

Engage Graef-USA

Public Comment Form Results

Nov 08, 2024 - Jun 22, 2026

Project: Janesville Zoning and Subdivision Code Rewrite

Form: Public Comment Form

Tool Type: Form

Activity ID: 10

Exported: 2026-06-23 10:06:04

Exported By: DMarlow

Filter By: No filters applied.

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

- Why does this draft code have provisions directing large commercial projects (in excess of 50,000 sq. ft) to conditional use proceedings, but no similar provisions establishing size/scale caps for industrial zones before conditional use proceedings (including public notification) are required? Very large projects can have very large impacts on surrounding land uses and should not be approved by right – establishing a point at which the scale of a proposed project dictates a conditional use proceeding protects surrounding neighborhoods from unintended impacts from large projects.
- Backyard chickens and ducks are listed in the land use table as an accessory use, but not bee hives. Why?
- It looks like someone forgot to research what these land uses actually are and whether or not they need performance standards for community protection. For example:
 - o Land Use 6.18 Recycling Center – Often have lithium battery fires. Where are the emergency management plan and access lane requirements (like in the 7.01 Battery storage facility)? Any other standards needed to guarantee fast access? Minimum/Maximum size?
 - o Land use 6.09 - Direct Carbon Capture facility. Permitted by right – administrative approvals only. INAPPROPRIATE. These facilities, as a function of their use, operate large fans to capture carbon emissions. Noise is a predictable problem, and the current noise standard included in the code exempts construction noise, intermittent equipment use noise, and uses only an a-weighted scale for measuring noise levels (not a comprehensive study including high/low frequency and tonal issues). No vibration studies or standards are required. No decommissioning bond, financial assurances or requirements for remediation or materials storage disposal if facility fails or closes. No lease agreement provisions. No termination of approval provisions. No requirement for third-party independent studies for local impacts or public release of ongoing monitoring. No strong enforcement provisions. No requirement for construction traffic road repair bonds or similar. No size/scale ranges for this type of facility that identify appropriate sizing comparable to the surrounding community. NO PUBLIC NOTIFICATION OR HEARING.
 - o Land Use 7.01- Battery Storage Facility. Same problems for land use 6.09.
 - o Land use 7.05 - Solar storage facility - No maximum size/scale ranges for this type of facility that identify appropriate sizing comparable to the surrounding community. NO PUBLIC NOTIFICATION OR HEARING.
- Land and use base performance standards are not consistent between land use categories. See 7.01 Battery storage facility vs. 7.05 Solar storage facility vs. 7.07 Telecommunications – Class 1 collocation and new tower. And most of these are permitted by right, require no public notification or hearing, few requirements for local impact studies or ongoing public monitoring, no requirement for construction traffic repair bonds, and no size/scale provisions.
- In speaking with Craig on June 18, he indicated that some land uses were governed by state statute and few/no local performance standards were provided because of that governance. Where are the links to the relevant state statutes? Why wouldn't they be provided in the document so that a lay-person could reference statutory performance standards as effectively as an industry representative?
- This draft was released to the public without any links between subchapters and chapters, or between local ordinances or state statute in place. It is impossible to establish ease of use or read the document with an eye toward providing feedback when the mechanisms that make it easy to read and easy to reference are not in place. This document was not ready for public viewing without those items in place.

The format of the open house:

 - o Created an environment of fragmented, one-on-one conversations between city representatives and citizens. Citizen questions and officials' responses to questions are rarely captured for the official record. Citizen who don't know zoning code well enough to know what to ask can't rely on the contents of their neighbors questions and officials' responses to generate their own questions or navigate the meeting/draft document.
 - o Placed the onus for reporting needed changes on the citizens (go to the clearing house and report or fill in the forms sprinkled around the room) rather than on staff and consultants (record your comment, attribute it appropriately, and we will add it to feedback from tonight). When you host an open house, it is inappropriate to do so without an internal, planned way to record, attribute and share feedback. If perception matters, this type of event gives the perception that you are making citizens jump through hoops to submit feedback.
 - o Many of the boards did not have staff members available to answer questions (or, again, write down feedback). Many citizens aren't going to provide feedback or ask questions if they have to track down an organizational representative to do so.
- Plus the "data center" and "major utility" land-use concerns that SNOW Janesville has already fielded to you
- The South side of Janesville has a huge chunk of the city's industrially zoned properties, and most are surrounded by or abut residentially zoned areas. Every major project that is permitted by right excludes citizens from the development process and potentially impacts their property uses and enjoyment, their home values and their quality of life. Yet potentially large scale, highly impactful facilities like Direct air carbon dioxide capture facility (6.09), Battery energy storage (7.01), Major utility (7.09), solar power generating facility (7.05), and data center. are

permitted by right and require no public notifications and (for the most part) have very limited performance standards associated with them. This is unacceptable. These facilities should all, at minimum, be listed as conditionally permitted, with performance standards in alignment with the proposed use. Data Centers should have their own base zoning designation.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

With historic homes and shared driveways, the requirement for a cement or hard-surface driveway before a garage can be built is cost prohibitive. Homes are either retaining old and unsafe garages or refraining from building them because of the added cost of cement makes it irrational. The requirement could be reduced or modified to include more options. Cement and asphalt are bad for urban heat, increase the carbon footprint, and create a car-centric vs a person-centric city. Pavement should be reduced and switched over to permeable or more natural surfaces wherever possible, and with homes, cutting out the driveway requirement is an easy win.

Downtown areas should have reduced traffic, reduced parking, and increased access to public transportation and multi-modal transit. Bus stops should be a frequent requirement of not only housing areas, based on 15-minute access from door to bus on foot, but also a requirement for higher density mapping of stops in business areas. All stops should be required to be covered bus shelters.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Dear City of Janesville Zoning Committee,

I am writing to urge the committee to revise the current zoning draft regarding the proposed industrial districts. If it were up to me, we would not have a data center in the middle of Janesville, but since the city seems keen to move forward with the idea, I propose that data centers be granted their own zoning category rather than being grouped with benign developments. In the current draft, data center development is in the same category as projects like a "maker's space," meaning it would only require City Council approval without additional oversight. However, the footprint, resource consumption, and community impact of these two types of developments are not even close to being in the same realm.

Because data centers require such a large amount of resources, their impact on residents is significantly greater than a single building for a creative space. Placing these types of developments together removes the external evaluation process data centers require. I strongly recommend that data center development be placed into a specialized zoning category that requires scientific, environmental, resident, and city oversight before approval.

Thank you for your consideration of this necessary revision.

Sincerely,

Laura Linek

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Please, Please slow down and take into consideration:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
10. Mandatory and legally enforceable Community Benefits Agreements.
11. Comprehensive generator standards, including emissions requirements, noise limitations, public notification of testing schedules, and disclosure of generator inventories before permit approval.
12. Comprehensive electronic waste management plans with ongoing public reporting requirements.
13. Data centers are not like traditional industry - they require their own base zoning category and shouldn't be grouped with traditional industrial uses.
14. Major utilities installations should be conditionally permitted in ALL zoning districts (not permitted by right in industrial areas).

Response No:
5

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Asking for:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
10. Mandatory and legally enforceable Community Benefits Agreements.
11. Comprehensive generator standards, including emissions requirements, noise limitations, public notification of testing schedules, and disclosure of generator inventories before permit approval.
12. Comprehensive electronic waste management plans with ongoing public reporting requirements.
13. Data centers are not like traditional industry - they require their own base zoning category and shouldn't be grouped with traditional industrial uses.
14. Major utilities installations should be conditionally permitted in ALL zoning districts (not permitted by right in industrial areas).

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Please consider the following:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
10. Mandatory and legally enforceable Community Benefits Agreements.
11. Comprehensive generator standards, including emissions requirements, noise limitations, public notification of testing schedules, and disclosure of generator inventories before permit approval.
12. Comprehensive electronic waste management plans with ongoing public reporting requirements.
13. Data centers are not like traditional industry - they require their own base zoning category and shouldn't be grouped with traditional industrial uses.

From your neighbors at 2410 Kennedy Rd 53545

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Please, consider the following:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
10. Mandatory and legally enforceable Community Benefits Agreements.
11. Comprehensive generator standards, including emissions requirements, noise limitations, public notification of testing schedules, and disclosure of generator inventories before permit approval.
12. Comprehensive electronic waste management plans with ongoing public reporting requirements.
13. Data centers are not like traditional industry - they require their own base zoning category and shouldn't be grouped with traditional industrial uses.
14. Major utilities installations should be conditionally permitted in ALL zoning districts (not permitted by right in industrial areas).

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Please consider stronger protections for neighborhoods and include stronger enforcement rules with penalties for violations. Ensure we have guaranteed funding to remove facilities like data centers when they reach the end of their useful life. Those data centers need larger setbacks from homes due to the noise and pure unattractiveness of them too. Require public notice, public hearings, and public access to information along with requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. They shouldn't be allowed to have non disclosures nor should their be automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises. Lastly, data centers require their own base zoning category and shouldn't be grouped with traditional industrial uses.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

We are aware there are parts of this that are placed to "speed up the process". We're asking you not to take advantage of zoning rewrites that will make it easier for big corporations to take advantage of our wonderful city. We aren't going to find more drinking water somewhere else to replace what we have when it's gone. All of our future generations, including your own, depend on good decisions made now.

Please consider the following:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
10. Mandatory and legally enforceable Community Benefits Agreements.
11. Comprehensive generator standards, including emissions requirements, noise limitations, public notification of testing schedules, and disclosure of generator inventories before permit approval.
12. Comprehensive electronic waste management plans with ongoing public reporting requirements.
13. Data centers are not like traditional industry - they require their own base zoning category and shouldn't be grouped with traditional industrial uses.
14. Major utilities installations should be conditionally permitted in ALL zoning districts (not permitted by right in industrial areas).

Response No:
11

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

I do not think data centers should be included in the kinds of business developments that get automatic approval if they meet the zoning requirements. There needs to be public engagement and debate before any are allowed. Please change this before adopting the new code.

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Hello,

We ask that decision-makers consider the following:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
10. Mandatory and legally enforceable Community Benefits Agreements.
11. Comprehensive generator standards, including emissions requirements, noise limitations, public notification of testing schedules, and disclosure of generator inventories before permit approval.
12. Comprehensive electronic waste management plans with ongoing public reporting requirements.
13. Data centers are not like traditional industry - they require their own base zoning category and shouldn't be grouped with traditional industrial uses.
14. Major utilities installations should be conditionally permitted in ALL zoning districts (not permitted by right in industrial areas).

Regards,
Jackie Sylte

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

As a concerned citizen of Janesville, I would like to know what plans will be put in place to protect our neighborhoods from increased burden placed on our infrastructure, water quality, and utility costs, from proposed hyperscale data centers? In this increasingly AI centered city modification to local towns, what zoning laws will be put in place to safeguard our citizens, and our community against rising costs? I've come across articles where other towns have lost significant water quality once these large data centers are introduced to the community and I would like to see our water supply and quality be protected.

Response No:
14

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

100% against any Data centers in Rock County

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Ask decision-makers to consider the following:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
 2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
 3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
 4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
 5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
 6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
 7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
 8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
 9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
 10. Mandatory and legally enforceable Community Benefits Agreements.
 11. Comprehensive generator standards, including emissions requirements, noise limitations, public notification of testing schedules, and disclosure of generator inventories before permit approval.
 12. Comprehensive electronic waste management plans with ongoing public reporting requirements.
 13. Data centers are not like traditional industry - they require their own base zoning category and shouldn't be grouped with traditional industrial uses.
 14. Major utilities installations should be conditionally permitted in ALL zoning districts (not permitted by right in industrial areas).
- Also prove to the citizens that we will have water in our homes, not yellow or forced to use none. What about the noise level, regarding how it affects our health, many communities people are sick. What if they sue us? How you going to protect anything from a data centers taking over.
Go watch documentary on side affects of data centers

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Please consider the following:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
10. Mandatory and legally enforceable Community Benefits Agreements.
11. Comprehensive generator standards, including emissions requirements, noise limitations, public notification of testing schedules, and disclosure of generator inventories before permit approval.
12. Comprehensive electronic waste management plans with ongoing public reporting requirements.
13. Data centers are not like traditional industry - they require their own base zoning category and shouldn't be grouped with traditional industrial uses.
14. Major utilities installations should be conditionally permitted in ALL zoning districts (not permitted by right in industrial areas).

