



March 8, 2021

RE: Please support construction of The Hub II at 126 Langdon Street

Dear Plan Commissioners:

The North Central States Regional Council of Carpenters supports approval of Core Space's plans for 126 Langdon Street. Throughout this process our Union has been incredibly impressed with the development team's responsiveness and revisions based on extensive city and neighborhood feedback. Reductions in bed count, an increase in parking spots to accommodate ride-share and delivery, and additional setbacks have improved design, rhythm, and circulation. Additionally, this proposal is consistent with the Downtown Plan that calls for higher density on this parcel. This proposal unquestionably deserves approval from the Plan Commission.

Our community benefits from a diverse Union workforce building our city. Our tuition-free apprenticeship program offers livable wages, health insurance and a pension on day one. We are specifically dedicated to recruitment of underrepresented communities in our apprenticeship program and our demographic data backs this up, but apprenticeship only occurs if construction projects are approved by bodies like the City of Madison Plan Commission. The community benefits of this project will advance opportunity and equity in Madison.

Respectfully,

Andrew Disch
North Central States Regional Council of Carpenters

126 LANGDON STREET BUILDING PROPOSAL

My name is Yonden Dorje and I am the manager for Kennedy Manor Apartments at 1 Langdon street. I, along with many of our residents have many concerns about how this new proposed 7 storey structure could impact this historic neighbourhood and the quality of life for our residents. Please note our following concerns :

Architecture :

- The proposed building does not fit in with the character of the buildings in this historic neighbourhood.
- The proposed 7 storey structure is **too large** in scale and the exterior **design** does not fit in with the historic neighbourhood.
- If this structure is approved, it will serve as a gateway for other larger structures to be built in the future.
- This will forever change the fabric of this historic neighbourhood.

Noise / Disturbances :

- The proposed roof top patio on this building is likely to cause a huge noise disturbance to the neighborhood.
- Many of our residents have been living here for a long time. It will be difficult for our residents to avoid the expected loud noise and disturbances coming from this proposed roof top patio.
- It should not be acceptable for our residents to give up their quality of life and live with these expected noise disturbances coming from this proposed roof top patio.

Traffic Problems :

- The proposed building does not provide for enough parking spaces.
- This is going to greatly increase the problems with street traffic along Langdon Street.
- Ride share services like 'Uber' and 'Lyft' already create heavy traffic congestion along Langdon street.
- There needs to be more parking spaces for a structure of this size.
- We currently already have many students living along Langdon street who constantly use the Kennedy Manor parking lot illegally due to not enough parking spaces being provided at their buildings. This proposed building structure does not have adequate parking spaces and will elevate this parking problem.

From: [Prusak, Sydney](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Fw: Proposal, 126 Langdon Street, Opposition to Approval
Date: Monday, March 8, 2021 9:38:02 AM

From: Mark and Tammy Ehrmann <ehrfamily@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 4:14 PM
To: Prusak, Sydney
Cc: Heck, Patrick
Subject: Proposal, 126 Langdon Street, Opposition to Approval

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear City Plan Commission members,

We write to express our extreme opposition to the most recent proposal presented by Core Spaces for an apartment building at 126 Langdon Street. This project has been submitted in many iterations during the last two years, and the current design has shown little change to these earlier versions. This development has been denied several times because of a number of issues, and the minimal changes in this rendition do nothing to change the overall non-compliant design.

As the owner and governing body of the Delta Delta Delta fraternity house, located next door at 120 Langdon Street, we have several concerns about the legitimacy of the proposal in relation to the zoning rules in place for this area. In addition we feel that the overall character and historical nature of the location will be severely compromised by this proposed development.

The location is home to many significant and historically important buildings, and the proposed building does not complement or enhance the nature of the area. The mass, scale and design of the project is completely out of proportion with the neighboring buildings, making it non-compliant with the zoning rules and regulations. This is an historic area and owners work very hard to adhere to rules and regulations regarding historic property. In no way does this building compliment or enhance that historic flavor of the area. Once that is gone it will never be able to be reinstated - and in fact, opens up the gates for others to add these kinds of developments to the area. It starts to make more sense to sell existing buildings to developers for the land alone, rather than spend so much to keep them compliant with the historic area and have them overtaken by behemoth structures that do not fit in. Langdon will end up being a long narrow street filled with high rises that are filled with students and the local flavor of Langdon St, will be lost forever. The work and monies involved in maintaining and preserving these facilities is extensive and expensive, and in fact this imposing building will make the value of these properties be in selling the land to future developers - not in maintaining this slice of history in Madison.

