

## Zone Tosa for All: Community Conversation # 2 Q+A

### Q&A Zoning Recommendations

**Question #1) Do these recommendations go far enough? For example, minimum density requirements could be proposed in certain areas, especially around high job centers and low population centers—around Medical Center, Mayfair Mall, Blue Mound – Zoo area—where transportation investments and job density necessitate higher residential density?**

There's so much to get accomplished by removing unnecessary regulatory constrain in the existing ordinance that we want to start there. Our experience, even in highly regulated markets on the West coast—like Portland that has experimented with minimum density over the years—brings some real challenges. This is an interactive process— we want to remove obstacles and provide incentives before we move further down the spectrum to imposing greater regulatory requirements. And we want to start there.

**Question #2) Because the Wisconsin building code doesn't differentiate between one and two houses at all, why not allow duplex in every residential district in Wauwatosa? West Wauwatosa is more likely to redevelop than some of the older, more historical houses in East Wauwatosa.**

Recommendation 14 gives some considerations to strategically looking at some R-1 zoned areas for potential reclassification to include more middle housing types. We feel we must do this in the context of the comprehensive plan, which does call for those areas to be single-family, and it requires some more nuance and greater study this idea of allowing duplex is by right in some R-1 areas. We are trying to follow a balanced approach here.

**Question #3) Would you mind explaining Zoning Recommendation 3?**

The change will be to remove the existing limit on the number of dwelling units allowed in a building in the R-4 and R-8 districts. The R-4 district currently limits buildings to no more than 4 dwelling units, and R-8 no more than 8 dwelling units. By removing those numerical limits, we will still retain the existing building size limitation of those districts—no more than 35 ft height, etc. The size of the building wouldn't increase, we will just tell the people how many units they can put in the building. The possibility would allow for some density.

**Question #4) How many additional houses these changes would create in the next 10 years? What kind of mechanisms are built into the current zoning recommendations that would encourage affordable housing and not just housing?**

We haven't tried to estimate or project. It is very difficult to estimate how many property owners will take advantage of new redevelopment opportunities in their properties. There is not a lot of vacant lands that could be developed. This would largely be a redevelopment and spotty-infill type situation that we need to have a far better understanding of in the real-estate market that we have at this moment.

In terms of guaranteeing affordability, we have not made recommendations regarding imposing restrictions on new housing produce under any of these programs. For example, Wisconsin has some state laws when it comes to mandating the price of housing and rent control or affordability measure. However, smaller units will be somewhat more affordable. These units ensure some level of affordability. In terms of requiring it, we are going to run up against some constraint state law and it's something we might also want to push for a legislative agenda that gives cities more control over that sort of thing.

**Question #5) Sometimes folks are concerned about 'increased traffic' with more density. How do you suggest we counter that fear?**

We need to do our best to educate ourselves about what the concern is, and to share our experience and knowledge about how these issues are resolved. We can do our best to empirical studies, moving forward with comprehensive plans and studies that the city has, to demonstrate the traffic-related impact in various development scenarios, and how we address that.

Q&A Communication Recommendations

**Question #6) After a while with public engagement, you get the sense that the only people who come out are people that are mad and that would oppose the project no matter what, no matter what concessions are made. How do we get an engagement strategy to get the people who never show up at a meeting because they don't have a strong opinion?**

That is the overarching issue that we are trying to tackle with all these different recommendations. First, it is by making engagement more accessible and fun – expanding communication network with local organizations so that they can help spread awareness of what planning initiatives and developments are happening Second, education about zoning is crucial for people to understand why their voice matters.

**Question #7) Can you share some examples of digital community engagement and information sharing?**

- [SocialPinPoint](#) and [BangtheTable](#) are a leading digital engagement tool that enables Community Planning Professionals to build hybrid participation strategies that drive greater reach, diversity, consultation, and collaboration.

- Virtual whiteboards with augmented reality, sound mapping, and interactive installations
- [Konveio](#) makes planning materials easier to understand and facilitates more relevant, concise, and constructive feedback.

**Question #8) Has the council been engaged in this process to date?**

Yes. A zoning audit was presented to Committee of the Whole in September 2020 and Council members were invited to all Zone Tosa for All public meetings to date. The final recommendations, incorporating comments from the public, will first be heard by the Common Council at a Committee of the Whole in October 2021.