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

I really like the new housing types which allow for increased density. However, I have seen two cottage type housing projects (8-10 units) fall through in the last couple of years in surrounding communities. The main issue with both was trying to meet storm water requirements onsite without the majority of the communal green space onsite being taken up by basins or rain gardens. Especially when also trying to make water, sanitary, electric, gas, and communication services fit between the storm water practices. If possible, offering offsite or regional storm water for these types of developments would greatly increase the feasibility.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

The minimum lighting illumination for commercial, industrial, and institutional uses seems excessive at 2 FC. Beloit, Edgerton, Milton, Stoughton, and Delavan all have a minimum of 0.4 or 0.5 FC with some even requiring lights to conform to International Dark Sky Association certifications.

Additionally, more clarification on which site areas need to be illuminated and to what level would be useful (i.e., driveways vs parking stalls vs sidewalks, etc.).

Response No:
19

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

I think it would be helpful to have more guidance on snow storage areas, at the very least a percentage of the paved area that's required.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

I would encourage you not to include separation requirements for multi-family, 2 units as this appears to be unduly restrictive. Allowing the developer to determine the best combination of housing types and placement of multi-family units is reasonable and allows the continuation of desirable practices like the use of corner lots for duplexes.

I am also concerned with proposing anti-monotony standards for the same reason. I was unable to locate the draft standards referenced as 46-1750, but there are often times when it would be preferable to have consistency in design and appearance of housing units on adjacent lots.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Hello,

We ask that decision-makers consider the following:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
10. Mandatory and legally enforceable Community Benefits Agreements.
11. Comprehensive generator standards, including emissions requirements, noise limitations, public notification of testing schedules, and disclosure of generator inventories before permit approval.
12. Comprehensive electronic waste management plans with ongoing public reporting requirements.
13. Data centers are not like traditional industry - they require their own base zoning category and shouldn't be grouped with traditional industrial uses.

Regards,

Jackie Sylte and Bill Gilmore

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Please consider:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.

Response No:
23

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

The P3 designation needs to be changed to conditional use. Trying to make it sound as if there are checks and oversight is misleading. The Plan Commission is a city designated group that does not have the ability to properly approve a development with an unknown impact on the community based on plans that can change without any further oversight.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

I'm shocked to find that the majority of commercial zoning is permitted by right, with very few zoned conditional use, and only 2 as P3 (battery energy storage and data centers). Due to the severe impact of an industrial location (construction, traffic, nearby business and/or residential, environmental impact, utility demands), I would expect and highly recommend all commercial should be zoned as conditional use. That would allow for proper studies, committee review, and public engagement. For comparison, some examples that are zoned as conditional use that would have a much smaller community/environmental impact include drive through windows, house museum, makers space, residential shelter care facility, smoke/vape shop, gas stations, and public safety facilities? If the city feels those need close oversight and reviews, then any industrial development certainly does as well.

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

9.42 sale of personal vehicles is only allowed in residential zones. Does this refer to where the vehicle is physically parked with a for sale sign, or to the sale transaction, or both? What about the common recommendation, for personal safety, to meet a stranger and handle the transaction at a public location like a police station, bank, grocery store, etc.?

Response No:
26

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

On pages 5-5 and 5-11, the notes for P1 and P2 refer to article 4 division 10, but the descriptions are actually in article 5 division 3, on page 5-15.

Response No:
27

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Seasonal retail sales of produce should be allowed in residential districts to improve food access in areas that may not have nearby grocery stores or other food outlets.

Response No:
28

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Community gardens should be permitted in the City Center district to allow greater access to residents who live downtown and may have limited access to transportation.

Response No:
29

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

In article 6 section 9, please add regulations/encourage edible landscaping, i.e. planting edible plants for residents to forage in addition to non-edible shrubs and trees

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Please consider the following:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
10. Mandatory and legally enforceable Community Benefits Agreements.
11. Comprehensive generator standards, including emissions

Response No:
31

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

I would like the city council to require major and minor utility installations to be conditionally permitted in all zoning districts.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Hello

Please consider the following :

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.

Regards,
Jackie Sylte and Bill Gilmore
305 Apache drive

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

As a Southside resident, I have major concerns with the following:

- No conditional use permits with special protections/considerations for public "health, safety or welfare of the City", compatibility with surrounding properties or surrounding "uses, values and enjoyment". (p. 67)
- No public notification of proposed projects
- No public hearings or opportunities to express concerns or learn more about a proposed project before it is advanced.

Please revise these provisions in the draft language so that the most affected neighborhoods around industrial zones do not get screwed over. Remember, residents vote, not businesses.

Thank you!

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding and equitable plans to repurpose facilities when they reach the end of their life as data centers. The environmental and community burden absorbed by the expectation of complete demolition and new rebuild is unsustainable, especially by small cities looking for opportunities to grow. The well publicized lack of progress in addressing the old GM buildings should be evidence enough of this risk. The plans need to:
 - a. Acknowledge and identify new land use standards specifically for data centers that are not normal buildings and cannot be repurposed just by switching out the building contents and calling them offices. These facilities are not traditional light (M-1) or General Industrial (M-2) category buildings.
 - b. Identify requirements for the ability to "standardize" these buildings so they can be reasonably repurposed and require the funding and the evidence of standardization be part of the proposal. Major industrial complexes in the middle of a town that prides itself on parks and historical conservation should be made to fit into that paradigm. If it can't be repurposed, reused, and made better for the next generation, it shouldn't be allowed.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes, and provisions for sensitive environmental sites. Where sensitive environmental sites are involved, reporting to the public on impact should be mandatory through the life of the facility.
 - a. Sensitive environmental sites and the impact metrics should be identified by a qualified and unbiased third party, and should consider regenerative environmental theory.
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations at both construction and after the building is in use. Penalties should be assessed on a percentage of property and property improvement value and not on a fixed-per-violation basis. The penalties must have economic impact, and the public should be made aware of the penalties as assessed and why.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information. Given the scale of these facilities, and the outsized risk of stranded assets (see GM/Jatco history and economic bubble), the standards for data center facilities should require public notice of major changes throughout the life of the building and not just at proposal and pre-construction.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, water use, water recharge, emissions, and waste must be established, actively monitored, and have real penalties to failure to comply. Considering the outsized negative impact to the community, LEEDS Green building standards should be applied to this special building category and if not enforced for these facilities, at a minimum a comparison of how the facility matches against these standards should be required as part of the publicly available proposal for the building, and as part of the ongoing reporting to the city and community.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public. These studies need to be based on existing and proven independent metric systems, such as LEEDS Green. Failure to meet the standards should have enforceable and significant penalties collected by the city and the collections and fund use should also be contained in reporting to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, summary of public violations and fines, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
10. Mandatory and legally enforceable Community Benefits Agreements.
11. Comprehensive generator standards, including emissions requirements, noise limitations, public notification of testing schedules, and disclosure of generator inventories before permit approval. In addition, there are energy alternatives. The outsized impact and risk of this category of building should require a comprehensive package of energy solutions. These buildings should utilize solar panels, back up battery power storage, and other energy solutions as a mix with generators. That mix, the utilization of that mix, and the usage metrics from the grid should be part of the reporting packing to the community.
12. Comprehensive electronic waste management plans with ongoing public reporting requirements. These buildings are filled with processors that have a 3-5 year lifetime max, so e-waste will be cycling out of these buildings frequently. There's no mention of how this waste will be disposed of and if the community will have to absorb that impact through local landfills.
13. Data centers are not like traditional industry - they require their own base zoning category and shouldn't be grouped with traditional industrial uses.

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Please consider the following:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
10. Mandatory and legally enforceable Community Benefits Agreements.
11. Comprehensive generator standards, including emissions requirements, noise limitations, public notification of testing schedules, and disclosure of generator inventories before permit approval.
12. Comprehensive electronic waste management plans with ongoing public reporting requirements.
13. Data centers are not like traditional industry - they require their own base zoning category and shouldn't be grouped with traditional industrial uses.

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

This zoning code rewrite essentially eliminates manufactured housing except in a manufactured home community. It states that it allows it in a specific manufactured home zoned area, which does not exist. It would also not allow for a manufactured Accessory Dwelling Unit, which is the most affordable method of producing those smaller homes. Many states are protecting the ability to place manufactured homes in subdivisions as long as they conform to all the other aesthetic requirements as the other homes in the neighborhood. It is very unfortunate that Janesville does not accept that affordable quality homes can be built to a Federal HUD code to offer quality without compromise. I've attached pictures of home that Janesville would be zoning out of single family subdivisions.

To help understand, I attached the new manufactured housing zoning working paper by Mandelker. He is a leading land-use scholar and has concluded that unequal zoning treatment, especially exclusion from single-family districts, is the central barrier to manufactured housing. He makes good arguments.

Here are some main points to make in your comments:

- The ordinance, as drafted, would have the effect of excluding manufactured housing
- Modern manufactured homes are a quality, federally regulated housing option that should be treated comparably to other single-family homes
- Janesville's land use policy should expand attainable housing options, including those built to the federal building code

Below are some examples of statewide zoning in other states that are giving manufactured housing parity.

State-wide parity / close to parity

California is one of the clearest—and earliest—examples of a strong, explicit statewide parity statute. In California, if a parcel is zoned for conventional single-family housing, a jurisdiction must allow a manufactured home there (with limited exceptions and conditions). California law has required jurisdictions to allow HUD Code manufactured homes in any single-family residential zone and to treat them the same as site-built homes. This is a long-standing model for preventing local exclusion through state law.

These are the states where the current sources most clearly show recent statewide legislative moves toward California's precedent of treating manufactured homes like other single-family homes:

- Florida: 2026 law; eligible homes since June 15, 1976; allowed in all single-family zones; same requirements as other single-family homes; also prevents unfeasible structural requirements.
- Kentucky: 2025 law; qualified homes up to five years old; allowed in all single-family zones; same requirements as other single-family homes; prevents unfeasible structural requirements. Localities may regulate only limited compatibility items and those cannot be more stringent than for a site-built home in the same zone.
- Maine: 2024 law; homes since 1988; allowed in all single-family zones; same requirements as other single-family homes; prevents unfeasible structural requirements. Maine legalized manufactured housing wherever single-family dwellings are allowed.
- Maryland: 2024 law; new manufactured homes; allowed in all single-family zones. The law bars a legislative body from prohibiting a new manufactured home in a zone that allows single-family residential uses, so long as the home is converted to real property.
- Montana: 2025 law; allowed in all single-family zones; same requirements as other single-family homes.
- Virginia: 2026 law; homes within five years of manufacture; allowed in all single-family zones. Beginning July 1, 2026, localities may not adopt or enforce zoning, land-use, or development rules that treat manufactured homes differently or more restrictively than site-built single-family dwellings in the same zoning district, subject to the conditions in the statute.
- incremental state-level anti-discrimination or siting reforms, not universal by-right placement statutes. Protection is narrow, conditional, or limited to some residential zones rather than all single-family districts.
- Idaho: 2026 law; homes since June 15, 1976; allowed in all single-family zones and some residential zones; same requirements as other single-family homes; does not prevent unfeasible structural requirements.
- New Hampshire: 2024 law; not all single-family zones, but some residential zones; same requirements as other single-family homes. CSG summarized it as requiring municipalities to provide "reasonable and realistic opportunities" for siting manufactured housing in residential districts rather than mandating full by-right placement everywhere single-family homes are allowed.
- Oregon: 2022 law; no age limit; some residential zones; same requirements as other single-family homes.
- Texas: 2025 law; new homes; some residential zones; same requirements as other single-family homes, but not a full all-single-family-zones mandate.
- Connecticut: 2021 law; an anti-discrimination/compatibility reform rather than a clean statewide by-right placement law.

Additional resources linked below:

American Planning Association summary - as of April 2024, only 18 states had laws ensuring local zoning codes do not discriminate against manufactured housing. [planning.org].

Council of State Governments resource: States Loosen Manufactured Housing Restrictions - CSG East

I would love to discuss all of this with you if you would like. I am available to do a zoom presentation or come in person to further this very important conversation.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Please stop trying to minimize data center requirements!

We need:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
10. Mandatory and legally enforceable Community Benefits Agreements.
11. Comprehensive generator standards, including emissions requirements, noise limitations, public notification of testing schedules, and disclosure of generator inventories before permit approval.
12. Comprehensive electronic waste management plans with ongoing public reporting requirements.
13. Data centers are not like traditional industry - they require their own base zoning category and shouldn't be grouped with traditional industrial uses.

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Please consider the following:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
10. Mandatory and legally enforceable Community Benefits Agreements.
11. Comprehensive generator standards, including emissions requirements, noise limitations, public notification of testing schedules, and disclosure of generator inventories before permit approval.
12. Comprehensive electronic waste management plans with ongoing public reporting requirements.
13. Data centers are not like traditional industry - they require their own base zoning category and shouldn't be grouped with traditional industrial uses.

