

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** July 27, 2016

TITLE: 418 Division Street – Rezoning and      **REFERRED:**  
Conditional Use for a Proposed 31-Unit

Apartment Building. 6<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (43725)      **REREFERRED:**

\*Advisory recommendation at the request      **REPORTED BACK:**  
of Ald. Rummel\*

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary      **ADOPTED:**      **POF:**

DATED: July 27, 2016      **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Sheri Carter, Cliff Goodhart, Richard Slayton, Tom DeChant, Dawn O’Kroley and Michael Rosenblum.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of July 27, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **GAVE AN ADVISORY RECOMMENDATION** for a rezoning and conditional use located at 418 Division Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Ken Saiki, representing Ken Saiki Design; and Randy Bruce, architect. Registered and speaking in opposition were Ken Lonquist and Joanne Schilling. Registered neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak was Lou Host-Jablonski.

The project sits at the corner of Eastwood and Division Street. The building is 3-stories in height with underground parking of 29 stalls for 31 apartments. The main entry is located on the corner of Helene and Division Streets with the units stacking up except for the northwest corner which contains a community room and outdoor roof terrace. Changes have been made to the early renderings to address City staff concerns, predominantly the repetitive nature of the window patterns. They have increased the pane size and used an unbalanced pattern for more variation. The traditional architectural form is punctuated with curved elements on the corner and along the western edge, which alludes to its industrial roots. The units on the first floor will have individual entries. All the apartments on the upper levels will have private balconies. Cast stone in a light gray tone is proposed for the base material, along with brick, gray and silver metal. The base is articulated with the coursing of the material itself, with additional landscaping that allows them to meet grade at the bike path. The space between the bike path and the building drops down quite a bit. They will be doing extensive stormwater management and installing rain gardens. The plaza space will have a connection around the neighborhood monument to connect to the public sidewalk, in addition to landscaping the outside edge of that plaza space to give an additional buffer to the apartment on the corner.

Joanne Schilling spoke in opposition as a resident of the immediate area. She’s not opposed to the project if it is measured and controlled. She noted a few issues expressed in the neighborhood: There is an unusual of heavy semi trailer traffic that comes into the neighborhood, nearly around the clock. Bringing 31 units into this area will add huge congestion into the area that will lead to the side streets. There is concern about the TSS zoning;

that could bring retail south of Eastwood Avenue into the neighborhood. There is other soft real estate that could be developed in the coming years and that feels threatening as a resident of the neighborhood. She is also concerned about the metal siding and the industrial look of the building; it feels too modern compares to the rest of the residences in the area. If you're going to give a nod to the manufacturing history of the neighborhood it should be a renovation and not fake siding.

Ken Lonnquist spoke in opposition. This represents the first development on the south side of Eastwood Avenue. People who moved to this neighborhood around 30 years ago came because we didn't want to live on the west side and liked the architecture of this neighborhood. We as a neighborhood would like the City to require that that be the case with future developments in this residential area. There is concern about the TSS zoning and how it might open up non-residential development on that side of this domestic neighborhood. Kennedy Point was mentioned by the developers. The best part of that is the landscaping, it's very nice. The building, however, was originally slated to be a 15-unit building and was bumped up to 44-units. There was a promise that the street would not be modified and a triangle park would be left alone. The street, a few years later, was modified at the expense of Triangle Park. Please be mindful of history; this is the same developer, I want any promises like that that are made to be kept. It is a very high traffic area and that ought to be a major concern to all of you.

Lou Host-Jablonski spoke as a neighborhood resident. He'd like the Alder to talk about the neighborhood meeting he was unable to attend. He is heartened to see the level of landscaping. The lack of connection between the building and bike path is much better now. The connection between ground level units and their immediate outdoor space oftentimes get short changed, he hasn't seen enough development on this project yet to speak to that, but urges the Commission to think and talk about.

The site is currently zoned TE, Traditional Employment. The developer is requesting TSS Traditional Shopping Street. From the viability of retail they are essentially the same. The rezoning has more to do with the residential density. There is also a conditional use for the number of units. Alder Rummel has asked the UDC to make an advisory recommendation to the Plan Commission based on those requests.

The zoning issues are appropriately addressed at the Plan Commission level. The building itself as designed is what we're weighing here.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- You have one public stair on that face, otherwise it's individual units?
  - Yes, we have a public stair here and a main entrance here.
- Can you talk about Lou's point of private space?
  - We have entry porches, and they are sized well enough for a chair and side table for your morning coffee. On the bike path side we actually have recessed porch areas with the ability to have this landscaping around the rain garden area, but also landscaping to provide a buffer between your space and the public use.
  - We have community rooms and a management company where we provide coffee and we encourage people to use the rooftop decks in the morning for that purpose.