The safety factor is a concern from those of us who live, work or maintain properties in the area. The site circulation of the area has not been addressed in a way that meets requirements for the area. The last building that was in that location allowed for an entrance on the east side of the property and an exit on the west side of the property, giving a one way flow to all vehicles in the area. The new plan eliminates the west side drive completely, requiring cars, delivery trucks, fire trucks and garbage trucks to make a y turn in a narrow parking lot at the bottom back of the building. This does not seem to be a safe way for that to happen considering all of the foot traffic in the area from the many residents who use the drive as a way to get to Langdon St. In addition, it causes congestion in a small, tight parking lot that belongs to another residence. There will be an increase in traffic to the area with the number of residents proposed in the development, and the current conditions do not even work with the current amount of traffic. The plans do not address this added traffic that a building of this size will require in an acceptable way.

Another safety concern is the rooftop hot tub (which is a pool size). In other developments by Core Spaces, both in Madison and in other parts of the country, this has proven to be a nuisance and detriment to the area. This is an

accident waiting to happen, whether it be from things thrown from the rooftop, overuse by residents and their guests while alcohol is used, lack of supervision by staff (with only resident managers on site at much of the time), and the noise and disruption to the area as a whole.

Please know that we, as an organization and as individuals, are in extreme opposition to this development. We cannot urge more strongly that a denial is in the best interests of the area, and that we feel that forever changing this location of historical significance will harm the rich fabric of the history of Madison.

Delta Delta Delta Mu Chapter House Corporation
120 Langdon Street
Madison, WI 53703

Tammy Ehrmann, President
Shawn King, Vice President
Patty Milliken, Treasurer
Jessie Solcz, Secretary
Connie Mills, Member-at-Large
Molly Weininger, Member-at-Large

Comments on application for 126 Langdon St

Bob Klebba

8 March 2021

The developer's proposal at Plan Commission is almost identical to the one withdrawn for the 24 February 2020 Plan Commission meeting and to the one placed on file at the at the 27 July 2020 PC meeting. The current application proposes minimal building size and bed count changes from those for the previous excessively large proposal. The Plan Commission should deny this application because the proposed building still does not meet standards of approval 1, 3, 4, and 9 and because such a development will have a deleterious effect on the Langdon Street Mansion Hill Neighborhoods.

Standard of approval 3

Several luxury student residences have been developed recently with rooftop pools. These amenities have resulted in many MPD calls for service and there is no reason to believe that they won't happen in this proposed residence marketed heavily to the Greek life community. The proposed building management plan does not adequately address security and enforcement and I am concerned that **the application as submitted will be detrimental to the welfare of the Langdon Street community.**

Standard of approval 4

Staff's argument about a large lot detracts from the precedent that will encourage nearby property owners to demolish and redevelop their properties to the 9 (lake side) stories allowed by the Downtown Plan. Buildings that owners plan to demolish are purposefully not maintained, as we saw last year at 619-621 N Lake St. For that application, staff recommend against the approval of an 8-story apartment building for the reason that it would encourage further demolition and redevelopment. **The approval of this application will irrevocably damage the preservation of the historic Langdon Street and Mansion Hill neighborhoods.** As the neighborhood has been requesting since October 2019, a smaller development at 3 stories would be welcomed and more appropriate.

Standard of approval 9

Neighbors have been very concerned about how the proposed 5-story façade will disrupt the architectural rhythm and flow of Langdon St. Even a modern building at 3 stories would tower over the adjacent properties. While the current iteration of the proposal has increased articulation, when approaching the proposed building, it would be obvious there are 5 stories extending a distance down to the lake. The depth and slope of the lot allow the applicant to propose a 9-story building height, which totally overwhelms all adjacent properties. By focusing on the setback requirements, the staff report overlooks how out of place this proposed building would be in this location.

It is obvious that the application proposes a building that maximizes size and profit for the lot size without any consideration for the surrounding historic neighborhoods. **The Plan Commission should deny this application so that a more compatible proposal can be reviewed.**

Standard of approval 14

The excess height was previously not recommended by UDC. They asserted that the quality the building design was not enhanced by the excess height. Furthermore, even at 5 stories, the building does not match the existing character of the surrounding area due to the height and massing of the proposal. **The application should be denied because it does not need the excess height and is out of place in the Langdon Street and Mansion Hill neighborhoods.**

For the proposed development under consideration, Core Spaces have aggressively pursued their goals ***without regard to adjacent neighbors' concerns, Madison's political process and Madison's ordinances.*** The application being reviewed at the 8 March 2021 Plan Commission meeting is essentially the same as what was proposed in October 2019 in spite of several steering committee meetings, several UDC meetings and now 3 Plan Commission meetings. .