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

I urge you to go to Port Washington and drive by the hyperscale AI Data Center currently being built. If you do it will be obvious why these data center facilities require a separate base zoning category, separate from traditional industrial uses. It will allow for the development of standards specific to this land use, appropriate public planning and process, and public confidence that standards and resulting projects are consistent with community needs and vision, predictable, and protective of the public interest. It is heartbreaking to see what has happened to Port Washington and we need to address these issues now.

As leaders I ask you to consider the following:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
10. Mandatory and legally enforceable Community Benefits Agreements.
11. Comprehensive generator standards, including emissions requirements, noise limitations, public notification of testing schedules, and disclosure of generator inventories before permit approval.
12. Comprehensive electronic waste management plans with ongoing public reporting requirements.
13. Data centers are not like traditional industry - they require their own base zoning category and shouldn't be grouped with traditional industrial uses.

Thank you for your consideration. In addition, I do appreciate the new zoning plan regarding parking requirement changes.

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

I currently do zoning for my job in a nearby county. As such, I understand the need to update and amending an Ordinance to fit the current/future needs of the community, but also make sense for various staff to have clarity for enforcement/regulating the Code. It's not an easy job to do, but there needs to be thoughtfulness behind what is written so that one can effectively due their job, but also develop/maintain/create a community for all to enjoy.

I think that having something like a data center, be just general review, instead of going through CUP processes is a disservice to the community. I understand that ACT 67 can be tricky for members to navigate, but if one truly tries to follow the mentality behind it and puts measures in place, it can prove it has done it's due diligence to properly deny or approve a project with actually having 'substantial evidence' in order to come to whatever conclusion is made. Also, the impacts that data centers can have on all levels is something that needs serious considerations, studies throughout the process, and plans in place for restoration if a data center is to be removed.

Most of all, I think there are several things that should be considered with this Ordinance in relation to data centers:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.

There is already evidence of there being far more negative impacts than good. An ordinance's main focus should usually be to promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community.

2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.

There should be financial insurance so that facilities can be removed and areas restored properly. Metallic mines have financial assurance they need to provide via bonds, etc. There is no reason one can't implement the same with data centers.

3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'.

There is already evidence across the country of data centers impacting local communities, even when miles away from nearby houses. There needs to be stronger and better parameters in place for distances that make sense.

4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.

As someone who does zoning for a living, nothing makes the job harder than not being able to have enforcement actions implemented that violators don't take seriously when issued. There needs to be levels to the enforcement, especially if there is a potential for there to be repeat violations. Large entities/corporations don't always take one citation as seriously in comparison to someone who runs a much smaller operation.

5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.

Data centers can have long-lasting impacts and people deserve to have input on things that can effect the resources that current generations and future generations will rely on.

6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.

These are common complaints that happen with zoning projects and having clear rules leads to better transparency on expectations, but also make it better for enforcement.

7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.

There should also be ways that if a study proves that a data center is causing major issues for the community in impact, that steps can be taken to either put in corrective measures or stop the project from going any further.

8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.

Also, there is no place for nondisclosure agreements in the world of zoning. No board, administrator, etc, should be participating in such an act because it builds distrust within the community. It builds a lack of respect and trust between those in charge, the people who enforce the codes, and the community at large, making it much harder for the departments within the zoning/planning/sanitaiton, etc offices to do their jobs when engaging with the public.

9. No automatic approvals for full buildout - Even if Phase One is approved, each new building or expansion must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.

10. Mandatory, Legally binding Community Benefits Agreements.

11. Comprehensive generator standards, including emissions requirements, noise limitations, public notification of testing schedules, and disclosure of generator inventories before permit approval.

12. Comprehensive electronic waste management plans with ongoing public reporting requirements.

Thanks for your time! I hope that the City takes in consideration the input that they receive and are truly committed in having an Ordinance that reflects what the people expect for this city for generations to come.

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Please consider the following:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
10. Mandatory and legally enforceable Community Benefits Agreements.
11. Comprehensive generator standards, including emissions requirements, noise limitations, public notification of testing schedules, and disclosure of generator inventories before permit approval.
12. Comprehensive electronic waste management plans with ongoing public reporting requirements.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Janesville's zoning code rewrite doesn't account for the scale, infrastructure demands, environmental impact, or long-term risks of hyperscale data centers. Whether it's the proposed Viridian Partners project at the old GM site or others targeting nearby farmland, the City shouldn't bend zoning rules to fit a land use that's fundamentally different from standard industrial development. Data centers are resource-intensive facilities with minimal job creation, constant noise, heavy utility demand, and real environmental impacts. They should be treated as their own category instead of being grouped into existing industrial zoning.

The City should set clear, enforceable standards before any approval: measurable limits on noise, vibration, and water use, larger setbacks from homes, real penalties for violations, stronger public notice and hearings, and full disclosure of infrastructure and utility costs. The rewrite should prioritize public health, transparency, and long-term financial responsibility over fast-tracking large outside developments that don't meaningfully benefit residents.

Response No:
43

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

No means no Data center period!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Please consider the following:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for full buildout - Even if Phase One is approved, each new building or expansion must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
10. Mandatory, Legally binding Community Benefits Agreements

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Please consider:

Ask them to consider:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for full buildout - Even if Phase One is approved, each new building or expansion must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
10. Mandatory, Legally binding Community Benefits Agreements

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Please adopt some or all of these items in considering a zoning change.

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.

Sincerely,

Ray Jewell
624 Cherry Street

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Things that the town should consider looking over are as follows. If these NEEDS of the city are not met in any capacity I will do my best to help vote out current members of the board and elect new representatives who don't have closed door meetings about something that may be detrimental to the entire town.

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase needs its own approvals and must come back for a new public review, updated impact studies, and proof the earlier phases are fulfilling promises.

Response No:
48

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Please find attached our proposed suggestions for the zoning code rewrite.
Sincerely,
Viridian Partners

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Janesville and Rock County taxpayers on a large scale are not in favor of Data Center expansion. Especially in smaller cities where land isn't abundant. Considering Wisconsin already has upward of 50 data centers, we have access to a mountain of evidence. Evidence that points to real environmental damage, utility rate hikes, and taxpayers seeing property values tank. Clean Wisconsin at length reports on why big tech is targeting Wisconsin for rapid expansion and all the above. <https://www.cleanwisconsin.org/data-center-secrets/>

There's a lot to discuss yet Janesville isn't going to sit down and accept NDA's, excuses or back door meetings as acceptable forms of governing.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Please consider the following related to data centers:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. Requiring the developer to pay ALL City-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure/agreement = No zoning approval.

Response No:
51

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Reading your proposed zoning rewrite, I see that manufactured homes are not allowed except in a non-existent zoning area and in manufactured home communities. This is unfortunate as your comprehensive plan states that you want more affordable housing. I've attached some examples of manufactured homes that I do not believe you would want to exclude in your city. You could allow manufactured homes that meet all other requirements for a subdivision.

Response No:
52

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Honestly if you care about drinking water, and not your fat fucking checks, maybe get your head out of your fucking asses and think about the fucking people who SUPPORT your fucking wallets.

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Your current draft document allows major utility installations to be administratively approved. The Document describes a major utility installation as: A place, building and/or structure, or portion thereof, whether public or private, used or is intended for providing basic infrastructure or utility services and which could potentially have a moderate to high impact on neighboring property.

You anticipate moderate to high impact on neighboring property. Yet....there are no requirements for:

Community benefit agreements

Impact studies (including property value impacts to neighbors and impacts to sensitive sites) and required mitigation measures

Notification requirements, public hearings

Construction performance standards

Decommissioning requirements or financial assurance bonds

Strong enforcement provisions

This type of usage should be treated similarly to a data center. Again....reference this document:

https://tr.ee/fi_ptf6YQJ

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Perhaps you could consider taking a look at this document (Rock County Neighbors 18 month moratorium request and proactive ordinances) to make sure all of our data center bases are covered. They largely reflect the requests already made and provide additional detail and recommendations.

https://linktr.ee/nobeloitdatacenter?fbclid=IwY2xjawSTlz9leHRuA2FlbQIxMABicmlkETFhNWgxTGQxOFNQSnRkNnVnc3J0YwZhchBfaWQQMjIyMDM5MTc4ODIwMDg5MgABHoi7CRQV6hLgRu05ycSQt0PdUWJ53yPrLY_xLqbj7wyua37KGXNT8hYbYnZ_aem_OXLSN0KGI12sOAFUPJAoSg

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

I have concerns regarding the language in this draft, specifically regarding the implications for data centers:

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.
2. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code.
3. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Please consider and address the following:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes and provisions for 'sensitive sites'
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before construction, during construction, and after construction, with results available to the public.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.
2. Data centers should have guaranteed, bonded funds to remove or decommission the facility as a performance standard.
3. Data centers should have larger setbacks from neighbors (especially residential ones) for buildings, generators, fuel tanks and cooling equipment with evaluation provisions for 'sensitive' sites.
4. Data centers must have strong enforcement provisions and include significant daily fines, permit revocation for violations, no special exemptions and no extensions once approvals expire
5. Data centers and major utility installations require strong public notice provisions in both individual land use, and base zoning district scenarios. Public input, public hearings, and public information release should not be negotiable or optional.
6. Data centers should have enforceable rules and performance standards for construction, including: construction hours, construction noise, water usage and reporting, dust and blasting controls, truck routes, construction lighting and developer-funded hotline for complaints and on-site community liaisons.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

The current draft language for data centers fails to safeguard this community.

Data centers are fundamentally distinct from other land uses and require unique regulation under zoning code. Therefore, they should have their own Base Zoning District.

Data centers and major utility installations should not be exempt from opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be mandated for data centers, both as individual land uses and as base zoning districts. This transparency is crucial for protecting the community and ensuring orderly and responsible growth.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.
2. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code.
3. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Hello!

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.
2. Data centers should have guaranteed, bonded funds to remove or decommission the facility as a performance standard.
3. Data centers should have larger setbacks from neighbors (especially residential ones) for buildings, generators, fuel tanks and cooling equipment with evaluation provisions for 'sensitive' sites.
4. Data centers must have strong enforcement provisions and include significant daily fines, permit revocation for violations, no special exemptions and no extensions once approvals expire
5. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district.

Sincerely

Jackie Sylte and Bill Gilmore

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

A zoning code is a statement of priorities for our community. It determines what gets built, where it gets built and what protections will exist for those who live near by. With the current proposal for a hyperscale data center in Janesville the proposed zoning ordinances do not address many of the concerns raised by citizens in our community. Bee keepers have more requirements to meet on many of these issues than a data center would. Below are specific concerns.

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.
2. Data centers should have guaranteed, bonded funds to remove or decommission the facility as a performance standard.
3. Data centers should have larger setbacks from neighbors (especially residential ones) for buildings, generators, fuel tanks and cooling equipment with evaluation provisions for 'sensitive' sites.
4. Data centers must have strong enforcement provisions and include significant daily fines, permit revocation for violations, no special exemptions and no extensions once approvals expire
5. Data centers and major utility installations require strong public notice provisions in both individual land use, and base zoning district scenarios. Public input, public hearings, and public information release should not be negotiable or optional.
6. Data centers should have enforceable rules and performance standards for construction, including: construction hours, construction noise, water usage and reporting, dust and blasting controls, truck routes, construction lighting and developer-funded hotline for complaints and on-site community liaisons.

Thank you for your consideration.

Response No:
62

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

NO DATA CENTERS! YOU WILL DESTROY WISCONSIN

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.
2. Data centers should have guaranteed, bonded funds to remove or decommission the facility as a performance standard.
3. Data centers should have larger setbacks from neighbors (especially residential ones) for buildings, generators, fuel tanks and cooling equipment with evaluation provisions for 'sensitive' sites.
4. Data centers must have strong enforcement provisions and include significant daily fines, permit revocation for violations, no special exemptions and no extensions once approvals expire
5. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Tell them:

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.
2. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code.
3. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth

Data centers are bad for communities- cost of utilities- sound from them is heard in a five mile radius- our home values will go down- water consumption is astronomical. Medical

Issues are arising in areas with them. Do to the pollution and sound. They will not bring jobs- see if they have their own construction crews. The county opposes them the city should as well. Zoning should be tighter regarding data centers. If you care about the community.

Response No:
65

Member ID:

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

We don't want a data center in Janesville. We need full transparency on any attempts to build one so we can exercise our rights and block it.

The current language that would apply to data centers doesn't protect the community. Since they're so different from any other type of land use, they should have their own Base Zoning District. Furthermore, these types of facilities have no reason to be pushed through without full transparency and allowing residents to voice their concerns. The businesses proposing them only want to take advantage of Janesville, to the detriment of everybody who lives here. We must have a say to be able to prevent them from being built.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.

