

**Feedback Summary 5: June 10, 2024-July 16, 2024**

Staff has reviewed, categorized, and summarized public feedback received since the Phase 4 Feedback Summary from April 20, 2024 to June 10, 2024 through the activities shown in the legend at the bottom of the document. The legend also includes abbreviations used within the document to identify where the various comments came from.\*

Public comments received during Board, Committee and Commission meetings and third-party gatherings like neighborhood association meetings, friends groups, and other activities are not included. Board, Committee and Commission meeting recordings are available via the West Area Plan project webpage.

The "multiplier" column approximates how many times similar comments were received. In certain cases, individuals may have submitted the same or similar comment multiple times. If the comment is not within the scope of what the West Plan covers, staff shared the comments with the appropriate city agency.

\*The details provided below are only from comments directly received by the City, External community engagement efforts done are not included below unless stated otherwise.

# West Area Plan - Community Feedback Summary

COMMENT	SOURCE	MULTIPLIER	AREA/DETAILS
<b>Land Use</b>			
Approve of land use changes	(EF)	1	In agreement with the concepts set forth in the zoning and land use plan
Concern/Oppose land use changes	(EF)	1	Oppose land use designation changes to 6200-6300 Old Sauk Rd - seems city staff are selectively picking larger than average single family lots for high density housing - this is an invitation to developers
Want more developments like Sequoia Commons	(OH20)	1	Sequoia Commons is a gem and the neighborhoods greatest amenity, just like elements of increased density in the drafts of the West Area Plan, it was opposed when it was proposed for development, want a visionary plan to allow for more Sequoia Commons- type development and future residents will thank you
Support greater density	(OH20)	1	Support greater density along transportation corridors and in the West Towne area
Less density/development	(EF)	2	Need recognition of saturation/overdevelopment and excess loss of per capita green space, density comes at a price, need a balance of development and green, Madison has a unique charm that should not be sacrificed moving forward, consider current residents as well, concern urban containment will drive up housing prices and reduces the availability of land to support the development of middle-income housing, overlooking opportunities to promote and support affordable, owner-occupied housing for community service professionals
Building heights	(EF)	1	Opposed to any development greater than 3 stories in a location that is adjacent to/among single family homes, will decrease value of homes
No Rezoning	(OH20)	1	Why do we have zoning?, opposed to rezoning that strips power from the residents, do not remove planned development (PD), opposed rezoning Old Sauk single family homes from LR to LMR without the owners knowledge
No escalator clause	(OH20)	1	
Oppose BRT overlay for Hill Farms neighborhood	(EF)	1	Maintain the historic designation of Hill Farms and reverse the BRT overlay, reverse decision on the BRT overlay in the Hill Farms neighborhood, bisects the neighborhood and will create strife among neighbors, do not want multi-unit or multi-story complex next to single-family home
Approve of Highlands neighborhood rezone removed from plan recommendations	(EF)	1	Thank you for removing proactive rezone TR-R to SR-C1 from plan, renewed faith in City and staff listening to residents feedback, want to preserve TR-R zoning for Highlands neighborhood due to wanting to retain the historic greenspace for all future Madison residents and visitors
<b>Transportation</b>			
Oppose Sauk Creek Greenway pedestrian/bike path	(OC) (OH20)	4	Oppose any wide paved paths through the Sauk Creek Greenway, no east-west path; Concerns: Destructive to this urban forest (loss of a substantial number of trees, foliage, and plants), Less than ¼ mile, Will need switchbacks to traverse the bluff due to slope, Circuitous route, Serious bikers will not use it, Won't add any destinations for Inexperienced bikers plus all streets surrounding the greenway are considered low stress by the City, Won't be a lovely ride in the woods –once the trees are gone, Don't compare to pheasant branch/capital city bike trail/Southwest commuter bike trail, Bridge construction will require clearing of trees for construction machinery, and to protect the bridge, as seen throughout Madison, close alternate pathways (Westfield, Farmington and Tree Lane) with established bike lanes to travel in area, will necessitate "zigzags" that will result in the loss of even more trees, motivation to access it (plants, animals, etc.) will be severely altered, high cost financially and environmentally, tress and wetland soil play a huge role in carbon sequestration, weigh wants vs needs, work together to achieve 40% canopy (private property, neighborhood association, landscapers, volunteers)
Support both east-west and north-south paths in Sauk Creek Greenway	(OC) (OH20)	1	East-west path will create a safe bike/ped corridor that connects the neighborhoods and continues on to Colony Drive and the nearby elementary, middle, and high schools, far too many students who live west of Sauk Creek are within walking/biking distance of school but are bussed because of a lack of sidewalks and hazardous traffic on Tree Lane, north-south path will simply be beautiful, a place for people of all ages and abilities to safely enjoy the greenway without getting their feet muddy, should go back to original language
Approve of east-west Sauk Creek Greenway connection	(EF)	1	"Lack of sidewalks" seems to implicate Red Fox & Grey Fox Tr, missing sidewalks of many cul-de-sacs such as Plover Ct, Copper Ct., and Stoneridge Ct, Tree lane is very busy, planned east/west path through the Sauk Creek greenway will allow students to walk quieter Colony Drive, West Area Plan in harmony with the MMSD Unusual Hazard Plan seems well on the way