- Neighbors' concerns about massing: **ignored**
- Neighbors' concerns about excessive height: **ignored**
- Neighbors' concerns about maintaining the architectural rhythm of the historic Langdon Street neighborhood: **ignored**
- Neighbors' concerns about deleterious activities directly associated with a rooftop pool: **ignored**
- UDC rejection of proposed excess height: **ignored**
- Aggressive campaign offering monetary gain to exclusive group of students in exchange for support for the proposed development: **illegal**
- Suspected direct payment of members of exclusive group of students in exchange for support at 12 February UDC meeting: **illegal**

I ask the commissioners

- **to respect the recommendation of Urban Design Commission and reject the excess height as per MGO 28.183(6)14 and Downtown Plan Objective 3.3**
- **to recognize that this application will encourage demolition and redevelopment**
- **to deny the current application**
- **if inclined to approve the application, to request the conditions of approval found in the 3 February 2020 and 8 March 2021 Steering Committee Reports to the Plan Commission**

Plan Commission
Meeting of March 8, 2021
Agenda #11, Legistar #63476

In July the Plan Commission placed on file the 126 Langdon conditional use request, finding that the project did not meet Conditional Use Approval Standards 1, 3, 4, and 9.

What has changed?

The height along Langdon is about 1' higher due to the parapet.

The length of the Langdon frontage remains the same (about 131 feet). Though, since the most easterly 5 feet is set back 46', one could say the width is 126' – a 5', or 3.8% reduction.

The July version had 3 segments:

From west to east, about 67', 31' and 33'.

- The westerly 67' was stepped back at the 5th floor by about 4.5'.
- The center segment of 31' was set back 9'.
- The easterly segment of 33' was 25' from the property line.

The current version has 3 segments.

From west to east, about 63', 34', 34'.

- The westerly 63' is set back 1.67' from the center portion, with a 6.33'* step back at the 4th and 5th floors. There are two 2' wide and 2' deep breaks in the façade of this segment, one at approximately the midpoint of the segment, the other where this segment abuts the center segment.

*Note: The Letter of Intent claims an 8' step back at the 4th and 5th floors.

Page A16 of the plans shows a 33' setback from the property line for floors 4 and 5. Page C-400 shows the section is set back 26.67' from the property line: $33' - 26.67' = 6.33'$.

- The center segment of 34' is 25' from the property line.
- The easterly segment is set back 1' at the first floor (the delivery parking area). At the second floor and above, there is a 14' step back for 29' and about 46' for the most easterly 5'.

The Letter of Intent speaks to articulation: "The revised Langdon Street façade has incorporated significant setbacks and mass reductions to reduce the overall façade width in both horizontal plane breaks and a step-back after the third floor."

As can be seen on the next page, the July version had set backs and step backs. This version rearranges the pieces. Of note are the following.

- (1) One segment is set back an additional 5' (from 9' to 14'). The center segment had been set back 9', now the center segment is moved forward and the easterly segment is set back 14'.
- (2) 63' of the width has gained a 4th floor step back of 6.33'.
- (3) Small tweaks such as: the 5th floor step back has increased by almost 2' along 63'; 5' at the easterly end has been stepped back 46'.



July 2020



February 2021

Fire Access Lane

The Letter of Intent uses the fire access lane to support three CU standards.

- CU standard #3: "The development of the site will also create a wider fire access lane along the project, supplying enhanced fire access for the adjoining properties ..."
- CU standard #4: "The proposal will improve vehicular and fire access to the adjoining properties and will not preclude development or improvement of the surrounding properties."
- CU standard #6: "The project widens the shared access drive with adjoining properties creating better access for vehicles and fire for the site and the surrounding buildings."

The redevelopment of 126 contributes little to the fire lane. The fire lane is 23.25' at Langdon, tapering to 22' towards the rear of the building, to about 16.5' at 124 Langdon's retaining wall, to about 14' turning the corner under the back overhang. (Page C-400 of the plans, pdf page 45.)

- The 126 property is contributing 5.13' to the fire lane, per page C-400. Or, in other words, it is devoting its side yard setback to the fire lane.
- About 18' of the fire lane is the existing driveway easement (primarily, if not exclusively, property owned by 124 Langdon). This easement, document #4287212, was recorded April 10, 2007 per page C-100, and that page says "the location of the easement is approximate as the recorded document does not provide distances."
 - It is worth noting that the demolition plans submitted in 2012 had an easement width of about 18'. If the easement is only from 124 Langdon, then, based on the property description, the easement is 18' in width.