Data centers should have guaranteed, bonded funds to remove or decommission the facility as a performance standard.

Data centers should have larger setbacks from neighbors (especially residential ones) for buildings, generators, fuel tanks and cooling equipment with evaluation provisions for 'sensitive' sites.

Data centers must have strong enforcement provisions and include significant daily fines, permit revocation for violations, no special exemptions and no extensions once approvals expire

Data centers and major utility installations require strong public notice provisions in both individual land use, and base zoning district scenarios. Public input, public hearings, and public information release should not be negotiable or optional

Data centers should have enforceable rules and performance standards for construction, including: construction hours, construction noise, water usage and reporting, dust and blasting controls, truck routes, construction lighting and developer-funded hotline for complaints and on-site community liaisons.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.

Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code.

There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth

Response No:
68

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

I disapprove of the new zoning code draft. If car washes and drive-thru windows require a public hearing, then so should data centers. Data centers have a much larger impact on the surrounding community than car washes or fueling stations. Anything as large and possibly detrimental to the community- like a data center - should have its own zoning requirements. And they should include a lot of public input.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.
2. Data centers should have guaranteed, bonded funds to remove or decommission the facility as a performance standard.
3. Data centers should have larger setbacks from neighbors (especially residential ones) for buildings, generators, fuel tanks and cooling equipment with evaluation provisions for 'sensitive' sites.
4. Data centers must have strong enforcement provisions and include significant daily fines, permit revocation for violations, no special exemptions and no extensions once approvals expire
5. Data centers and major utility installations require strong public notice provisions in both individual land use, and base zoning district scenarios. Public input, public hearings, and public information release should not be negotiable or optional.
6. Data centers should have enforceable rules and performance standards for construction, including: construction hours, construction noise, water usage and reporting, dust and blasting controls, truck routes, construction lighting and developer-funded hotline for complaints and on-site community liaisons.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.
2. Data centers should have guaranteed, bonded funds to remove or decommission the facility as a performance standard.
3. Data centers should have larger setbacks from neighbors (especially residential ones) for buildings, generators, fuel tanks and cooling equipment with evaluation provisions for 'sensitive' sites.
4. Data centers must have strong enforcement provisions and include significant daily fines, permit revocation for violations, no special exemptions and no extensions once approvals expire
5. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Hello. As you already know, the existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community. It is shameful to have to remind our city servants that all progress does not mean moving forward.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

As a homeowner in (and lifelong resident of) Janesville, I have serious concerns about Data Centers and how they would affect our community. They are known to be high consumers of water and electricity (which also has a negative impact on the affordability of those public utilities), they have a negative impact on the physical environment and the climate at large, they can be—and often are— physically and psychologically harmful to humans and other animals, and they are unlikely to provide any tangible economic benefit to our community or its residents.

The city's existing draft language for Data Centers does not protect nor benefit our community. In fact, it's likely to make us extremely vulnerable to significant adverse affects.

Due to their nature and the known dangers associated with them, they are fundamentally different from other types of land uses; and as such, it's imperative that the city of Janesville regulates them differently and more stringently under the zoning code.

It is offensive and without excuse to think that Data Centers or any other major utility installations should be exempt from public hearings, input, and/or information releases. Last year alone I paid over \$7,500 in property taxes. And for what exactly? I certainly have seen no tangible benefit from providing that large sum of money to the city's funds. To claim that doesn't even buy transparency and public collaboration in this city is not sufficient. Transparency and public collaboration are both foundational principles of democracy; and they are necessary for responsible, measured growth that benefits the community at large. Without those principles, there is absolutely nothing combatting: greed, corruption, incompetence, lack of foresight, lack of creativity, nor lack of perspective.

It is imperative that city listens to, and works with, its residents on the topic of Data Centers.

Response No:
73

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

We do not need more data centers! They ruin our land, livelihood, nature, environment, and all because the rich want more money! This is abominable! Stop this nonsense!

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.

Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District - they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district.

This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect our community.
2. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code.
3. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

It has come to my attention that a data center would not have to have a public hearing to be approved under the draft ordinance. A data center would consume significant amounts of energy and water. It creates noise. No public hearing and notice will not protect the citizens of Janesville.
Susan Fowler, Janesville resident since 1976

Response No:
77

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

NO to the Data Center because of increased water and electrical usage.
NO to new sidewalks, we are happy with our neighborhood without them.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

As a Janesville Resident, I very concern about this Zoning Ordinance Draft.

The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.

Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code.

There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth.

Therefore, I urge the city to amend the draft to provide language that protects the community from Data Centers! We love this city! We want to see it grow but in a responsible way. Thank you for your time.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Hello!

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.
2. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code.
3. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth.

We will be there at the meeting in June to relay this to you in person as well!

Regards,
Jackie Sylte and Bill Gilmore
305 Apache drive

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

This is putting the needs of AI above the needs of people. The pollution and water use will destroy this area.....America First should mean HUMANS FIRST. It is really becoming obvious that the small town people are just acceptable collateral damage to achieve the AI objectives. They are ALL going in in rural and economically challenged areas.....only.... :(

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Dear Committee members and city staff,

This data center issue is quickly getting out of hand. From what I have seen you, as a committee, can make this into more of a public forum instead of continuing the lack of transparency in this matter. There is so much wrong with the hyperscale data centers that to even consider it as an option seems to me to be very irresponsible. Here are some items for you to consider:

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.
2. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code.
3. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth

Sincerely,

Ray Jewell
624 Cherry Street

Response No:
82

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

I think there's not enough language here protecting the community from data centers. They pose a lot of risks to a community and the zoning for Janesville should allow the community the opportunity to weigh in each step of the way. And it should be easy for people to find out about it, not a quiet, "you only know if you know" sort of opportunity to be heard. We all want a vibrant, thriving Janesville and big decisions like land use for a data center should mean they have their own base zoning district with their own regulations that the public can comment on.

Response No:
83

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

The draft document does not do enough to regulate data center construction. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning district so residents can be informed and involved.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.
2. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code.
3. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth

Response No:
85

Member ID:

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth.

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Hello, The existing draft language for data centers does not protect Janesville or other nearby communities. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code. Not doing so is negligent and does not give data centers the oversight they need. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth for Janesville and the surrounding communities who will be impacted by Janesville's decisions regarding data centers.

Response No:
87

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Data centers should have more public comment. A drive up window, a card Wash has public comment. No data center! Then environmental impact by Grafton with the pet data center includes increased noise, air pollution as they have to keep offering free car washes to the community. People living near can no longer open their windows due to noise and a strange dust that now permeates the air. This is not even considering pollution, use of electricity and water pollution and usage. Data centers seem to be the new "coal mines" for pollution and harm to the people.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Regarding Data Center approvals: Such a resource heavy, utility sucking project that lowers property value should not be automatically approved, under any circumstance. "By right" feels like extremely predatory language, that takes power from the people that will be affected by projects to extract wealth from our community with little in the way of long term return. What tax deals will be made? How can we ensure excessive utility usage will not deprive locals or place an undue financial burden upon us? Why can there be good faith disclosure and approval with out this rapey legal language. Why are our representatives bowing to big money interests? How much is our consent being sold for, and who benefits? Seems like some vile, slime stuff. I understand updating zoning, but keep local decisions local.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.
2. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code.
3. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.

Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code.

There is NO EXCUSE for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth

Response No:
91

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Reasons why I believe any zoning changes needs to be discussed in a public forum.

For Janesville WI...

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.
2. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code.
3. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and growth.

Nicky S.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

As a long time resident I am very concerned.

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.
2. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District - they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code.
3. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth

Please consider the unknowns ahead and protect Janesville.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Rewrite Developement Code and allow public input.

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.
2. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code.
3. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth.

Concerned citizen

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Hello, I am a Janesville resident. I live only 2 minutes away from the GM/JATCO site, as well as many of my family and friends.

This comment is in regard of the current city meetings as well as the ones that follow for this year.

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.
2. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code.
3. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district.

This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth

DOING THIS NEW DRAFT WON'T LET THE THOUSANDS OF JANESVILLE RESIDENTS HAVE A VOTE ON IF THEY WANT PROJECTS OVER \$450 MILLION ON THE GM/JATCO SITE!

RESIDENTS WORKED HARD THROUGH THE WINTER SEASON TO GET THIS VOTING OPPORTUNITY ON THE NOVEMBER BALLOT FOR JANESVILLE.

DO NOT ACCEPT THE NEW ZONING. LET RESIDENTS HAVE A SAY ON WHAT WE WANT IN OUR CITY!

LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE TO LIVE WITH THE CONSEQUENCES.

Response No:
96

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

This needs to address data centers anyone who votes this in without including language to not allow data centers with ample notice to the public will not be getting my vote

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

I am submitting comments regarding the proposed zoning code update and the treatment of data centers within the City of Janesville.

I am concerned that the current draft allows data centers as a permitted use by right within industrial districts without meaningful opportunities for public notification, public review, or public input.

While I support responsible economic development, data centers are unique land uses that can have significant impacts on infrastructure, electrical demand, water resources, noise, visual character, emergency services, and future land-use planning. Because of their scale and potential community impacts, they should not be treated the same as typical industrial development.

I encourage the City to consider:

1. Creating a separate zoning classification or overlay district specifically for data centers and other large utility-scale technology facilities.
2. Requiring public notification and public hearings prior to approval of major data center projects.
3. Establishing clear performance standards related to noise, lighting, water use, energy demand, backup generators, screening, and compatibility with surrounding properties.
4. Providing transparency regarding proposed projects so residents have an opportunity to understand and comment on developments that may affect their community.

Good planning requires balancing economic opportunity with public involvement and long-term community interests. The zoning code should ensure that residents are informed and have an opportunity to participate in decisions involving projects of this scale.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Good afternoon.

For the new zoning code drafts, the existing draft language does not protect the community of Janesville. It blatantly ignores the constituents that live here and pay our taxes.

Second, Data Centers should have their own Base Zoning District that should be SHARED WITH THE PUBLIC PRIOR TO BEING AGREED ON TO BE BUILT. This sows distrust in the community with the backdoor agreements. These data centers NEED to be regulated under a different code.

And finally, because we are YOUR CONSTITUENTS, there is absolutely no excuse that the public is not notified about these planned centers. This is our First Amendment right to oppose these data centers, and the backdoor agreements go against what the people living in Janesville and are PAYING YOU TO DO YOUR JOB OF REPRESENTING THE PEOPLE, want and voted for.

Have a good day

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

To all because this matter affects all:

The community does not want a data center. It is our community. We do not want to be sold to the highest bidder. We want clean water, low bills, no sound issues, clean air, and say in what happens in our community.

The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.

Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code.

There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth.

We want our voices heard. Do right by your citizens. First do no harm.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

After review of the proposed changes to Zoning Ordinance, I would like to point out a fact that will be quite contentious in the months and years to come - specifically regarding possible data centers.

On page 106, it is quite clear that despite a multiplicity of other land uses that require public input (car washes? retail stores of all stripes?) - land use by a heavy water and electricity user, which also is known to produce excess noise, heat, and little long-term job benefits, does not require public input.

This is quite frankly shameful and more kowtowing to industries that Janesville citizens do not want. Protect the health of our community and its natural resources, and let the citizens have their say in such projects. Revise these ordinances to reflect real-world needs of your population.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Data Center developments under the current draft language don't require public notification.

No public hearings. No neighborhood notifications. No neighborhood meetings. No opportunity for public input. No conditional use permitting that would require public notification or land-use performance standards that require community notification.

Result: You may not know about an approved data center project until the construction trucks roll in.

By way of comparison: What other types of land-uses require public hearings?

Public Safety Facilities. Dog Parks. Health care clinics. Car Washes. Community Centers. Vehicle Fuel Stations. Animal Shelters. Conference Centers. Maker's Spaces. Drive-thru windows.

That being said...The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District. They are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code.

There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Regarding new zoning and data centers:

1. The existing draft language for data centers does not protect this community.
2. Data centers should have their own Base Zoning District – they are fundamentally different than other types of land uses and need to be regulated differently under zoning code.
3. There is no excuse for data centers and major utility installations to lack opportunities for public input, public hearings, and public information release. Strong public notification requirements must be required for data centers as both an individual land use, and as a base zoning district. This transparency is essential to protecting the community and ensuring orderly, responsible growth

Response No:
103

Member ID:

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Major Utility installations on industrial property have the potential to affect property owners in surrounding areas and other zoning districts. It is irresponsible to allow major utility installations on ANY property to proceed without the opportunity for surrounding neighborhoods to engage (public hearing, public comment, neighborhood meetings, etc.). Major utility installations should be removed from BY RIGHT permitting (administrative approval only) and listed as Conditional Use with performance standards that require notification of any residential properties within a specified distance, public hearings, neighborhood meetings, etc.

