, Heather Stouder, Kevin Firchow, Matt Tucker

Fey was chair of the meeting. The meeting was called to order by Fey at 5:30 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

David Sparer, 16 North Carroll Street, Madison, speaking on behalf of co-ops in the Marquette neighborhood. Mr. Sparer said he likes the proposed zoning text for housing co-operatives in the Marquette neighborhood. He said there is a housing co-operative on Merry Street that should be added to the staff recommended geographical area. Staff noted that the property in question could be zoned TR-V1 to address the concern.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

There were no disclosures or recusals.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2012 SPECIAL MEETING

A motion was made by Sundquist, seconded by Rummel, to Approve the May 3, 2012 Minutes. The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 -

Steve King; Marsha A. Rummel; Eric W. Sundquist; Michael W. Rewey; Bradley A. Cantrell and Nan Fey

Abstentions: 2 -

Chris Schmidt and Tonya L. Hamilton-Nisbet

Excused: 2 -

Michael G. Heifetz; Anna Andrzejewski and John L. Finnemore

1. [12186](#)

Draft Zoning Code

A motion was made by King, seconded by Rewey for informal consideration. Motion passed by voice vote/other.

Staff presented a memorandum titled "Summary of Recommended Zoning Text Changes" dated May 23, 2012.

Staff provided an overview of 1. Housing Co-operatives in the Marquette Neighborhood.

Staff noted that zoning the housing co-operative on Merry Street TR-V1 will address Mr. Sparer's concern.

The Plan Commission informally agreed with the staff recommendation for 1. Housing Cooperatives in the Marquette Neighborhood, including rezoning the housing co-operative on Merry Street to TR-V1.

Staff provided an overview of 2. Changes to Residential Districts.

Discussion about deed restrictions or protective covenants as they relate to proposed TR-C4 zoning which allows two unit dwellings on 6,000 square foot lots.

The Plan Commission informally agreed with the staff recommendation for 2. Changes to Residential Districts.

Staff provided an overview of 3. Changes to the Employment Campus District.

Discussion of whether this district could be applied to the Mifflin area. Staff said the Employment Campus District is not intended for the Mifflin area. The Employment Campus District requires a "master plan".

Staff noted that the landscape buffer omission in the fourth column of the "Parking Location" row will be corrected.

Discussion about the proposed standards in the table titled "Summary of Potential Bulk Changes". Some Commissioners raised concerns that the proposed building height, corner lot provisions, and parking location are suburban, not urban.

Discussion about whether the University of Wisconsin Research Park has any issues with the Employment Campus District as it was originally adopted. Staff noted there was significant coordination during the crafting of the original Research and Development Center district standards.

Discussion about the proposed building height standards. Height of buildings could be part of the "master plan" consideration. The "master plan" requirement in the Employment Campus District allows the Plan Commission to require two or more story buildings.

Suggestion to add text to the Employment Campus District's Statement of Purpose that addresses the primary goals of the district and refers to the desire for two story buildings but not necessarily everywhere.

Discussion about lot coverage. Explanation of what counts as lot coverage.

Discussion on the bulk requirements for corner lots for the Employment Campus and

Research and Development Center district.

Comment about requiring some parts of buildings in the Employment Campus District to be built to the corner.

Discussion about what grounds the Plan Commission has to reject "suburban-style" development. Staff said the "master plan" process allows the Plan Commission to review the overall form for the development..

The Plan Commission informally agreed to ask staff to bring back the text of the Employment Campus District with the changes described in the staff memorandum.

Staff provided an overview of 5. One Story Projection for Garages.

The Plan Commission informally agreed to ask staff to clarify the staff recommendation for 5. One Story Projection for Garages by explaining how 30% is calculated and explaining what "projection" means.

Staff provided an overview of 6. Revise Building Materials Definition and Revise Use Table.

Discussion about whether this use would be allowed in the TSS District.

The Plan Commission informally agreed to approve the staff recommendation for 6. Revise Building Materials Definition and Revise Use Table.

Staff provided an overview of 7. Intersection and Driveway Sight Distance Vision Clearance Standards.

The Plan Commission informally recommended approval of item 7. above.

Suggestion to look at vision triangles for parking garages.

Staff provided an overview of 4. Bulk and Height Standards for Lakefront Development.

Discussion about using current text as a baseline (floor area ratio), but allow Plan Commission to approve more. Potential legal issue with that approach since the Plan Commission can't grant variances.

Comment-Could we add "view from public area" and "neighbor's houses" to the conditional use standards?

Comment about protection of riparian interest. Lot coverage affects riparian issues.

Discussion about having bulk standards specifically for lakefront properties.

Comment to consider tree preservation along the lake. Consider size and species.

Comment about possibly using floor area ratio.

Discussion about building height along the lake.

Discussion about how to measure height. Should bulk be based on the median floor area ratio based on five properties on each side of the subject property?

The Plan Commission informally agreed to remove the bulk and height maximums (125% median of properties within 1,000 feet on either side) as absolute requirements. The Plan Commission maintained a bulk comparison with five properties on either side, as well as a comparison of existing and proposed building height for informational consideration associated with conditional use review. The Plan Commission informally agreed to create a new conditional use standard regarding height and bulk and their impact on neighboring properties.

This Item was Referred to the PLAN COMMISSION

2. Discussion of Future Potential Meeting Dates

ADJOURNMENT

**A motion was made by Rewey, seconded by Rummel, to Adjourn at 7:42 p.m.
The motion passed by voice vote/other.**