The fire department had this to say about the applicant's July proposal, which had the same 'fire access' lane: "This site and neighborhood has limited fire apparatus access especially for ladder truck operations. Provide fire access as required by IFC & MGO standards. Additional fire safety features within the building above and beyond the state minimums maybe a means to *offset fire lane access shortcomings.*" (emphasis added)

The fire department currently says in condition #64: "The private street on the westside of this parcel is not a compliant fire lane and needs to be widened in order to be considered for new construction. The fire lane shown on the eastside of this site meets the 20-ft fire lane minimum width but is short for aerial access consideration; however, MFD will consider the 24-ft width as it significantly improves access to the existing neighboring structures provided other means to offset the need for aerial access is incorporated into the building design."

Also of note is that the applicant does not commit to construction of this fire lane – it is questionable whether the existing lane meets standards (constructed of concrete or asphalt, designed to support a minimum load of 85,000 lbs).

Land Combination

126 Langdon is a single tax parcel, but it is not a single lot. There are two lots, one is the lot on which the old building was located, the other is the lot on which the parking lot was located (the portion between 142 Langdon and Langdon Street). If approved, this project will be cited as precedent by future developers for other large scale projects. For example, 210 and 216 Langdon could be combined, as well as 245 and 241, 227 and 221, 611 and 601. Or, as seen with the 619 and 621 N Lake request, deferred maintenance could lead to demolition and lot combination.

The proposal also has another lot combination: about 7.5' of 142 Langdon's side yard would be added to the 126 property, leaving 142 with a 5' side yard.

Usable Open Space

The applicant claims 8,312 SF of usable open space. 126 is zoned DR2, which requires 20 SF of usable open space per bedroom per MGO 28.079. The proposal has 351 bedrooms, which requires 7,020 SF of usable open space.

The amount claimed by the applicant is only sufficient if (1) The Plan Commission permits landscaped areas to qualify as usable open space due to "a limited existing lot area"; and, (2) if private spaces (e.g., a terrace for a particular unit) are counted for the full dimensions as usable open space (instead of linking the 20 SF per bedroom to the number of bedrooms in the unit).

Ground level landscape area: 3,238 SF

Both the easterly and westerly sides of the building have retaining walls in the midst of the claimed usable open space (see page C-400, pdf page 48, of the plans).

The westerly side is about 8-10 feet in width, about 8' where the building juts out, about 10' in other areas. 4' of this is a walkway, then there is a retaining wall along about 70% of the length, then there is landscaping between the retaining wall and the building. (Landscaping is shown on the last page of the plans.)

The easterly side has about 10' of space between the building and the property line. Of this, about 3 feet is the access drive, then there is about 1.5', then there is the retaining wall, then about 5' of landscaped area.

The applicant seems to be using MGO 28.140(1)(c) to qualify the whole area as usable open space. That section provides:

"Within the Central Area, as defined, where usable open space requirements cannot be met due to limited existing lot area, or building/parking placement, required landscaped areas may be used to meet the usable open space requirement, provided that said landscaped areas are a minimum of five (5) feet in width."

Should the landscaped area be allowed as usable open space for this project? Certainly there is not a limited lot area (page A33 shows the lot size as 31,360 sq. ft.), nor is

there an issue caused by parking placement (which is underground). If a developer's desire for a particular building size is enough reason to invoke the exception, there may as well not be any usable space requirement.

At the back of the property, there is a pocket of usable open space. The sidewalk entry and the portion to the east do not count. The sidewalk is 5.5' in width, and MGO 28.140(1)(b) specifies that paved paths no wider than 5' can be ignored. At 5.5', this path cannot be ignored, so the path does not count as usable open space, and the area to the east of the path is too small to count as usable open space – it is less than 100 SF and MGO 28.140(1)(a) provides that no area can be less than 200 SF. That leaves the westerly section of about 300 SF.

Behind the "L" portion of the building is about 400 SF, some of which is the walkway and a bit of which is landscaped. An area to the west of the "L" portion has been created by removing bicycle parking, to have a space of approximately 550 SF.

Counting the portion behind the "L", the area to the west of the "L", and the area at the back of the building yields about 1,250 SF of space that might qualify as usable open space.

Rooftop pool terrace: 3,515 SF

Balconies/terrace: 757 SF

The Plans, pages A17 and A18, show two terraces at the back on the 6th and 7th floors, 193 SF each, for a total of 386 SF. But since these are private terraces, not available to all units, should the full 386 SF be counted, or would these terraces just be used to meet the needs of the two units (each are 3 bedrooms, requiring 60 SF per unit), meaning 120 SF of the usable open space requirement is met by these terraces.

I am not sure where there may be another balcony terrace (757 SF less 386 SF, leaves another 371 SF of balcony/terrace somewhere). Perhaps the applicant is claiming the terrace above the third floor along Langdon, which is about that size. However, the plans do not reflect any access to this area, and even if there was, it would only be two units of 3 bedrooms each that could access the space. Again, the issue would arise whether this would count for 120 SF (6 bedrooms * 20 SF/bedroom) or for 371 SF. Plus page A7 of the plans shows the area as entirely landscaped.