Response No:
104

Member ID:

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

I just wanted to reach out and mention that I would like to make sure that our properties at 220 St Lawrence Ave and 201 E Van Buren remain possible for either residential or commercial use, and strongly favoring opening up the commercial use to more than O2.

The property was the YWCA for 50 years - they added on the gym/banquet hall, and it clearly makes more sense to be something of a social or event space in that spirit.

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

We appreciate the work the City is putting into reviewing proposals for new large-scale data centers. Because these projects can bring long-lasting impacts to surrounding neighborhoods and they operate differently than traditional industrial uses, we are submitting the attached plain-language materials to help guide an effective and protective city ordinance.

The goal is simple: make sure any data center that comes to our community is built responsibly, pays its own way, protects neighbors, and operates transparently and safely for its entire life cycle.

To support that goal, the attachments include:

Attachment A: Plain-Language Community Standards for Data Centers – a clear summary of what residents expect a strong ordinance to include. ASK DUANE CHEREK

Attachment B: Key Questions the City Should Answer Before Approving Any Data Center – a checklist to help ensure decisions are well-informed and publicly understood. ASK DUANE CHEREK

These materials outline expectations related to noise, water, air quality, emergency response, traffic, neighborhood notice, long-term construction impacts, and financial guarantees that protect taxpayers. They also describe how the City can require accurate baseline testing, independent studies, and transparent public communication before any approval is granted.

I believe these standards are fair, balanced, and based on what other communities across the country are already doing. They put residents first while still allowing responsible development to move forward.

I welcome further discussion and stand ready to assist staff, commissioners, and elected officials as the review process continues.

Thank you for your time, service, and thoughtful consideration.

Cathy

1. What counts as a “data center”?

A project should be treated as a data center if:

- It uses over 50 megawatts of power,
- Covers over 100 acres, or
- Is built as a large, multi-building campus for computers and servers (even if the tenant isn’t identified yet).

These types of projects operate at a scale unlike anything else in most communities.

- Should have its own base zoning designation, not fall into another category.

2. Larger setbacks from neighbors

Normal industrial setbacks are not enough. Data centers should be required to keep:

- Buildings, Generators, Fuel tanks, and Cooling equipment a safe distance away from homes and property lines.

3. The developer must pay all City-related costs

Any public cost caused by the project—road upgrades, utility expansions, emergency response training—should be fully paid for by the developer, not taxpayers.

4. Guaranteed funds to remove/decommission the facility

The developer must set aside money (120% of removal cost) before construction begins so the City never gets stuck with an abandoned facility or expensive cleanup.

5. Strong public notice requirements

Before approval:

- The full application must be public for a set number of days.
- Neighbors within a defined distance must receive mailed notice.
- Signs must be posted on-site.
- At least two neighborhood meetings must take place after key studies are completed.

6. A Community Benefits Agreement is required

The developer must sign a public agreement explaining:

- How the community will benefit,
- What commitments the developer is making, and
- How those commitments will be legally enforced.

This agreement must be available to the public for a set number of days before any approval vote.

7. No automatic approval for full buildout

Even if Phase One is approved, each new building or expansion must come back for:

- A new public review,

- Updated impact studies, and
- Proof the earlier phase is meeting its promises.

8. Independent studies, paid for by the developer

The City—not the developer—chooses the independent experts.

Studies must be done before approval, during construction, and throughout operation with reporting available publicly. Required studies include:

Fiscal impact analysis/property value analysis

Demonstrate that the project will not negatively impact taxpayers or surrounding property values.

Noise and vibration

Measure real impacts on neighbors, especially during generator use.

Water usage and groundwater testing

Test private wells, public wells, and PFAS levels before construction and throughout operations.

Air quality monitoring

Track emissions from generators and cooling equipment.

Traffic and road wear

Require road bonds and pre-/post-construction road inspections.

Heat output

Understand the heat the facility releases and require planning and infrastructure for its reuse.

Emergency response needs

Assess firefighter staffing, equipment needs, diesel fire risks, and battery hazards.

Environmental and health impacts

Measure wildlife impacts and neighborhood health baselines (respiratory, cardiovascular, noise).

Cumulative impact

Study the combined effect of all current and proposed data centers within 15 miles.

9. Generator rules

Generators must meet modern emissions standards, stay within noise limits, and follow strict testing schedules. The total number of generators must be part of the conditions of approval.

10. Plans for E-Waste Disposal

Developer must delineate plans for E-Waste disposal.

11. Long-term construction rules

Because these projects take years to build, the City must set enforceable rules for:

- Construction hours
- Construction noise
- Dust and blasting controls
- Truck routes
- Construction lighting
- A developer-funded hotline for complaints and on-site community liaisons

12. Strong enforcement

The ordinance must include:

- Significant daily fines
- Permit revocation for violations
- No special exemptions
- No extensions once approvals expire

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Who would I contact to help me better understand which sections of the proposed code will be permitted by rights vs. conditional use and what the implications of this designation are?

Thanks!

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Article 3

Section 46-102 - Why does this section not authorize the city government to file an application regarding a parcel that the city government does not own? The city government probably should be authorized by the zoning code to file an application for "proactive rezoning" of parcels it does not own.

Section 46-104 - Is the statement regarding the burden of proof in subsection (A) consistent with the state law about the burden of proof when imposing conditions as part of a Conditional Use Permit? I suggest adding "Except as otherwise provided in state law," to subsection (A).

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

Article 2

Definition of "building scale" - The definition makes reference only comparing a proposed new building to existing surrounding buildings. I suggest that the definition should also include comparing a proposed new building to the new buildings that city plans anticipate will be built in the area. If city plans anticipate that an area will be redeveloped with substantially larger buildings, the first larger building should not be rejected because it is out of scale compared to the current existing building that likely will eventually be replaced by larger buildings.

Definitions of "Land use, accessory" and "Land use, principal" - Some land uses can be an accessory land use in some situations or a principal land use in other situations, for example, a parking facility (which can be an accessory or principal surface parking lot or an accessory or principal structured parking ramp). If there is a regulation of parking facilities, it is important to indicate whether that regulation applies only to parking facilities that are principal uses, or only the parking facilities that are accessory uses, or both.

Answering a question posed by the consultants, yes, it would wise to include definitions of both "Yard, primary street" and "Yard, secondary street."

Response No:
109

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

The parking minimums found in Article 6 should be removed. Best practice these days is to either not regulate the number of parking spaces or to set a maximum. This would help with affordability, stormwater management, infill development and more.

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

I have been trying to follow the complicated work you are doing. I am a property owner on Crossing Lane. The Plan shows the existing two family condos in brown, multi family. It extends through the vacant parcel with the red barn (currently zoned light industrial?) shouldn't our little area be zoned 2 family? The condos right behind are zoned two family. Thanks

Response No:
111

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Like Houston TX why not eliminate zoning for Conditional Use Permits so it opens thinking and new ideas?

Response No:
112

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Test comment

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

-In the Land Use Table, I don't understand why Mixed-Use Residential is not a permitted use or at least a conditional use in the R-3 and MRH (mixed residential housing) district. This is especially puzzling because Mixed-Use is a permitted use in the B-1 district, where very little housing density is otherwise permitted.

-I encourage you to make more light business uses permitted or conditional uses in the MRH district, such as community cultural facilities, financial services, personal services, restaurants and taverns. Having a mix of housing types, some of which could be fairly dense, would be more attractive if the new neighborhood included some businesses to which the residents could walk.

-In the Dimensional Standards, I really like that four buildings would be permitted in the R-3 district. This is bold.

-I am concerned that the 70 foot building height limit in the R-3 district would not be tall enough to allow a building that consists of a podium on the first floor (which might include some commercial space) and four "stick" floors above, especially if the building does not have a flat roof.

-There is a mention of maximum housing density allowed in the MRH district expressed as a ratio of housing units per acre. I think you should clarify whether the denominator of this ratio, acres, is the gross acres of the large parcel(s) being developed or only the acres within the large parcel(s) that are buildable, which would exclude wetlands and maybe exclude storm water facilities constructed as part of the development.

-For maximum building height limits, please provide clear explanation for how the height of a building will be measured when the parcel where the new building will be constructed slopes downward as you move away from the primary street. I recommend measuring the building height only on the front facade.

Response No:
114

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Thank you so much for the presentation at Plan Commission last night. The way the information was presented was easily digestible, especially because of the visuals provided.

Response No:
115

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

It would be good to remove minimum parking requirements to allow for more efficient land use. It would fall within a number of different recommendations from the comprehensive plan and help us to grow the tax base and provide more housing.

Response No:
116

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Remove the parking minimums to allow more expansion within the city.

Response No:
117

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

All the minimum parking mandates should be removed. They are an outdated hinderance that numerous cities in the state have recently removed.

Response No:
118

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

What Building Code is Currently used by the City Of Janesville WI for Commercial Project?

Response No:
119

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Good morning,
Last evening I received a comment related to Public Comments. I referred the party to the website. I'm following up to see how comments are rec'd and responses communicated. Thank you.
Kathy Voskuil, Chair

Q1

[Comment Here](#)

Long Text

High Density Housing seems to be all the rage in Dane County. May it never be universally so in Rock County. A few neighborhoods, perhaps, but universally applied by ordinance or zoning for large tracts of land, no. Here's one consideration. It's likely impractical to install fire sprinkler systems in smaller single-family homes or duplexes, built on small lots, much closer together (e.g. there would be no reasonable mechanism for inspection, testing and maintenance of these systems). This creates a risk. The more common residential kitchen and garage fires grow rapidly, even in a well-protected city like Janesville, with its full-time, paid fire department. Add higher wind conditions and a delayed fire department response (e.g. icy roads, the closest units committed to another incident, units out of the area or delayed while training, etc.) and a fire that starts in one home will quickly spread to the adjacent homes. In such situations, in homes constructed of wood, the distance between the homes will largely increase or decrease the likelihood of fire spreading beyond the home where it first started.

Response No:
121

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Where is your comparison document showing the old plan and the proposed changes?

Response No:
122

Member ID:

Q1

Comment Here

Long Text

Where is the front page link on your city website that allows people to find this page easily (in less than a click or two, without having to search for it on your page). No one should have to search for this link.

Where is the email listserv that sends or "pushes" out project notifications, dates, participation options, and links to important documents that are changing so that interested parties don't have to "check back often". In today's era of technology, there is no reason that interested parties shouldn't receive updates via push-notification.

Written comments received at June 18, 2026 Open House

Zoning code article 6 - 6.08 Data Center: Add to its own base zoning district plus a whole list of community protections see SNOW email

Zoning code article 6 - 6.09 Direct air carbon dioxide capture facility: Scale. Decommissioning? Financial guarantees? Impacts studies?

Zoning code article 6 - 6.18 Recycling center - B. Location of materials and activities: Does this include emergency response plan -> batteries lithium fires

Zoning code article 6 - 7.01 Battery energy storage facility: Allowable sizes? Speaks to scale

Zoning code article 6 - 7.05 Solar power generating facility - A. Minimum lot area: Is there a max? Speaks to local scale

Zoning code article 6 - 9.06 Backyard chickens and ducks: Bees?

Comment card: I support the new proposed smaller footprints, smaller lot sizes along with the additional alternatives like cottage courts + tiny homes. All of these changes will allow us to meet the needs of more housing including affordable housing. [SIGNATURE]

Comment card:

- Started in 2024
- Data center was in the works already then
- Today you want input
- Today it's to change the code
- Changing the code to prevent data center is not mentioned
- Today was told data center will have its own day
- City council is deciding Monday to extend the plan
- We need to trust those in charge

Comment card: We need tiny homes, for better cost savings. This is good for single people and elderly. We have lost homes from fire, flooding, inflation. We need tiny homes now!!! Wood cost more; iron and anything used for the home will cost more.

Comment card: No zoning for Data Centers.

Comment card: You have representatives here that will help consult on how to build large scale projects. Where are the scientists and medical professionals to assess the risks to humans and the environment if the projects are built

Comment card: Janesville does not want zoning for any DATA CENTERS

Comment card: I would like to see more opportunities for [unclear] zoning in residential areas. The 4th ward, where I live, could use some stores, things like a grocery store and another place to purchase needed items. A problem in the 4th Ward is low income and a lack of transportation.

Comment card: Transparency and ease of use are good goals.

However, there needs to be an additional Industrial category for large scale projects with significant community impact (like Data Centers and Data Center expansion) including independent assessments of environmental - air & noise - and property value repercussions. To be blunt, this should not be a Data Center easy button bypassing your constituent wishes. We pay the bills!

