

ADDENDUM
PLANNING DIVISION REPORT
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY
AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
January 23, 2009

RE: I.D. #12473, Zoning Map Amendment I.D. 3394, Rezoning of 201 & 229 West Lakelawn Place from R6 to PUD-GDP-SIP

1. Requested Action: Approval of a rezoning to PUD-GDP-SIP to allow construction of an 18 unit multifamily building adjacent to an existing building with lodging rooms R6 (General Residence District) zoning. This property also lies within a National Historic District and Downtown Design Zone 4.
2. Applicable Regulations: Section 28.12 (9) provides the process for zoning map amendments. Section 28.07 (6) of the Zoning Ordinance provides the requirements and framework for Planned Unit Development Districts, including Planned Unit Development Districts in Downtown Design Zones. Resolution 58533 provides the design criteria for Planned Unit Development Districts in Downtown Design Zones.
3. Report Prepared By: Heather Stouder, AICP, Planner

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

This application is subject to the zoning map amendment standards of the Zoning Ordinance, Section 28.12 (9). Section 28.07 (6) provides the requirements and framework for Planned Unit Development Districts. The application is also subject to the review standards for Downtown Design Zone 4.

RELATED ACTIONS:

On January 12, 2009, the Plan Commission referred this request to the Urban Design Commission for a recommendation on final approval and a specific finding regarding whether the Design Criteria for Planned Unit Developments in Downtown Design Districts had been met by the proposal. Further, the Plan Commission requested information from the City Attorney's Office as to whether a specific set of findings from Commissions is necessary for approval of such proposals. The City Attorney's Office provided a brief electronic memorandum on the subject (copy enclosed) concluding, *"Although these bodies are required to provide reasons for their decisions that inform the parties of the basis for the decision and these reasons should be more than conclusory statements, a detailed set of findings is not necessary to meet due process requirements."*

The applicant submitted additional changes for consideration at the January 21, 2009 meeting of the UDC, where the UDC unanimously recommended final approval. Having carefully considered the Design Criteria for Planned Unit Developments in Downtown Design Zones, the UDC made a specific finding that they had been met with this proposal, stating in the motion that it *"meets the design guidelines for its particular situation on an infill site on a non-prominent thoroughfare"*. As conditions of their recommendation, the UDC suggested that final review of the project by Planning Division staff include the following considerations related to the northern part of the property and landscaping details:

- Enhancement of the articulation of the northern elevation
- The addition of a “Vesta” sign on the northern elevation
- Relocation of the outdoor moped parking indoors, accommodating the additional mopeds with the use of structured parking
- Improvements to the function of the plaza on the north side of the building, including a switch in the location of the bicycle racks with the planting strip
- The replacement of Bush Honeysuckle with Spirea or another species
- The replacement of the Scots Pines along the eastern elevation with White Pines, as had been previously proposed

The completed reports, approved minutes, and staff memoranda related to the Landmarks Commission and UDC are attached in reverse order by date. The reports from the January 7 and January 21, 2009 UDC meetings were not available at the time of this report.

PROJECT REVISIONS:

Revisions to the proposal as submitted on January 14, 2009 include the following:

- A revised Northern elevation with a more prominent entryway with a canopy over a 6’ wide glass garage door, a glass door, and an additional window. Most notably, a glass “column” centered on the interior stairway has been added from the top to bottom of the building.
- Eleven (11) bicycle parking stalls were removed from the front yard, as requested by the UDC. Although site plans, floor plans, annotation, and narrative provided by the applicant are not entirely consistent, it appears that their relocation resulted in a net loss of 5 (indoor) moped stalls and a net gain of 3 bicycle stalls as shown in the table below:

	December 17 2008 Revisions			January 14 2009 Revisions			Net Change
	Indoor	Outdoor	Total	Indoor	Outdoor	Total	
Bicycle	36	36	72	46	29	75	+3
Moped	12	5	17	7	5	12	-5