Sunken terrace: 802 SF

This space raises the same public/private space as the balconies/terraces. It is the only entrance to one unit of 5 bedrooms, and one other unit has windows at the terrace space level. Is this a private space for the one unit (thus counting for 100 SF) or public space where all residents can enjoy, or potentially enjoy, a space that is about 11' *73'?

Ground level landscape area: 1,250 SF

Rooftop pool terrace: 3,515 SF

Balconies/terrace: 120 SF

Sunken terrace: 100 SF

Total: 4,985 SF, or about 70% of the required space.

Additional Height

Page A28 is a visual from the Downtown Plan showing additional height areas, and is a bit fuzzy as to the actual line. What is clearer is the "Maximum Building Heights" map from the 2012 downtown plan materials. The 2012 map outlines in black lines the area for additional height, and then draws a red box around that outline (see below, with the additional height area rotated to the same orientation as the project plans). Note that the line parallel to Langdon runs along the back of 142 Langdon.

The second image is from page A17 of the plans with blue lines added from the back of 142 Langdon (the edge of the additional height map) and from the edge of the 6th story. The 6th and 7th stories are approximately 13 feet too close to Langdon.



The applicant attempts to justify the height, page A43, by showing other tall buildings in the area. Some of these comparisons are outside the historic district. Five of the buildings on the map were built 1956-1968, the heyday of what the Downtown Plan refers to as out-of-context buildings. Five of the buildings are historic buildings, with 3 at 3 stories, one at 4 stories and 1 at 5 stories. The 5-story building, 1 Langdon, is a corner apartment building at a height of about 50 feet.

Two of the comparisons are recent construction, 155 Langdon and 633 N Henry (the Waterfront, which was approved under the 1966 zoning code for planned developments).

	155	633	126
	Langdon	N Henry	Langdon
Stories	4	6*	5-9
Footprint	5,598	16,168	19,500
Lot size	10,275	25,255	31,360
Lot frontage	98	150	153
bldg frontage	83**	53/25/49***	131
total GFA	27,990	124,673	148,514****

*The 6th story is only 57% of the size of the 1st story due to significant setbacks

** The corner has a significant setback, so the frontage without setback is 51 feet

*** The original proposed building width was 127 feet. Approval was for a single building with 3 segments: approximately 53 feet, 25 foot open space which is setback about 75 feet, 49 feet

****Per Staff report in July (and building mass has not significantly changed)

Easements

There is an easement that needs to be substantially revised, one that needs to be created, and another that at least requires modification (not including utility easements). Have the other property owners agreed to amend/release/replace the easements?

Recommended condition of approval #29 discusses a private roadway and private utility easement for the benefit of 130 Langdon St, per Doc Nos 492580 and amended by 1083622. The width of this easement is 11' and runs along the westerly property line of 126 Langdon (separating 126 from the former parking lot on 128 Langdon, which the applicant is seeking to combine with 126). Has 130 Langdon agreed to amend/release/replace this easement, giving up a relatively wide access lane that can be used for walking, for a 4' wide walkway that is tucked between buildings?

Recommended condition of approval #30 discusses a need for 126 to have a private Storm Sewer/Drainage Easement/Agreement with 124 and 130 Langdon, an agreement which is adequate to address all drainage discharged onto adjacent lands and which is recorded. Have 124 and 130 Langdon agreed to accept 126's drainage?

Recommended condition of approval #33 requires the access drive/parking easement to be amended/replaced. The access drive is almost entirely on property owned by 124 Langdon. Has 124 agreed to amend/replace the access drive agreement?

Parking

As of 2/16, the plans finally met the required bicycle parking (document #7, revised lower level plans) - 179 spaces for 351 bedrooms and 11 guest parking stalls.* No auto parking is required, nor is moped parking (though 16 auto and 13 moped spaces are provided).

*Document #7 shows 15 outside space for guest bike parking. However, the revised plans submitted the following day, document #8, show those spaces moved and reduced to 11 in order to create usable open space.

If this project were just a permitted use in DR2, an 8-unit building, overflow bike/moped parking would not be of too much concern. However, this proposal is akin to a dormitory/fraternity/sorority. Those buildings would require 351 bike stalls for residents plus 88 stalls for guests. The 126 proposal provides less than half of the bike parking that would be required for a dormitory/fraternity/sorority.

Even though the ordinance parking requirements are met, the impact on the neighborhood of a building of this size can still be considered under conditional use standards #1 and #3. Where will all those bikes be parked? Are 172 residents going to haul their bikes to their units, or will those bikes be locked to trees?