I do heartily approve of allowing ADU flexibility. Senior caregiving is a huge and expensive societal issue that needs to be addressed.

Also wondering how focus groups for this were chosen and public input opportunities were publicized. THIS is the first I've heard of this process and it's difficult not to be cynical about that considering recent city events. [SIGNATURE]

Comment card: [SIGNATURE] - Make development plans (general development plans) less detailed. Don't make so much detail be PEQ.

Sticky note: General development plan ask for too much upfront [Signature]

Comment card: Fix P1, P2, P3 sections, they do not jive. Several loopholes.

Exhibit Board 3 comment: Add new industrial district: M5 - Data center (enterprise; colocate; hyposcale; modular)

Exhibit Board 3 subcomment: Yes!

Exhibit Board 10 comment: Data centers should be their own base zoning designation & conditional/special use only

Exhibit Board 10 comment: Major utility should be conditional use across the board.

Exhibit Board 11 comment: Protections for communities w/ construction noise such as hourly regulations

Expand stormwater management beyond just municipal code; there is more than just sediment that can affect sewage and discharge
consider weight restrictions on roads (residential)

Should hyperscale data centers have their own zoning code? And should they be permitted conditionally (obligatorily) and reviewed frequently (also obligatory)?

Exhibit Board 11 comment: Allowing Tiny Homes, Cottage Properties, & ADUs -> Yes, please

Exhibit Board 11 comment: Don't put a data center at the GM/Jatco site. The community needs housing, small businesses, communal use space.

Dear City of Janesville Zoning Committee,

I am writing to urge the committee to revise the current zoning draft regarding the proposed industrial districts. If it were up to me, we would not have a data center in the middle of Janesville, but since the city seems keen to move forward with the idea, I propose that data centers be granted their own zoning category rather than being grouped with benign developments. In the current draft, data center development is in the same category as projects like a "maker's space," meaning it would only require City Council approval without additional oversight. However, the footprint, resource consumption, and community impact of these two types of developments are not even close to being in the same realm.

Because data centers require such a large amount of resources, their impact on residents is significantly greater than a single building for a creative space. Placing these types of developments together removes the external evaluation process data centers require. I strongly recommend that data center development be placed into a specialized zoning category that requires scientific, environmental, resident, and city oversight before approval.

Thank you for your consideration of this necessary revision.

Sincerely,
Laura Linek
2422 Bond Pl
Janesville



MEMORANDUM

TO: GRAEF, City of Janesville Zoning Consultant

FROM: Viridian Partners

CC: Duane Cherek, Planning Director
Kathy Voskuil, Plan Commission Chair
Jay Shambeau, Interim City Manager
Jimsi Kuborn, Economic Development Director

DATE: June 11, 2026

RE: Comments to Draft Zoning Code

As interested development partners of the former GM site, Viridian Partners has reviewed the draft City of Janesville Zoning Code, specifically section 6.08 Data Centers. We commend the City of Janesville for taking steps to put specific guidelines in for Data Center uses. Viridian would like to offer the following suggestions to even further enhance this section and provide additional protection for the community.

- **Noise Reduction:** The proposed ordinance lacks specificity regarding allowable levels and/or ways to mitigate. We know that this will be sensitive issue for neighbors and especially adjacent residential areas. Significant improvements have been made to data center technologies that allow for reduced noise levels compared to past developments. Here are suggestions to improve noise concerns:
 - o **Set Maximum Noise Levels at adjacent property lines:** We suggest setting maximum decibel levels at adjacent property lines. This would be verified via a detailed Sound Study during the approval phase and then measured post development. Viridian suggests the following specific limits. Note these limits would be exempt during times of power failure when on-site generators need to operate. However, they would be in effect when generators are being tested.

Use	Day Limit	Night Limit
Residential, Agricultural or Sensitive Receptors:	65 dbA	60 dbA
Commercial Uses:	70 dbA	65 dbA
Industrial Uses:	75 dbA	70 dbA

Note that these levels are lower than those proposed in our RFP response. Also, if current (pre-construction) ambient noise levels exceed these amounts, the intent would be to limit any increase by the Data Center to the ambient levels plus 5dba.

- **Limit Generator Testing Hours:** Generator testing is an essential part of normal Data Center Operations and creates additional noise. Limiting this to daytime business hours will help alleviate additional evening and night-time noise.
- **Generator Court Positioning:** Generators are usually positioned in a screened courtyard on one side of each Data Center Building. Language should be added that generator courts will be designed (whenever possible) to not be parallel and/or adjacent to the closest neighboring property lines. When possible, they should be positioned perpendicular or on the opposite side of the building of the closest property lines. This will further improve noise levels at the site boundaries and minimize less desirable site lines into generator courts.
- **Generator, Mechanical and Electrical Infrastructure Screening.** In addition to providing visual screening to these areas, screen walls can also be used to provide additional sound buffering. Some language is included in the code which could be improved. We offer the following:
 - **Rooftop Screening:** Screen walls on roof tops should completely surround equipment and be set back a minimum of 10' from the building edge. Height should be sufficient to screen all equipment on the horizontal plane. Screen walls should complement the building architecture and achieve a Sound Transmission Class (STC) of 35 or greater and a Noise Reduction Coefficient (NRC) of 0.9 or greater.
 - **Generator Court and Electrical Infrastructure Screening.** When a Data Center Building itself does not provide screening to these areas, a minimum 12' high screen wall should surround these areas. Screen walls should be built to complement the building and site architecture, should not be limited to masonry walls, achieve a Sound Transmission Class (STC) of 35 or greater and a Noise Reduction Coefficient (NRC) of 0.9 or greater.
- **Implement reasonable Construction Phase Noise Standards.** We would be happy to work with staff to develop these which often need to be site specific.
- **Air Quality:** Data Centers rely on electric power to power almost all aspects of a facility including cooling, heating and data/server/computer operation. This limits the emissions to three primary sources:

- **Emergency Generators:** We recommend language that generators must conform to EPA Tier 4 generator standards, dictating a near-zero level of harmful air pollutants by mandating a 95% reduction in particulate matter and a 90% reduction in nitrogen oxides compared to Tier 3 engines.
- **Facility Generated Traffic:** Data Centers have the benefit of creating relatively small traffic counts compared to other industrial, warehousing, or commercial uses. After construction, traffic is primarily generated by employees with a small amount of truck deliveries. We would encourage that trucking routes are approved to reasonably minimize disruption to residential and sensitive areas during and after construction.
- **Construction related Emissions and Dust.** Language should be added requiring a Perimeter Air Quality Plan be approved by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR). This would assist with construction equipment emissions as well as dust and other potential pollutants during the construction process.
- **Bulk Regulations**
 - **Residential Setbacks:** When abutting a Residential, Agricultural or other sensitive use, the setback from the common property line should be increased to a minimum of 150' for both principal and accessory uses. This would include generator courts in addition to the building itself. Currently it is 100' for just Residential uses.
 - **Residential Buffer Yards:** Add a minimum buffer yard requirement adjacent to residential, agricultural or other sensitive uses. We suggest that Buffer Yard maintain a minimum 75' width adjacent to property line with a minimum 7.5' high well landscaped berm. Where appropriate, these areas would be accessible to the public with potential walking paths. Security Fencing, parking and/or site circulation roads (except as needed for access) would be prohibited in the buffer area. Along with the additional setback above, we feel this creates a well landscaped and functional buffer between the development and residential or other sensitive areas.
 - **Lot Coverage:**
 - **Impervious Coverage:** Reduce maximum to 75%.
 - **Green and Open Space:** Suggest a requirement for a minimum of 10% of the total lot area (excluding stormwater facilities) to be designated as green or open space.
 - **Parking:** We believe the parking regulations are excessive at a minimum of 1 space per 2,000sf. Most data centers have relatively low parking counts compared to commercial or other industrial uses. Reducing this to 1 per 10,000 sf would be appropriate and would

increase the potential for green space by not having excessive empty parking areas. There are users that may require more parking and the code should allow this if needed.

- O Height:** Data Centers users have varying requirements for building height. To provide the flexibility needed to attract the best users/operators, flexibility is required to build two story structures that would be up to 85' tall. This would be approximately 75' to the average parapet height and 85' to the top of the rooftop mechanical equipment screens. Should the City elect to increase the building setback to 150' at residential areas (as suggested above), we would request that the "wedding cake" ability to add to the building height (from 65' high) start at 110' from the property line for all areas and not the 150' setback. This would maintain the ability to build an 85' high building at a 150' minimum setback, which would have been possible prior to us suggesting the setback be increased.
- Building Design:** The proposed code currently has an emphasis on using a minimum of 20% glass at each building façade. Although glass is an attractive element, it is not functional on a data center except at where offices are placed. We are suggesting language below that puts more flexibility into building design while requiring that they have architectural appeal and not be monolithic in nature.

 - O Principal Facades (office areas and areas facing adjacent property):**

 - Facades shall be consistent in terms of design, material, detail, and treatments.
 - Facades shall avoid the use of undifferentiated surfaces that result in a monolithic appearance by including two of the following design elements:

 - Changes in building height
 - Building step-backs or recesses
 - Building projections, risalites, or avant-corps
 - Fenestrations
 - Change in material, pattern, texture, color, or accents.
 - Facades designed as to provide the appearance of an office building or similar professional space as opposed to a structure for the storing or logistics of computer and technological equipment.
 - O Secondary Facades: (Data Center Areas not directly facing adjacent property, internal to development)**

 - Facades shall be consistent in terms of design, material, detail, and treatments.
 - Facades shall avoid the use of undifferentiated surfaces by including the following design elements:

- Fenestrations
- Change in material, pattern, texture, color, or accents.
 - Facades designed as to provide the appearance of an office building or similar professional space as opposed to a structure for the storing or logistics of computer and technological equipment.
- **Decommissioning:** Language requiring preparation of a decommissioning plan to be approved by the City.
- **Water Usage:** We would suggest adding the following:
 - o **Groundwater:** Groundwater should not be used for any purpose other than use during construction. A public water source shall be used for general operation of the completed project.
 - o **Public Water:** The Janesville Water Utility will review and approve all requests for water usage. Developer shall stay within parameters approved by the Utility.
- **Accessory Uses:** On Site Electrical Switching and Sub-Stations are required as part of any Data Center development and should be listed as accessory uses.
- **Development Agreement:** Although done outside of a Zoning Ordinance, Development Agreements are a great tool to put additional site-specific requirements in place prior to a Site Plan approval process or Permits being issued. We would encourage the City to consider this for any Data Center development.

Thank you for your consideration of the above. We would be glad to speak with any of the stakeholders regarding this matter.

Public Comment on Janesville Data Center Zoning and Rezoning Concerns

Janesville should not approve zoning language that opens the door to a hyperscale data center without stronger public review, enforceable protection, and clear accountability. Too many questions remain. The costs, risks, and long-term obligations should not be an afterthought.

One modern hyperscale facility can host millions of servers. That kind of capacity can support cloud services, streaming, and data storage for tens of millions of users. Wisconsin already has dozens of data centers, and projects are being proposed or built across the state. Before Janesville adds another one, the city should be able to clearly explain what local needs are being served, who benefits, and who carries the risk.

Why This Matters to Janesville

Janesville and Rock County taxpayers have legitimate concerns about large-scale data center expansion, especially in smaller cities where land is limited. Across Wisconsin, residents are raising questions about environmental damage, utility rate impacts, property values, infrastructure costs, secrecy, and whether communities are being asked to carry risk while corporations stay silent.

Clean Wisconsin has reported at length on why large technology companies are targeting Wisconsin for rapid expansion and what that could mean for water, land, energy bills, and public transparency.

Examples From Other Wisconsin Communities

Recorded testimony from Maily Kocinski out of Beaver Dam documented environmental concerns involving a creek near her property. During blasting operations, that creek reportedly experienced intermittent dry spells. She also paid for testing that showed heavy metal contamination. The DNR made appearances at her request and reported that applicable laws were being followed. That answer may satisfy the legal minimum, but it does not answer the larger public question: are the current laws strong enough to protect residents before damage occurs?

This is not an isolated concern. Similar questions are being raised in Racine, Port Washington, Turtle/Beloit, Kenosha, Mount Pleasant, Beaver Dam, and other communities.

Better Alternatives Should Be Considered

Rather than targeting farmland or the JATCO site, Janesville should look first at existing structures and previously developed sites. Warehouses, empty department stores, and vacant commercial buildings such as the old Schnuck's grocery store may be better suited for smaller-scale infrastructure. These sites already have some combination of built-in noise containment, loading docks, HVAC, parking, and access roads.