Alder Rummel discussed a neighborhood meeting held on June 29, 2016. Approximately 50 people attended. This is new to this side of Eastwood so the change from single-family is a big change. Having this building right next to an industrial facility that receives daily deliveries was a concern, as well as the future of the rest of the street. There should be a good conversation with Schoepp's about the way they use the street. Pertinent to this Commission are issues of setback, which is greater than currently exists, and lack of stormwater control on

the building itself. If you're going to rezone it, what else can we get for that? Green infrastructure is important. There were concerns with industrial versus residential. Everyone really liked the rowhouse effect on the bike path. Bruce responded that they will be looking into solar, LEED certified and additional stormwater management possibilities.

Chris Wells of the Planning Division spoke to staff issues and concerns, including the patio on the corner being active or inactive. Bruce replied that it is now planned to be part of the patio space for that unit and outside would be additional landscaped plaza space. Staff is concerned about the lack of usable open space. The treatment along the bike path could be more successful, playing more with landscaping. It was suggested to explore the potential of taking advantage of the higher roof with the unit as a loft space with possibly transom windows added.

- The brackets right now are both very tenuous as they're touching. If you could open up those windows and make that vaulted ceiling very light, get rid of the brackets, it could be much more true to its form.
- I'm struggling with this ring around the building. Can't you just connect the public stair to the bike path a little more gracefully instead of a "T," taper off into that bike path and connect those couple of units to that section. If those patio units connect in less of a public fashion to that main public area, and then that corner plaza should be passive, an extension of that bubble and people on this side of the building would connect to the bike path through that, rather than walking against the face of the building to get back to this point.
- If you were thinking that that point on Division Street was more of a public space rather than that unit space, then that becomes more of a public continuation into the City space where a walkway makes a little more sense.
- I don't see any delineation between the building and the parking lot side.
  - Schoepp's parking lot right now extends almost to where our building is now. They're paved over the lot line. There's an easement there now. Essentially our retaining wall will come up. There's really no buffer there, none that they've ever had. Hopefully when Schoepp's redevelops there will be opportunity for that.
- The grade change is what?
  - There's quite a bit of grade change from the bike path, approximately 6-feet. The floor elevations have been lifted so they are just slightly above the bike path so we can have that engagement; right now the site has no engagement with the bike path.
- I agree with the staff report on simplification of building materials. Maybe just two instead of three.
- If you're able to really incorporate a real barrel, instead of a ½ barrel, you don't really see that form around.
  - I really enjoy the ½ barrel, I think it's fun.
- The entrance looks like it could be a commercial space; that could be more residential looking, maybe using some of the windows you already have on the building.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Carter, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GAVE AN ADVISORY RECOMMENDATION** citing the comments made by the Commission during discussion. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0).

**From:** Suzanne Leimontas [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 03, 2016 5:51 PM  
**To:** Stouder, Heather  
**Subject:** new apartments on Division St and Truck Traffic

I have lived at [REDACTED] Oakridge Ave since 1982. My husband and I have raised 3 daughters in this wonderful neighborhood and I am so grateful for all this area offers.

I do have a concern that I think might impact my area and wanted to bring it to your attention. I understand an apartment complex is going to be built on Division St. I am wondering if the city has studied how the increase in traffic will affect the traffic flow on Division St and other side streets. Right now traffic is compromised due the large trucks that come to the area. I have always been concerned about the size of these trucks and how they interfere with traffic, bikers, and pedestrians. I would appreciate it if you could let me know if this concern has been taken into account when evaluating this proposed apartment complex.

Thank you for your assistance.

Suzanne Leimontas

**Wells, Chris**

---

**From:** Kent & Ruth Hill [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 03, 2016 5:39 PM  
**To:** Wells, Chris; Rummel, Marsha  
**Subject:** 418 Division Project

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Chris & Marsha

Brad Hinkfuss wrote this in his 8/2 e-mail (below): "Renewed push for Schoeps truck traffic to behave as per city ordinance as a corollary to the development." When we (Marquette & Schenk/Atwood) met with Joe Krupp and Matt Tucker on 6/30, I was the one who spoke to the importance of ordinances on this project. Others spoke more to building design and setback issues. I then volunteered to be on the steering committee, and went a bit further the next week with them.