Pedestrian Safety

The plans from last July had 2 temporary use stalls on the western end of the property. Now there is also a drop-off/pick-up area at the eastern edge which is accessed from the access drive. That area is about 25' in width, or enough for 3 vehicles (though page A35 shows 2 spaces).

Between bikes, mopeds, cars, and who knows how many Amazon and food deliveries for 351 bedrooms, the access drive will see a great deal of increased traffic. A resident from along the lake, particularly from 130 Langdon which can house 50 women, will have a more perilous walk along the access drive.

One might say that those women could use the walkway along the western edge. That, too, has issues. The walkway is merely 4 feet in width. The walkway is relatively isolated, particularly at the bend in the walk behind the "L". Then, near the front of the property, the 4' walkway will also have moped and bike traffic since mopeds and bikes need to use the sidewalk to access the guest parking areas. (See the latest revised plans, document #8, which clearly shows access to moped and bike parking from the walkway.)

The applicant also refers to this 4' wide walkway as an "extension of informal Langdon Street mid-block walkway, for use by neighborhood." (See page A35.) The walkway is not even the width of a City sidewalk. The path of the walkway is not the mid-block walkway envisioned by the Downtown Plan. The Downtown Plan, page 80, has a map of the informal walkway, which

runs parallel to Langdon and the lake – the 126 walkway is just a way to get from Langdon to the lake, or to buildings on the lake.



Langdon Mid-Block Path Concept – plan view.

CU Standard #9: "... the project creates an environment of sustained aesthetic desirability compatible with the existing or intended character of the area and the statement of purpose for the zoning district."

The Downtown Plan recommends that the Langdon neighborhood preserve "the historical and architectural heritage of the area" and that a limited amount of higher-density residential development can be accommodated on selected sites and that "new development must enhance the essential character of the area." Recommendation #95: encourage relatively higher-density infill and redevelopment that is compatible with the historic context in **scale and design** on non-landmark locations and sites that are not identified as contributing to the National Historic District." (emphasis added)

The GFLU Map has this area at Medium Residential. The Comprehensive Plan provides MR as having a general density range of 20-90 du/acre (high residential is 70+). The proposed project, at .72 acres and 106 units, has a density of 147 units/acre – not, under any definition, even close to "medium residential."

The Staff report acknowledges 126 would be the widest building on the 100 north block of Langdon: existing building widths, per the staff report, range from 40 to 89 feet, with a median of 50 feet. The staff report states that the width of the 7-story portion would be 65 feet. However, the building width along Langdon would be 131 feet – 42 feet wider than the widest building (47% wider) and 81 feet wider than the median (162% wider). The project's building width is out of context with the area's intended character.

Even the lot size is not compatible with the 100 north Langdon block. 126 would have a lot 153 feet wide. The width of historic lots along north Langdon range from 18 feet to 104 feet, with a

median of 82 feet. At 153 feet in width, the lot would be 49 feet (47%) wider than the widest lot. The project's lot width along Langdon is out of context with the intended character.

The Staff report also notes that the depth of the building would only be 5 feet deeper than the demolished building. But that building was an out of context building, so the comparison is not relevant. The deepest building on the block is 601 N Henry at, perhaps, about 130 feet (the lot depth is 148 feet). The project's depth of 225 feet is out of context with the intended character.

The project's 63' height along Langdon (including the parapet) is out of context with the intended character. The height could work, perhaps, in a well-designed building that had an appropriate width.

The Staff report for the Waterfront (a planned development approved under the 1966 Zoning Code) provided a deeper analysis of standard #9. Since that project had 127 feet facing N Henry (with articulation and an original entry setback of about 25 feet), those comments could be equally as applicable to 126 Langdon. Some snippets:

- The [Downtown] Plan recommends preservation and rehabilitation of contributing historic buildings in the Langdon District and higher-density infill redevelopment that is compatible with the historic context in scale and design on non-landmark locations and sites that are not identified as contributing to the National Register Historic District.
- ... the scale, height, mass and design of the proposed eight-story, 79-unit apartment building are fundamentally inconsistent with the recommendations of the Downtown Plan ... [Note: the floor heights were all 9 feet, so the overall height for the 8 stories would have been 72 feet]
- New development in the Langdon District is recommended to preserve the historic and architectural heritage of the area, enhance the essential character of the neighborhood and not diminish views of Lake Mendota. Specific recommendations for the Langdon District encourage the preservation and rehabilitation of contributing historic buildings (Recommendation 94) and relatively higher-density infill redevelopment that is compatible with the historic context in scale and design on non-landmark locations and sites that are not identified as contributing to the National Historic District (Recommendation 95).
- Another component of the Langdon District plan recommendations is the enhancement of access to Lake Mendota and formalization of the ad hoc pedestrian path between the lake and Langdon Street to enhance the path's aesthetics and safety and to make stronger connections to the proposed lakefront path. The Plan recommends that implementing these amenities be pursued in conjunction with new development adjacent to these corridors, but that implementation of the amenities should not be justification for approving new development that is otherwise inconsistent with the recommendations of this plan.
- Staff further believes that despite the efforts the applicant has made to reduce its visual impact, that the scale, bulk and mass of the 79-unit apartment building is not consistent with the historic scale of the area, which aside from a smattering of taller 1960s and 1970s-era apartment buildings, is predominantly characterized by lower-scale structures dating back primarily to the first three decades of last century, including 4 of the 5 buildings on the subject site.