COMMENT	SOURCE	MULTIPLIER	AREA/DETAILS
Oppose to Middleton Street Connection	(OC) (OH20)	8	Keep Middleton Street closed at point Middleton and Madison meet; Concerns: not about improving connectivity, safety concerns, environmental concerns, area is steep, windy, and narrow therefore not suitable for increased traffic especially during winter, street is not designed for increased traffic, adjacent to wildlife (turtles, ducks, etc.) which would be negatively impacted by increased traffic, negatively impact ecology of Stricker's Pond, Sticker Pond is a sanctuary, the barricade is a pedestrian intersection, two pedestrian paths empty out directly onto Middleton Street
Oppose road diets	(EF)	1	Any reduction in lanes will result in even more idling vehicles
Education for bikers and drivers	(EF)	1	Drivers and bikers need education on the rules of the road
Appalachian Way	(OC) (OH20)	3	No need to open up Appalachian Way to Sauk Ridge Trail; this is a single family detached housing area where people want to have larger lots with privacy and space for families. Concerns: increase traffic on Appalachian Way and Blue Ridge Parkway, will open area to medium or high density housing in the area (large apartment buildings), area should not be rezoned or a road put through - makes no sense to disrupt quiet streets with a vehicle pass through, opposed to continuing the path eastward
Yosemite connection	(OC)	1	Do not favor reconnecting Yosemite Place and Yosemite Trail, disconnected decades ago to stop teens from speeding down the street and trying to get their cars airborne, very hazardous for the residents of the street, do not undo past improvements
Concerns on eliminating right turns	(EF)	1	Concerned we are creating an environmental/air quality problem with the elimination of right turn lanes to accommodate bike lanes, single lane roads (road diets) and BRT stations, increasing the amount of idling
Would like to bike path improvements	(EF)	1	Keating Terrace, with a way to use some of the Queen of Peace parking lot, to Glenway would be a great alternative to a bike lane on Mineral Point road, make South Hill Drive a bike boulevard as alternative to Mineral Point Road
Opposed to removing parking	(OH20)	1	Opposed to removing parking from southside of Old Sauk Road, we do not need a sidewalk on each side
Would like to see more safety improvements	(EF)	1	Intersection of Segoe and Mineral Point intersection does not allow enough space for a right turn lane, Whitney Way is already a difficult street to turn on to or cross, look for even more ways to get bikes off major streets and create more bike boulevards parallel to those major streets
<i>NOTE: sidewalk comments summarized in Health &amp; Safety section</i>			
<b>Neighborhoods and Housing</b>			
School comments [staff note: the City does not control school attendance areas or school expansions]	(EF)	1	More direct and structured interactions with MMSD-include a specific approach to examine the impact of any new housing development on the school system and the existing infrastructure, the lack of infrastructure including taxes from developer is not sustainable and the costs are being passed down to single family home owners, concerns of overcrowding of schools
<b>Economy and Opportunity</b>			
<b>Culture and Character</b>			
<b>Green and Resilient</b>			
Rennebohm Park	(EF)	1	Bringing picnic tables or fireplaces/chimneys to the perimeter of the park would increase the appeal of the low usage areas
<b>Effective Government</b>			
<b>Health and Safety</b>			
Additional sidewalks	(OC)	1	Change Red Fox & Grey Fox Tr to GREEN priority sidewalk
<b>Planning Process/Other</b>			
Public Feedback format	(EF) (OH20)	3	Individual input can be at odds with some City priorities and initiatives (ex. housing), rigid template for input by filtering, focusing, and summarizing citizen input to fit template, what happens with feedback afterwards?, count each signature of petitions as individual responses
Good Job with plan	(OH20)	1	
City Budget	(OH20)	1	No referendum , cut all wasteful spending, reduce borrowing, use \$31.2 M + \$10 M found in 2025 budget to pay for the \$27M shortfall, reevaluate all positions and funded groups and cut where needed, lobby legislature for your fair share of revenue, 1/4 % sales tax 1/4 transit tax
Provide more information within plans and planning process	(OH20)	1	Provide fiscal notes
More information on planning process	(EF)	1	Difficult to understand the exact implementation of the various zoning and land use plans

**Feedback Summary 5**  
(OH20) In-Person Open House - All topics May 20  
(EF) Emailed Feedback  
(OC) Online draft Map and Action Comments

COMMENT	SOURCE	MULTIPLIER	AREA/DETAILS
---------	--------	------------	--------------