- A revised landscaping plan includes colorful low lying perennials, shrubs, and smaller serviceberry trees along the West Lakelawn Place frontage, and three larger Ginkgo trees have been relocated to the Lakelawn Place frontage. A row of seven Scots Pines are proposed along the eastern side of the building, replacing nine White Pines in an earlier version of the plans.
- Small revisions have been made to brick color, vertical vents, and window placement consistent with Urban Design Commission recommendations
- The kitchen layout in units #002, #103, and #203 has been reoriented in response to an informal suggestion during discussion by Plan Commissioners at the January 12, 2009 meeting.
- The addition of a bench to the hardscaped area provides seating opportunities near the main entrance of the building

EVALUATION AND CONCLUSION

Planning Division staff believe that January 14, 2009 revisions to the proposal demonstrate improvements to the relationship of the proposed building to Lakelawn Place. No substantial revisions have been made to the mass of the building or to increase the amount of usable open space, but it is widely recognized that this would likely involve the elimination of units or bedrooms, and render the project infeasible from an economic standpoint.

No revisions have been made to the shallow "balconies" in the center of the West Lakelawn Place frontage, although the applicant has acknowledged that these are included for aesthetic purposes and not as usable balconies. The decrease in moped parking is significant for this particular market. It is questionable whether or not 12 total moped stalls will be sufficient for the 53 tenants in the new building, let alone the 84 total on-site residents. However, it appears that there are very few, if any, possibilities to accommodate more mopeds on the site. Staff recommends that since it is unreasonable to expect that bicycles can be stored inside small living units or narrow hallways, no bicycle stalls should be removed to accommodate more mopeds. The applicant should provide as a part of the management plan for the site a strategy for limiting the number of mopeds to that which can be accommodated on the site.

Overall, the Planning Division recognizes that the project has received "final approval" by the UDC and that the UDC has concluded that the design criteria for approval of a Planned Unit Development in this downtown design zone have been met. On the whole, Planning Division staff feels that this is an impressive proposal on a very small site. The applicant has made many improvements while maintaining the same building footprint and essentially the same interior floor plan. The Plan Commission and Common Council must also decide whether the building as proposed sufficiently meets the standards for Planned Unit Developments in Downtown Design Zones.

RECOMMENDATION

While staff have not changed the recommendations in the January 9, 2009 Planning Division Report, if the Plan Commission recommends that the project be approved, the following changes should be added to the recommended conditions of approval:

- Condition No. 5 pertaining to the northern elevation may be reworded to state that "Final plans for approval by Planning Division staff will include a revised northern elevation with an appropriate sign for the building and enhanced articulation to the extent feasible"
- The Management Plan as outlined in Condition No. 8 shall also include a plan to ensure that mopeds on the site can be limited to a number that can be adequately accommodated.
- An additional Condition No. 9 will state, "The final landscape plan submitted for approval by Planning Division staff will address suggestions made by the UDC, including the replacement of Scots Pine with White Pine, the replacement of Honeysuckle with another species, and a reconfiguration of the planting strip and bicycle parking along Lakelawn Place.

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: January 21, 2009	
TITLE: 229 West Lakelawn Place & 201 West Lakelawn Place – PUD(GDP-SIP), Rental Housing Development. 2 nd Ald. Dist. (12710)	REFERRED:	
	REREFERRED:	
	REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: William A. Fruhling, Acting Secretary	ADOPTED:	POF:
DATED: January 21, 2009	ID NUMBER:	

Members present were: Bruce Woods; Chair, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, Ald. Marsha Rummel, Ron Luskin, Dawn Weber, Mark Smith, Richard Wagner, Jay Ferm, and John Harrington.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 21, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) for a rental housing development located at 229 West Lakelawn Place and 201 West Lakelawn Place. Appearing on behalf of the project were David Kaul and Bill White. Kaul reviewed the changes since initial approval was granted, including:

- Adding glass to the north facade where the stairwell is located, as well as a glass door and more windows.
- Moving some bicycle parking inside.
- Revising the landscape plan.
- Eliminating darker colored brick on some of the upper story elements.

The Commission discussion focused on the following issues:

- Alternatives to further enhance the north elevation.
- Ways to create a more usable open space, focusing on the plaza area on the northern end of the site.
- How the project conforms to the Downtown Design Zone Guidelines.

Peter Ostlind, representing the Capitol Neighborhoods Development Review Committee, registered in opposition citing concerns about whether the project met the Downtown Design Zone Guidelines.