The city could also consider purchasing or controlling a site and leasing the space as a revenue stream. Power and energy upgrades would still be required, but those costs should be paid by the leaseholder or developer. Water use should also be treated as a design choice, not an unavoidable cost. There are examples of data center designs that rely on little or no municipal water for cooling, and Janesville should require that kind of standard before considering any approval.

Public Trust and Transparency

Wisconsin Watch reported that polling showed about 70% of registered Wisconsin voters believe the costs of data centers outweigh the benefits, with similar findings from Marquette Law School polling. That public skepticism should matter, especially when residents are expected to live with the consequences.

The number of questions regarding this rezoning proposal is alarming, as it should be. Rezoning requires a level of consideration that seems to be missing here. We do not question how hard this body works. We question whether the process is protecting the people who will be directly affected.

The city appears to offer flexibility on residential construction, which is commendable. But commercially, that same flexibility seems to line up with what developers, technology companies, and consulting firms want. I strongly urge this body to advocate first for residents, not for those with deep pockets, empty promises, and lawyers to persuade officials in their favor.

Concerns With the Proposed Zoning Language

The 295-page proposal includes legal language that appears to limit accountability by claiming no liability if damages occur because of compliance with the new zoning proposal. It does not clearly state who will be accountable or what specific measures will be taken if a developer builds a structure that causes environmental, property, infrastructure, or community damage.

DATA CENTER STATISTICS, & REZONING

If a development requires infrastructure, utility expansion, monitoring, mitigation, legal review, or eventual removal, those costs should be disclosed up front and paid by the developer.

The Data Center section on page 180, section 6.08, specifically outlines zoning requirements for a facility that appears to fit the GM site. That raises a fair public concern: if the zoning language has been shaped around a specific use or site, then residents deserve to know that before approval, not after.

Requested Safeguards Before Any Approval

At minimum, Janesville should require the following safeguards before approving zoning language that enables hyperscale data center development:

1. Stronger protections for neighborhoods.
2. Guaranteed funding to remove facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.
3. Larger setbacks between data centers and homes, with added protections for sensitive sites.
4. Strong enforcement rules with meaningful penalties for violations.
5. Required public notice, public hearings, and public access to information.
6. Clear construction rules covering noise, dust, truck traffic, lighting, blasting, and water use.
7. Independent studies addressing community impacts before, during, and after construction, with results available to the public.
8. A requirement that the developer pay all city-related costs. Infrastructure cost disclosures and agreements must be publicly available. No disclosure and no agreement should mean no zoning approval.
9. No automatic approvals for expansions or new buildings. Each phase should require its own approval, public review, and proof that earlier phases are fulfilling promises.
10. Mandatory and legally enforceable community benefits agreements.
11. Comprehensive generator standards, including emissions requirements, noise limitations, public notification of testing schedules, and disclosure of generator inventories before permit approval.
12. Comprehensive electronic waste management plans with ongoing public reporting requirements.
13. A separate zoning category for data centers because they are not the same as traditional industrial uses.
14. Conditional permitting for major utility installations in all zoning districts, rather than allowing them by right in industrial areas.

Closing Request

Janesville should not approve this rezoning as written. The city should disclose the full scope of what is being considered, require independent impact studies, and make sure any developer-funded protections are legally enforceable before any data center-related zoning approval moves forward.

Sources Reviewed

- Clean Wisconsin: Data Center Secrets
- WKOW: Creek concerns near Meta data center site in Beaver Dam
- TMJ4: Beaver Dam residents raise water concerns about Meta's AI data center
- Wisconsin Watch: Latest Wisconsin data center news and polling updates
- Wisconsin Policy Forum: Data Centers May Change Wisconsin's Utility Landscape
- Technology Magazine: Zero-water cooling approaches for data centers
- News Nation report on Virginia data center expansion concerns
- Data Center Watch report



FACTORY-BUILT MANUFACTURED HOME EXAMPLES



factorybuiltinwisconsin.com



608-255-3131



members@housingalliance.us



DEVELOPING WITH FACTORY-BUILT HOMES



Factory-built homes are a solution for affordable, high-quality, and energy-efficient community development.

As housing costs rise and construction timelines lengthen, factory-built housing offers a scalable, flexible approach to expanding homeownership — when paired with the right policies, partners, and financing strategies.

Benefits of Factory-Built Housing

- Built to federal or state residential construction standards for design, construction, strength, energy efficiency, safety, and performance.
- Constructed off-site in a controlled environment out of the elements to protect the materials.
- Indoor construction eliminates delays and ensures quality.
- Lower cost to build due to economies of scale.
- Can be built on permanent foundations like slab, crawl space, or basements.
- Modern amenities available just like in site-built homes.



Myths About Factory-Built Housing

- Quality - Built with same materials as a site-built home.
- Appreciation - Factory-built homes appreciate as much as site-built homes.
- Curb Appeal - Today's factory-built homes are designed to blend in to most neighborhoods.
- Safety - Factory-built homes are built to rigorous construction standards in the federal HUD Code.
- Financing - There are a variety of financing choices for today's factory built homes.

Partnering to Create More Housing

- Understand the different factory-built housing types and how they can be best used for your housing project needs whether it be a large scale development or infill lots.
- Building layered cap stacks with financing from public and private partnerships.
- Partnering with non-profits for housing infill projects.
- Consider zoning and local policies that impact your housing project.

**If you want to know more about today's factory-built housing,
contact us for presentations, factory tours or more information.**



factorybuiltinwisconsin.com



608-255-3131



members@housingalliance.us

Sources: Next Step Network, JCHS Harvard University, FHFA

MEMO

To: Duane Cherek, Brian Schweigl and Plan Commission Members

From: Forward Janesville's Zoning Work Group

Date: June 1, 2026

Re: Proposed updates to Janesville's Zoning and Subdivision Code

Work Group Feedback on Proposed Zoning Code Updates

Over the last 18 months, significant work has been done to gather input, propose updates, refine revisions and deliver a code ready for full public review. We are grateful to City of Janesville staff, Plan Commission volunteers and GRAEF consultants for the diligence of their efforts and their willingness to work with our Zoning Code Work Group as we tracked along with the process and provided suggestions.

We also want to highlight how thankful we are that there was a dedicated webpage for the code rewrite. The webpage was a homebase for our work group as we navigated the process and accessed core documents. Hosting a dedicated webpage with on-demand resources is a best practice for meaningful public engagement. Thank you for taking the time and care to provide it.

Forward Janesville members communicated their aspiration to have a zoning code and subdivision ordinance that was modernized, provided flexibility for innovative development concepts and was more predictable. When the current code (old code) is compared to the proposed updated code (new code), many of the updates achieve those objectives. Specifically:

- The new code's Table of Contents, color-coded Land Use Table, inclusion of visuals, and added content tables throughout modernize the code's structure, flow and navigability. These updates also make it more user-friendly.
- Flexibility has been introduced more widely by allowing for broader development of mixed-use concepts, mixed-type residential, and innovative concepts as enumerated in Article 8: Alternative Development Options.
- Lastly, the development process will be more predictable due to improvements like concurrent review processes, increased staff-level review and approval, and clarity on timelines, notice rules and appeal rules.

In addition to reviewing the old code against the new code, our work group also compared the March 7, 2025 Land Use Table to the April 30, 2026 Land Use Table. Attached is an AI-supported analysis where we offer five recommendations for how to further enhance mixed-use development in the City of Janesville and support economic development, particularly within residential districts where small-scale commercial uses could better serve residents.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

CITY OF JANESVILLE

Zoning Ordinance Rewrite

Land Use Table Comparison Analysis
& Opportunities to Enhance Mixed-Use Development

PREVIOUS DRAFT	CURRENT DRAFT
Working Draft	Discussion Draft
March 7, 2025	April 30, 2026
18 Zoning Districts	17 Zoning Districts

Prepared: May 29, 2026

Executive Summary

This document presents a side-by-side comparison of two iterations of the City of Janesville Land Use Table from the ongoing zoning ordinance rewrite project (Chapter 46 - Zoning). The earlier Working Draft (March 7, 2025) is compared against the most recent Discussion Draft (April 30, 2026), with key changes identified.

The April 30, 2026 draft represents a significant refinement of the proposed code, incorporating feedback from Plan Commission discussions, public open houses, and stakeholder engagement. The number of zoning districts has been further consolidated, the permit review structure has been refined (introducing P1, P2, and P3 sub-classifications), and several new land use categories have been introduced.

Key Findings

- District count reduced from 18 to 17 - the R-4 and R-8 districts were eliminated, and a new City Center Transition (CC-T) district was added.
- Granular permit review tiers introduced - the simple "P" classification has been expanded to P, P1, P2, and P3, providing more nuanced regulatory oversight.
- Several new land uses added including: Live/work dwelling, Batch plant, Poultry and game bird hatchery, Public landfill, Short-term rental, Outdoor hospitality area, and Common area amenity.
- Some uses removed or renamed including: Secondhand store (removed), Construction equipment sales and service (removed/consolidated), and various terminology refinements.

Part 1: Zoning District Comparison

The two drafts use different naming conventions and slightly different district sets. The April 30, 2026 draft consolidated districts and added clearer naming.

Side-by-Side District Comparison

Category	Old Draft (3-7-2025)	New Draft (4-30-2026)	Status
Residential	R-1 Suburban Residential	R-1 Low Density Residential	Renamed
Residential	R-2 Low Density Mixed Residential	R-2 Medium Density Residential	Renamed/Reclassified
Residential	R-3 Medium Density Mixed Residential	R-3 High Density Residential	Renamed/Reclassified
Residential	R-4 High Density Residential	(eliminated)	REMOVED
Residential	R-8 Planned Mixed Residential	(eliminated)	REMOVED
Residential	R-9 Manufactured Home Neighborhood	R-9 Manufactured Home Neighborhood	Unchanged
Business	B-1 Neighborhood Mixed Use	B-1 Neighborhood Mixed Use	Unchanged
Business	B-2 Community Business	B-2 Community Business	Unchanged
Business	B-3 Highway Commercial	B-3 Highway Commercial	Unchanged
Business	B-4 Downtown	CC City Center	Renamed/Reclassified
Business	(not present)	CC-T City Center Transition	NEW
Industrial	M-1 Light Industrial	M-1 Light Industrial	Unchanged
Industrial	M-2 General Industrial	M-2 General Industrial	Unchanged
Industrial	M-3 Central Light Industrial	M-3 Central Light Industrial	Unchanged
Special Purpose	P-1 Conservancy	C Conservancy	Renamed
Special Purpose	SP-1 Railroad	RLRD Railroad	Renamed
Special Purpose	SP-2 Mining Enterprise	ME Mining Enterprise	Renamed
Special Purpose	SP-3 Aviation Enterprise	AE Aviation Enterprise	Renamed
Special Purpose	SP-4 Urban Transition	UT Urban Transition	Renamed

Legend

NEW (Added)	REMOVED	Renamed/Changed	Unchanged
-------------	---------	-----------------	-----------

Part 2: Permit Review Structure

One of the most significant procedural changes between the two drafts is the introduction of tiered permit review classifications. The 5-6-2025 Plan Commission Meeting clarified these definitions.

Permit Classification Comparison

Symbol	Old Draft (3-7-2025)	New Draft (4-30-2026)
P	Permitted subject to any secondary review procedures	Permitted by Right (subject to administrative site plan review if required)
P1	<i>(Not in old draft)</i>	Permitted UNLESS multiple principal buildings per lot (then triggers conditional use review per Sec. 46-1067)
P2	<i>(Not in old draft)</i>	Permitted UNLESS large developments: • 50,000 sf building footprint • 5 acre site • Multiple buildings per lot
P3	<i>(Not in old draft)</i>	Permitted with Plan Commission review of Site Plan (administrative + Plan Commission review)
C	Conditional Use	Conditional Use (admin site plan + conditional use review)
CLA	Community Living Arrangement Review	Community Living Arrangement Review (unchanged)
TFR	Wireless Telecommunication Facility Review	Wireless Telecommunication Facility Review (unchanged)
WES	Wind Energy System Review	Wind Energy System Review (unchanged)

Source: Plan Commission Meeting, May 6, 2025 - Slide 15 (Land Use Organization).