There were three Plan Commission meetings on the Waterfront, the first just a referral to UDC. The minutes of the second meeting reflect the Plan Commission's concerns: "Plan Commission asked that the development team look at the scale, height and mass of the proposed 79-unit apartment building, ..." And even after changes were made (the deep entry on N Henry of about 40 feet, total of 7 floors, etc.), staff still said:

- ... the scale and mass of the new apartment building continue to be inconsistent with key recommendations of the Downtown Plan.
- Staff believes that the allowance for additional building height above the base five stories recommended in the Downtown Plan for this portion of the Langdon District (Area F) is predicated on enhancing the historic character of the Langdon Street National Register District and implementation of the Plan's emphasis on preserving contributing buildings.

Respectfully Submitted,
Linda Lehnertz

From: [Kathryn Pensack](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: [Heck, Patrick](#)
Subject: Opposition to 126 Langdon, Agenda item #11 on PC 3/8/21 Legistar#63476
Date: Sunday, March 7, 2021 5:11:52 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

To the members of the Plan Commission,

I am writing in opposition to the 126 Langdon project for two reasons. I have been unable to find plans for affordable housing in this project that would detail how many units would be available, the criteria for these units and how it would be ensured that a reasonable number of affordable units would be available.

If an affordable unit unit plan exists I hope you will scrutinize it carefully.

Also, sustainability plans for the building seem scanty. I hope the project plans more than LED lights and energy efficient appliances. This building will have over 170,000 sq ft. and all efforts to reduce energy consumption are greatly significant.

Thanks for your time. I hope you will explore these issues before approving the plan.

Yours,

Kathryn Pensack
207 N. Dickinson
Madison WI 53703

Response and Comments on the 126 Langdon Proposal from a Proximate Neighbor at 152 Langdon

The local Alpha Chi Omega organization has owned and operated the property directly west and across the fire alley from the proposed project for 125 years this May. The original acquisition from the Tenney Family consisted of a smaller red brick home, and property down to the lake including a pier and boathouse. The current fire alley was part of the original acquisition. Over the years we have invested millions of dollars in the site in order to remain true to the traditional historic charm of Langdon Street while making the house modern enough to be attractive to today's young women. It is our intent to invest an additional \$1,000,000.00+ in the next 18 months. A substantial portion of this budget will be committed to facade repairs to retain the historically significant look of the house.

Our original articles of incorporation include a clause stating the purpose of the corporation is *to provide safe and attractive housing to our members in a non-pecuniary manner*. The 126 Langdon project as proposed is expected to make it increasingly more problematic for us to provide this stewardship for 152 Langdon and the young women who live there.

We are opposed to the 126 Langdon project on the following grounds:

1. Building Mass

- a. The drawings submitted truly illustrate the massive industrial scale of the project and the glaring departure from the flavor of the neighborhood. The proposed signage is overtly commercial and not in keeping with other residential projects nearby. In general, the proposed design lacks natural fractal patterns which the human eye seeks out.
- b. The height of the building infringes on our airspace and ability to use solar panels and may well interfere with our cellular and internet capacity.
- c. The drawings submitted on shadow casting appear to be contradicted by actual photos of the previous property. The shadows cast are problematic for 152 Langdon and other adjacent neighbors for two reasons:
 - 1.) In the winter the buildup of ice that occurs in the fire alley will not get the morning sun it needs to melt. There is a steep incline in the fire alley which will become increasingly more difficult to navigate by vehicle or on foot. Due to the narrowness of the alley the potential of damage to property and structures increases, and could have an impact on insurance premiums in the future for the nearby property owners.
 - 2.) The shadows cast from a structure this large are expected to make our house darker and may require additional investment in exterior and interior lighting and electrical bills.
- d. And we are confused as to why the developer has not reduced the height of the proposed building despite recommendations to do so.