Joe Alexander and Adam Winkler, both representing the Alexander Company, registered in support.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Wagner, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** finding that this project meets the Downtown Design Zone Guidelines for its particular situation as an infill site on a non-prominent thoroughfare, subject to the following conditions as approved by staff:

1. Review of how the north elevation could possibly be articulated a bit more.
2. Moving the scooter parking on the north side of the building into the building with structured parking.
3. Swapping the locations of the bicycle racks and planting area on the north side of the building to allow for the enhancement of that space as a usable plaza area.
4. Changing the Scots Pines to White Pines.
5. Replacing the Dwarf-bush Honeysuckle with another species.
6. Adding the "Vesta" sign to the canopy on the north elevation.

The motion was passed on a vote of (10-0).

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 5-6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6.5, 6.5, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 229 & 201 West Lakelawn Place

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	6	6	-	-	5	6	6
	5	7	6	6	-	6	8	6.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	6	4	5	-	-	6	7	6
	5	6	5	-	5	6	6	5-6
	6	7	7	6	7	8	7	7
	6	6	6	-	6	6	7	6
	5	7	5	5	5	5	7	6.5
	7	7	7	-	-	7	7	7

General Comments:

- Excellent refinements.
- Appreciate improvements to building and landscape around 229. 201 landscape should be given similar effort.
- Much improved design but putting a lot of building on a small lot creates some unresolved problems but developers have been very responsive. Overall meets minimum requirements for Downtown Design Zone #4.
- Long haul but much improved. North better but still could be better.
- If there is a place for density, this is it. Nice background/fabric building.

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: January 7, 2009	
TITLE: 229 West Lakelawn Place & 201 West Lakelawn Place – PUD(GDP-SIP), Rental Housing Development. 2 nd Ald. Dist. (12710)	REFERRED:	
	REREFERRED:	
	REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED:	POF:
DATED: January 7, 2009	ID NUMBER:	

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Chair; Mark Smith, Dawn Weber, Richard Wagner, Richard Slayton, Jay Ferm, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett and John Harrington.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 7, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 229 West Lakelawn Place and 201 West Lakelawn Place. Appearing in support of the project were David Kaul and Bill White, representing The Alexander Company. Appearing neither in support nor opposition were Ledell Zellers, Ald. Brenda Konkel and Peter Ostlind, representing Capital Neighborhoods. Kaul and White provided an overview on modifications to the plans noting the following:

- Addition of balconies and glass on the West Lakelawn Place long elevation.
- The two colors of brick applied to the base have been toned down, with all windows and flashing to be anodized aluminum.
- Use of a terra cotta colored fiber cement board and a renaissance limestone base on the building.
- Parking has been removed from the ground floor with two additional apartment units added, in combination with more bike and moped parking allowing for the development of 79 bedrooms within the 4-story structure.
- The removal of the secondary entrance from the northerly end elevation as a result of the elimination of ground floor parking.

Following the review the Commission noted the following:

- The balconies in the center – concern about usable balconies not meeting a 5-foot width standard.
- Whether having the entry not at the corner is consistent with the Downtown Design Zone criteria.
- Need to see alternatives to corner and center entries.
- North elevation could use more work, need something else to treat it architecturally.
- Consider adding glazing to stairwell on north elevation and shift canopy to west to give more attention to the entry feature.
- North entry needs to address corner.
- Issue with front yard parking, needs relocation.

- The change in brick color on north not a change in plane, too flush, its terminus at the cornice.
- Consider the use of all the same color brick rather than a two color option.
- Concern with landscaping along west elevation, doesn't respond to architecture, specifically the use of Phlox and Burning bush.
- Bring windows down and canopy over on the north elevation entry.

Zellers noted the project reflected a lot of improvements in design and materials, including the increase in number of moped and bike parking but need more moped parking. Zellers stated the project is still too massive for the location and needs more articulation at the roofline to be more in character with adjacent historic structures.”

Peter Ostlind representing the Capitol Neighborhood Development Review Committee noted the following:

- Project is improved considerably but not sure if it meets the Downtown Design Zone criteria.
- Pavement of front yard not good precedent; should at least pull back from sidewalk.
- The architectural improvements on the west elevation are not carried over to the east elevation which is very flat; north elevation improvement is fairly plain; entry doesn't do much is diminutive, especially in light of design guidelines.
- Massing large in contrast with the rest of the neighborhood, entry on north would be more appropriate.