Part 3: Key Land Use Changes by Category

Category 1: Residential

Land Use	Old Draft	New Draft	Change Type
Boardinghouse	P in R-3, R-4	C in R-2, R-3	Now Conditional
Live/work dwelling	(not listed)	P in B-1, B-2, B-3, CC, CC-T	NEW USE
Mixed-use residential	P in B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4	C in R-3; P2 in B-1, B-2, B-3, CC, CC-T	Expanded + restricted
Multi-family 2 units	Merged with 2-4 unit category	P1 in R-1, R-2, R-3; P2 in B-1	Split out + clarified
Multi-family 3-4 units	P in R-1 through R-8; C in B-1+	C in R-1; P1 in R-2, R-3; C/P2 in business	Refined tiers
Multi-family 5-8 units	C in R-3; P in R-4, R-8	P1 in R-2, R-3; C in B-1, B-2, B-3; P2 in CC, CC-T	Refined tiers
Multi-family 9+ units	(part of 5+ category)	C in R-2; P1 in R-3; C/P2 in business	Split out
Single-family dwelling	P in R-1 through R-8	P1 in R-1, R-2, R-3; P2 in B-1; P in UT	Tiered review
Townhouse 2 units	Merged with 2-4 unit category	P in R-1, R-2, R-3, B-1	Split out
Townhouse 9+ units	(part of 5+ category)	C in R-2; P in R-3; C/P in business	Split out

Category 3: General Commercial - Notable Changes

Land Use	Change	Note
Secondhand store	REMOVED	No longer in land use table
Birth center	Moved to Government/Community Services (4.03)	Recategorized to Section 4
Community center	Moved to Government/Community Services (4.05)	Recategorized to Section 4
Community cultural facility	Moved to Govt/Community Services (4.06); added P1 in R-2/R-3	Recategorized + expanded to residential
Veterinary clinic	Added P3 in R-1, R-2, R-3	NEW - now allowed in residential with PC review
Vehicle sales and service	Split into 'Vehicle sales' (3.39) and 'Vehicle service establishment' (3.40)	Clarification
Equipment rental, heavy/light	Renamed: 'Equipment sales and rental, heavy/light'	Added sales component
Public EV charging facility	Expanded to all business and industrial districts; added AE	Climate/EV-supportive
Truck stop	Limited to B-3, M-1, M-2 only (previously included B-2)	Tightened

New Land Uses Added in 4-30-2026 Draft

Series	Land Use	Districts Where Allowed
1.02	Live/work dwelling	P in B-1, B-2, B-3, CC, CC-T
3.08	Commercial drone delivery hub	C in M-1, M-2, M-3, AE (consistent with old draft)
6.03	Batch plant	C in M-2, ME
6.17	Public landfill and waste disposal operation	P in ME
8.03	Poultry and game bird hatchery	C in B-3; P in M-1, M-2, M-3; C in AE
9.06	Backyard chickens AND ducks	P in R-1, R-2, R-3, R-9, UT (expanded scope)
9.31	Outdoor hospitality area	P in B-1, B-2, B-3, CC, CC-T, M-1, M-2
10.09	Short-term rental	P in all R districts, all B districts, UT
10.13	Temporary shipping container	P in B-1, B-2
11.01	Common area amenity	P in all R districts and all B districts

Land Uses Removed from 4-30-2026 Draft

Series (Old)	Land Use (Removed)	Where It Was Allowed
3.34 (old)	Secondhand store	Was P in B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4
6.06 (old)	Construction equipment sales and service	Was P in M-1; C in M-2, M-3, SP-3, SP-4
6.13 (old)	Manufacturing (generic)	Replaced by 'Manufacturing, heavy' (6.12) and 'Manufacturing, light' (6.13)
9.31 (old)	Outdoor food and beverage service	Renamed/replaced by 'Outdoor hospitality area' (9.31 new)

Part 4: Opportunities to Enhance Mixed Use Development

The following recommendations are intended to further improve the proposed 4-30-2026 Land Use Table and better support economic development, particularly within residential districts where small-scale commercial uses could better serve surrounding neighborhoods.

Opportunity 1: Allow Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial in R-3 (Ground Floor Buildout)

In the 4-30-2026 Land Use Table, the R-3 High Density Residential district allows very limited commercial activity. Coffee shops, small cafes, neighborhood retail, and similar small-business uses are prohibited. They appear only in business districts (B-1 through CC-T).

However, R-3 is intended for higher-density living - precisely the kind of district that supports walkability, vibrant streetscapes, and commercial activation. Small-format commercial can take two forms in R-3: (1) built into the ground floor of a mixed-use residential building, or (2) as a small free-standing building. Assigning a P, P1, P2, or P3 classification to a commercial use makes that use allowable in both forms - it is not limited to the ground floor of a mixed-use building unless the supplemental standards expressly say so.

Current Land Use Table - R-3 District Snapshot

Use Type	R-3 Current Status	Recommendation
3.11 Craft brewery, winery, distillery	Not allowed (-)	Allow as P2 (small-scale)
3.14 Financial services (small branch)	Not allowed (-)	Allow as P2 (small-scale)
3.17 General and professional services	Not allowed (-)	Allow as P2 (small-scale)
3.21 Instructional studio (yoga, art, etc.)	Not allowed (-)	Allow as P1 (small-scale)
3.26 Personal service (salon, barber)	Not allowed (-)	Allow as P1 (small-scale)
3.28 Restaurant (coffee shop, cafe)	Not allowed (-)	Allow as C (no drive-thru)
3.29 Retail sales, 15,000 sf or less	Not allowed (-)	Allow as C (neighborhood-scale)
1.04 Mixed-use residential	C (Conditional Use)	Upgrade to P2 (matches B-1, B-2, B-3, CC, CC-T)
3.32 Tavern (small neighborhood tavern)	Not allowed (-)	Allow as C (scale-limited, see discussion)
Use Type	R-3 Current Status	Recommendation

Proposed Implementation Approach

- Add a new sub-section to R-3 supplemental standards titled "Ground-Floor Commercial in Multi-Family Buildings" that defines size, location, and operational limits.
- Limit ground-floor commercial to no more than 30% of the building footprint.
- Require operating hours that respect residential character (e.g., 6 AM - 10 PM).
- Prohibit uses that generate noise, odors, or traffic impacts incompatible with residential living (no drive-throughs, no auto-related uses, no taverns).
- Use the new P2 classification framework as a model - allowing the use by right unless certain size thresholds are exceeded, in which case Conditional Use review is triggered.
- Mixed-use residential (1.04) should be upgraded from C to P2 in R-3 to actively encourage vertical mixed-use development, with the multiple-building trigger providing oversight for larger projects.

Benefits

- Increased walkability by reducing residents' need to drive for daily essentials.
- Support economic vitality by creating small-business opportunities and incubator-style space.
- Aligns with the rewrite objective of being responsive to local, regional and national markets and community needs.
- Aligns with the rewrite objective to simplify by reducing the need for spot zoning to introduce neighborhood-serving commercial.

Opportunity 2: Reconsider P2 Status for Single-Family Dwelling in B-1 District

The Question

Why is a Single-family dwelling (1.09) classified as P2 in the B-1 Neighborhood Mixed Use district?

Background

Per the Plan Commission Meeting of May 6, 2025 (Slide 15), the P2 designation means:

*"Permitted **unless** large developments: 50,000 sf building footprint, 5-acre site, Multiple buildings per lot."*

In the new draft, Single-family dwelling in B-1 is listed as P2.

Series 1.09: Single-Family Dwelling	Permit Status in 4-30-2026 Draft
R-1 Low Density Residential	P1 - Permitted unless multiple buildings/lot
R-2 Medium Density Residential	P1 - Permitted unless multiple buildings/lot
R-3 High Density Residential	P1 - Permitted unless multiple buildings/lot
B-1 Neighborhood Mixed Use	P2 - Permitted unless large development
UT Urban Transition	P - Permitted by Right

Analysis: Why P2 Might Not Make Sense for Single-Family in B-1

The P2 designation triggers Conditional Use review for "large developments" - defined as 50,000 sq ft footprint, 5-acre site, or multiple buildings per lot. This trigger framework appears to have been designed for commercial development, not residential development.

A single-family dwelling, by definition:

- Has **only one** principal building per lot (not multiple).
- Will almost never approach a 50,000 sq ft footprint (typical SFD is 1,500-4,000 sq ft).
- Will rarely sit on a 5+ acre lot in a B-1 Neighborhood Mixed Use district.

In effect, the P2 classification provides **no additional review** for a single-family dwelling in B-1, because the trigger thresholds are not realistically achievable for a single-family home. This makes the P2 designation functionally equivalent to P (Permitted by Right) - but creates regulatory ambiguity and reader confusion.

Recommended Action

- Change Single-Family Dwelling (1.09) in B-1 from P2 to P1 to align with residential districts and ensure the same protective trigger for multiple-building developments applies.
- Confirm with Plan Commission staff whether the P2 was intentional (e.g., as part of a broader mixed-use site review) if so, that intent should be made explicit in the supplemental standards and it is recommended not to include this as

Potential issues with P2 & P3:

- **Developer uncertainty:** A P2 classification signals to a developer that their project **might** require Conditional Use review. Even if the project clearly cannot trigger the 50,000 sf, 5-acre, or multiple-buildings thresholds, the developer must affirmatively confirm this through staff consultation before pursuing financing or design, delaying project timelines.
- **Additional review cost:** The need to demonstrate non-applicability of the P2 or P3 triggers adds soft costs to the project, including staff time, and potential pre-application meetings.
- **Financing friction:** Lenders and investors flag any Conditional Use possibility as a material project risk. A P2 or P3 classification that functionally cannot trigger review still appears in due diligence reports as a regulatory contingency, raising the cost of capital.
- **Conflict with simplify objective:** The Plan Commission's stated rewrite objective is to simplify for readability, understanding, and administration. Retaining P2 for a use that cannot trigger its conditional review thresholds works against that objective.

If the Plan Commission ultimately determines that the P2 & P3 classification serves a specific oversight purpose, it would be helpful if that purpose is explicitly documented in the supplemental standards for Series 1.09.

Opportunity 3: Expand 'Live/Work Dwelling' Concept to R-3

The new draft introduces "Live/work dwelling" (Series 1.02) as a P (Permitted) use in B-1, B-2, B-3, CC, and CC-T. This is an excellent addition that supports small entrepreneurs, artists, makers, and home-based businesses.

Series 1.02	Live/Work Dwelling	Current 4-30-2026	Recommended
R-1, R-2	Low/medium density	Not allowed (-)	Not allowed (keep)
R-3	High density	Not allowed (-)	ADD as C (Conditional)
B-1 through CC-T	Business districts	P (current)	P (no change)

Adding live/work as a Conditional Use in R-3 would provide additional flexibility for residents who want to operate small businesses (consulting, art studios, design firms) while ensuring Plan Commission review for compatibility.

Opportunity 4: Add Public EV Charging Facility to All Residential Districts

The new draft expanded "Public EV charging facility" (3.27) to be permitted in business and industrial districts. However, EV charging is increasingly a residential amenity, apartment complexes and townhouse developments need shared charging infrastructure.

District	Public EV Charging (3.27) Current	Recommended
R-1	Not allowed (-)	Add as C with screening
R-2	Not allowed (-)	Add as C with screening
R-3	Not allowed (-)	Add as P1 (accessory to multi-family)
R-9	Not allowed (-)	Add as C

Note: Series 9.25 'Incidental EV charging stations' is already permitted in all districts, which addresses single-user residential charging. The recommendation is specifically for public-facing facilities that could serve multi-family residents.

Opportunity 5: Allow Sidewalk Café in B-1 and B-2

Sidewalk café (10.10) is currently allowed only in CC (City Center) and CC-T (City Center Transition). This is a missed opportunity - many B-1 (Neighborhood Mixed Use) and B-2 (Community Business) corridors have established main streets where sidewalk dining would activate the streetscape.

District	Sidewalk Café - Current	Recommended
B-1 Neighborhood Mixed Use	Not allowed (-)	Allow as P
B-2 Community Business	Not allowed (-)	Allow as P
B-3 Highway Commercial	Not allowed (-)	Allow as P
CC City Center	P (current)	P (no change)
CC-T City Center Transition	P (current)	P (no change)

Summary of Potential Updates

#	Recommendation	Land Use Series	Plan Commission Objective
1	Allow neighborhood-scale commercial in R-3 ground floors	3.11, 3.17, 3.21, 3.26, 3.28, 3.29; 1.04	RESPONSIVE, BALANCE
2	Reclassify Single-Family in B-1 from P2 to P1 (or P)	1.09 Single-family dwelling	SIMPLIFY, ALIGN
3	Extend Live/Work Dwelling to R-3 as Conditional Use	1.02 Live/work dwelling	RESPONSIVE
4	Allow Public EV Charging in residential districts	3.27 Public EV charging facility	QUALITY, RESPONSIVE
5	Extend Sidewalk Café to B-1 and B-2	10.10 Sidewalk café	QUALITY, BALANCE