2. Circulation and Population Density Issues

a. Parking-

1. Currently parking availability is so limited in the area that outdoor spots within several blocks are going for up to \$175/month. Unauthorized parkers in our lot have become so routine we will be contracting with a towing company. During move in and move out days representatives of Alpha Chi Omega have been physically threatened and spat at when they have asked people not to park in the lot.
2. The neighborhood is overly congested already. The lack of parking in proximity to our house has contributed to a steep decline in alum participation in events at the house.
3. The parking lot at 152 Langdon has 15 legal spots in our lot for up to 60 live-ins, so there is one parking spot for every 4 residents. The proposed project next door would have 16 full time parking spots for 342 residents or a ratio of one spot per 21 residents. The addition of 342 residents without linear growth in parking can only result in exponential growth in the issues cited above.
4. No evidence of a cogent parking strategy has been offered by the developer
 - a.) If the rent in this project mirrors similar projects it is a reasonable assumption that those who can afford the rents will have cars
 - b.) The developer has proffered as their strategy, the intention to tell the residents not to bring cars. We do not believe this will be an effective strategy.
 - c.) Rather than looking for ways to expand parking onsite the developer has cited an Induced Demand Theory which hypothesizes, that if you add parking spots it will just create more demand for parking. There is a pragmatic defect in utilizing that argument here. Induced Demand talks primarily to driving to work or coming into an area for a finite event rather than 24/7 resident parking. And at the core of this economic theory is an assumption that not only would there be an abundance of parking but that it be cheap. When the developers were asked what their anticipated parking rates would be, they declined to give a number.
5. Other anticipated circulation issues include substantial increases in deliveries, ride shares and visitors will occur. At a prior meeting the developers obfuscated the order of magnitude of these increases in traffic by saying the previous structure at the site had roughly the same number of rooms as the proposed project. What they failed to clarify was that the previous structure had lower occupancy rates and the short-

term nature of occupancy generated much less traffic than 24/7 365 day lease tenants.

3. Safety and Quiet Enjoyment– Based on reports from other developer sites we are **very concerned for the safety** of the 60 young women living next door to the proposed project.
 - a. Recently the Langdon Street patrol was eliminated. To bring in 342 24/7 365 day residents into one block without additional security or policing seems very short sighted. The following investments in security may be required by our house:
 1. Increased utilization of private security
 2. Installation of an electronic gate on the parking lot
 3. Installation and monitoring of security cameras
 4. Additional fencing and reinforcement of all ground level casements
 - b. The upper stories on the proposed project will look directly down into our young ladies' rooms
 - c. The young ladies' rooms are not air conditioned and the additional noise generated at large apartment building by music, parties, and general traffic will be a major nuisance and distraction to those studying or sleeping. It is not feasible to expect the ladies to simply close their windows in the spring and the fall. And it would be extremely expensive to retrofit adequate AC to the rooms.
 - d. The inclusion of common/party space on the roof is a recipe for difficulties with the neighbors. Beyond the inevitable unwanted noise, the risk of projectiles is very real whether it is broken glass in the alley or being targeted by water balloons and bottle rockets.
 - e. A construction site is always disruptive for the neighbors. But the magnitude of this project as proposed prompts concerns regarding the impact on the integrity of neighboring buildings.

For these reasons it is very hard to envision the addition of 342 24/7 residents on the block, and the structure as proposed as a positive consequence for the neighborhood.

Thank you for the opportunity to present these concerns.

Christine Hughes

Board Member

Alpha Chi Omega Building Association

From: [ann ann](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Vote no- 63476 Item 11 - 126 Langdon Street
Date: Sunday, March 7, 2021 10:03:15 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I am against this horrendous project; too much density, not enough parking and trash removal plus the plans do not fit character of the neighborhood.

The Planning Commission should be focusing on retaining the historic charm and scale of Langdon St., not the greed of the developer.

Please vote against this this monstrosity.

Please place my comments on the public record.

Thank you,

Ann Kammerer
728 N 113th Street
Wauwatosa, WI. 53226

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Connie Mills](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: 126 Langdon Street
Date: Monday, March 8, 2021 9:02:55 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Please listen to the Langdon Street neighborhood and vote NO to this huge apartment complex. It doesn't fit in to either the scale or beauty of the 100 year old buildings nearby. The driveways between buildings will never accommodate all of the Amazon, pizza and service trucks. Those vehicles are triple parked now (prior to Covid). For over 30 years I have served on the House Corp board for 120 Langdon (next door). I am fully aware of how little regard college students have for their surroundings. This building and the hundreds of students it brings to Langdon Street is an ugly blister waiting to pop. Nothing good comes from this housing proposal. Please listen to the neighborhood, not out of town developers.
Connie Mills