Ald. Konkel noted improvements to the project, especially the first three stories, but worried that it does not meet the Downtown Design Zone guidelines and requested the Commission articulate on this in making a finding relevant to the project. Wagner noted issue with lack of a Planning staff report relevant to the Downtown Design Zone guidelines. The Commission summarized Downtown Design Zone criteria in regards to the report by Kitty Rankin as part of the Landmarks Commission review of the project.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion for approval found that the design criteria for Planned Unit Development Districts in Downtown Design Zones had been appropriately addressed in granting initial approval of the project, with details as discussed to be addressed with final approval of the project noting that the entry is in the right place, the massing is correct, the relocation of front yard bike parking, the resolution of the north elevation entry and façade issues, entry as is but to be made better with consideration of alternatives to one color of brick, the adjustment of landscaping at the ground level to reflect lines of the building, those usable balconies to be a minimum of 5-feet in width or to provide for the inclusion of more glass within the openings and the following as noted:

- Significant work must be done on the northern elevation to provide a better relationship to Lakelawn Place. Specifically, the applicants must propose a much more prominent entryway and reduce the width of the garage door.
- Bicycle parking stalls located in the front yard shall be relocated elsewhere on the site.
- The “Juliette” balconies are sufficiently sized as proposed but the usable wider balconies must either be larger (5-foot minimum width) or include more glass within the door openings.
- Ground level landscaping must be improved to reflect the lines of the building.
- All changes in brick color between the fourth and fifth levels should be accompanied with a change in plane if a two-color brick design is maintained.

- The applicant must resolve termination of vertical vents on western elevation of the building with the extension of the cornice treatment of alternative measures.
- The alignment of windows within the northern part of the western elevation shall be centered within the recessed portion of the building.

The motion was passed on a vote of (7-2) with Rummel and Barnett voting no.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 5, 6, 6, 6, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 229 West Lakelawn Place & 201 West Lakelawn Place

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	4	6	6	6	-	6	6	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	6	6	5	5	-	-	7	6
	7	7	6	6	5	6	8	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	5	5	4	-	-	5	5	-
	6	7	5	-	-	7	7	7

General Comments:

- Corner (street intersection) not addressed appropriately.
- Address north elevation/façade and entry location. Massing and roof articulation still problematic. But overall progress is being made.
- Much improved. North elevation needs to be higher quality to set a high quality precedent for the future redevelopment of Lakelawn Place.
- I like the improvements but the north elevation needs a warmer neighborhood character and parking cannot replace front lawn areas.
- A good example of an infill project on the Isthmus – nice work!
- Planting plan should relate to lines of building...

Stouder, Heather

From: Noonan, Katherine
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2009 8:42 AM
To: Murphy, Brad
Subject: downtown design zones guidelines

brad - below is my response (with your additions) to your query about the downtown design zone guidelines and the requirement for specific findings when the guidelines are applied. kitty

The **Exterior and Interior Design Criteria for Planned Unit Development Districts in Downtown Design Zones** were adopted by resolution by the Common Council on July 17, 2000. The resolution specifies that:

"The Common council adopts the Design Criteria for use by the Plan commission, Urban Design Commission, and Common Council for use when acting on requests for Planned Unit Development District map amendments in Downtown Design Zones pursuant to Sec. 28.07(6)(e), MGO."

The enforceable regulations for development in these zones are found in the zoning code provisions, Sec. 28.07 (6)(e). The Design Criteria are not adopted ordinances but are for the guidance of the bodies considering these projects. Planned Unit Development Districts are by nature flexible as far as bulk, use, design, landscaping, parking, etc. Due to concerns over the development in areas near the UW Campus, the Design Zones were created to regulate PUDs in these zones more specifically than other PUDs. These regulations, which are in the ordinance, generally are stated in terms of maximums or minimums (or the outer limits) for , height, yard size, etc. The Design Criteria are to be used in addition to the requirements in the ordinance as guidelines for determining whether the criteria for approval of a PUD in Sec. 28.07(6)(f) are met, and to help determine the appropriate height, yard size, etc. for individual projects in order to meet the standards for approval.

Boards, Commissions, and the Common Council need not set forth specific or individual findings for a determination using these guidelines. There are no statutory or ordinance requirements to provide such findings. Although these bodies are required to provide reasons for their decisions that inform the parties of the basis for the decision and these reasons should be more than conclusory statements, a detailed set of findings is not necessary to meet due process requirements. *Old Tuckaway Associated v. City of Greenfield*, 180 Wis.2d 254 (Ct. App. 1993); *Lamar Central Outdoor, Inc., v. Board of Zoning Appeals*

CAPITOL

NEIGHBORHOODS, INC.
MADISON, WISCONSIN

January 22, 2009

Mr. Brad Murphy
City of Madison
Planning Department
215 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
Madison, WI 53703

Re: Acacia
222 Langdon St. & 229 W. Lakelawn

CNI Development Review Oversight Committee Review

Dear Mr. Murphy,

Capitol Neighborhood's Development Review Oversight Committee has had the opportunity to consider the proposal brought forth by the Alexander Company for the subject property. This committee has reviewed the several iterations of this proposal and provided input to both the UDC and Plan Commission. We offer here our consideration of the most recent submission dated January 14, 2009.

The proposal is located within Downtown Design Zone 4. The Zoning Ordinance states that the Design Criteria are to be used to determine if specific criteria are met, including;

- Are the character and intensity compatible with the physical nature of the site and would it produce an attractive environment of sustained aesthetic desirability
- Are there adequate provisions for improvement and continuing preservation of attractive open space

We believe it is critical for the Commissioners to assess this proposal in light of the Design Criteria to meet the standards for their review and to establish a rigorous standard of review as the baseline for consideration of future proposals within the Downtown Design Zones.

The Design Criteria were established to articulate community design principles. The consensus of our review is that there are a number of Design Criteria where this proposal does not rise to the level meeting the requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance. Our assessment of the proposal is presented following the format of the Design Criteria.

Massing:

The scale of buildings should be compatible with other buildings in the vicinity. Transitions and architectural components can be used in designs to keep a larger building in scale with its surroundings. New buildings should not dominate or detract from the surrounding area.

The proportions of the building present a large and massive façade with limited transitions or other architectural elements to break up the mass of the structure. While the overall height of the building may be similar to some of the surrounding structures the overall presentation is out of scale with the adjacent buildings. The building fronts two quite narrow streets (W. Lakelawn Pl. and Lakelawn Pl.) which accentuates the imposing nature of this design.

The north elevation along Lakelawn Pl. is a flat and minimally detailed façade that does not interact with the surrounding buildings. A series of similar designs along Lakelawn Pl. would create an imposing monolith detracting from the various styles and scales of existing buildings.

It is also important to consider that just as other buildings which do not meet the criteria are being used as a justification for this building, this building will be used as a justification for further lack of adherence to the criteria.

Orientation:

Buildings should engage the street and respect the orientation of surrounding buildings, pedestrian paths and sidewalks.

The building abuts two streets but the façades do not 'engage the street ... or respect the orientation of existing buildings or pedestrian paths'. Lakelawn Pl. is the front yard for all of the buildings located along this street. This building treats Lakelawn Pl. as a rear yard starting with the setback and continuing by paving over virtually all of this yard for bicycle and moped parking and a driveway.

An active pedestrian pathway extends from Howard Pl. thru the arch of the Villa Maria building directly to the northwest corner of this site. The expression of the building from this vantage point will be a massive flat façade with limited articulation or pedestrian engagement. The building will be overpowering and does not reflect the more active character of its neighbors.

Articulation:

Articulation should add architectural interest to help break up the mass of the building and long monotonous facades. Even with the modifications that have been made to the

proposal the articulation is very limited contributing to the concerns with massing and presentation of the building towards its neighbors.

The north elevation is a full 5 stories tall with vertical band of windows set back only 8" and notches for the decks at the fifth floor. This elevation faces Lakelawn place and is effectively a front façade in relation to its neighbors.

The only articulation along 108' long east façade are two vertical shifts in the building of 9". The building's presentation to the east is an overpowering monolithic mass which will be out of scale with any structure that might be built on this site other than a similarly massive structure. The result will be a dark narrow corridor that will not contribute to the character or safety of the neighborhood.

Entry Treatment:

Entries should be oriented to the street, contribute to the definition of the building and promote a strong pedestrian feel along the street. The primary entrance to the building is tucked into the SW corner of the structure behind the Acacia building. This entry does not prominently address the main street frontage along W. Lakelawn Pl. The applicant has stated that this location is important since it addresses Langdon St. even though the building does not front on Langdon St. and only a glimpse of the entry might be visible when passing along Langdon St.

The north elevation along Lakelawn Pl. might traditionally be considered the front façade as it is for other buildings along this street and will be for future structures on the adjacent vacant lots. Here the entry is diminutive and at least partially concealed behind the large paved surface with bicycle and moped parking. This entry does not contribute to a pedestrian friendly street face.

Terminal Views and Highly Visible Corners:

Particular attention should be paid to views from these locations and the structures should be treated as focal points with a higher degree of architectural embellishment. The north elevation of this building is located on a three way intersection and is approached from the NW along the pedestrian pathway from Howard Pl. through the arch at the Villa Maria.

The north elevation is a particularly blank presentation devoid of significant architectural embellishment and fronted by a bicycle and moped parking lot. The current iteration of the proposal has incorporated a vertical band of windows at the stairwell. While windows can add architectural interest to a façade it is also important to consider what this will present to the passerby. Both day and night the stairs and the landings directly against the windows will be the visible presentation to the street. This is an interior space that is often forgotten and neglected. There are any number of examples from the 1970's & 80's which illustrate that this feature does not enhance the appearance of the neighborhood. Likewise the full glass overhead door to the parking area will provide a fulltime view of this blank concrete interior.

Semi-Public Spaces:

These important transition areas should incorporate a variety of textures in ground treatment with elements such as raised planters, street furniture, lighting and landscaping.

On the three main faces of the building the semi-public spaces are largely uniformly paved over. Most of this area is dedicated to bicycle, moped and trash storage. There are very limited enhancements to these areas to provide a pedestrian friendly environment. Properly designed these areas could significantly contribute useable open space which is sorely lacking in this proposal

Usable Open Space:

"Project designs should provide attractive, safe and creatively designed yards, courtyards plazas, sitting areas or other similar spaces for building residents."

For this new building the open space is limited to the small paved areas at the building entrances that is not taken up by bicycle or moped parking. These areas fall short of providing the usable open space described by the design criteria. Three of the apartment units have outdoor decks which will provide those tenants with some open space. The small 'decks' at 3 bedroom units at the center of the west elevation are too shallow to provide usable space and are accessed from a bedroom.

Evaluation of this proposal in terms of the Design Criteria is complicated by the fact that the applicant has chosen to put two buildings on a single site. This effectively put what has been treated as the rear of the building abutting Lakelawn Pl. rather than in a more typical rear yard setting.

Another factor driving the design is the number of units proposed for the building. The original density exceeded the recommendation for this district. During the various iterations of this proposal two units were added which further constrained the design and limited the options for providing space for bicycle and moped parking as well as providing usable open space.

There is no doubt that the basic design of the building has improved thru the changes made during the review process. However, the question still remains is this the right building for this site and does it sufficiently meet the Design Criteria to warrant approval.

The fact that the applicant has returned numerous times to the commissions with revisions is not in and of itself a rationale for approving an 'improved design'. In fact the design zone ordinance has a requirement to try to avoid this very situation. The applicant is required to bring a Concept Presentation for an informational presentation to UDC prior to submitting a formal proposal. In this situation the formal application was submitted to the City October 15, 2008 followed by an informational presentation of that full proposal to UDC on November 19, 2008.

January 22, 2009

This proposal is located in a very unique and distinct section of the city. This enclave of university housing is defined by the short and narrow streets, pedestrian oriented spaces and interesting mix of architectural styles. New development in this area should enhance these attributes and its sense of being on campus.

We urge the commissioners to carefully consider the proposal in relation to the Design Zone Criteria to determine if it meets the ordinance requirement that it be "... consistent with the spirit and intent of this ordinance and has the potential for producing significant community benefits in terms of environmental and aesthetic design."

Thank you for your consideration,

Peter Ostlind
Chair Development Review Oversight Committee
Capitol Neighborhoods