I read Monica's and Chris's e-mails from earlier today, and don't believe "ordinances" is an issue that fits well with what you're asking from us (me). Knowing that, I understand this may or may not seem important to you, but it is to me. Marsha has done much to help us, but it's not realistic to expect her to resolve these issues.

Here are some of the reasons why I wanted the issue considered: (1) traffic and parking problems on the 400 & 500 blocks of Division have been "accumulating" for years, (2) conversations with George Hank, Mark Winter, Marsha (our alder), and briefly with Katy Crawley suggest there may never have been a plan for today's Division Street, (3) with the new 45,000 square foot freezer near the inter-state and all production at the Division plant, truck traffic was destined to increase as product is moved from plant to freezer, (4) compliance with the stated ordinances would solve much of the problem (particularly the loading zone), but it's not simple (where would the semis park as they come off the inter-state unto Division), and (5) I think (but then I live at 523) you would find an assessment of the "activity on the street itself" useful.

I admire the many young people I met and who took time out of their busy lives to come out for the 6/30 meeting. They had good questions, but more important, they care about their neighborhood. I grew up on this street and neighborhood, went to schools like Marquette and East, had my first job at what is today Jenifer Market, and have continued to be part of the neighborhood now for over 70 years. One of my regrets is I didn't get involved in issues like 418 earlier in life.

Hope what I've shared can be useful, Kent

**From:** Monica H  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 03, 2016 11:02 AM  
**To:** Brad Hinkfuss ; Joanne Schilling  
**Cc:** john coleman ; [REDACTED] ; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: 418 Division steering committee

**Wells, Chris**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 19, 2016 1:46 PM  
**To:** Parks, Timothy  
**Cc:** Wells, Chris  
**Subject:** 418 division st.

Chris, Tim,

The plans that krupp has put forward for this property require many changes to make it satisfactory for the neighborhood here are some of the issues I have and have talked to other neighbors about.

1.) 29 parking spaces for 31 apartments is too few. 4 of the apartments are 2bd units which may have potentially 4 cars per unit=16 plus 27 one bd and eff. equals more like 43 spaces required. Needs either more spaces or fewer apt.s. And Madison SHOULD have an ordinance that forces a 1 to1 ratio of cars to apartments, that only makes sense in a city who has a history of parking issues.

2.) The plan for raising the back side of the property or the bike path side to level with the path has all kinds of problems with it. First by raising the back of the building by 5 to 6ft this essentially becomes a four story building, which we do not want and is not appropriate for this location. Secondly by raising the back and filling in an area 100ft. by 25ft wide (approx) of the city owned property he will be changing the way water is distributed down the narrow bike path corridor leading I fear to flooding in my and my neighbors yards. Third every other property along the full length of the path including Schoep's sits below the bike path level at street level, It would look odd or out of place sitting up above all other properties.

3.) Many of the neighbors had issues with the look of the building, I'm not so much, but I would like to see a rain garden built between the bike path and this building. This is the main corner representing our neighborhood we have a nice stone seat put down at this corner and whatever is done with this property must above all represent our community, right now the plans I have seen do not accomplish that.

**Wells, Chris**

---

**From:** Hyndla Kensdottir [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 24, 2016 10:11 PM  
**To:** Wells, Chris; Parks, Timothy  
**Subject:** 418 Division redevelopment

To: Chris Wells, Tim Parks, Madison Plan Commission

From: Pam Skaar, [REDACTED] Helena Street, Madison

Subject: 418 Division Street Redevelopment

Date: July 24, 2016

During the seven years I worked as an environmental consultant for The Evergreen Group and Eagle Environmental, I designed stormwater control systems for several industrial clients in KY, OH, and IN.

It's my understanding that the building plans for the proposed apartment building will raise the grade of the current lot about five feet from the north side apartments to the bike trail. That elevation in grade is likely to cause flooding in the lower yards on the same side of Helena. My house is probably the lowest.

To alleviate this problem, I suggest that a rain garden be installed between the building and the bike path in a manner similar to the development on First Street. This approach would also interface well with the bike trail and beautify the neighborhood entry on Division Street.

**Wells, Chris**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 20, 2016 9:07 PM  
**To:** Wells, Chris  
**Subject:** Fwd: Krupp Towers on Division st.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** keithkobs <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** district6 <[district6@cityofmadison.com](mailto:district6@cityofmadison.com)>  
**Sent:** Thu, Jun 30, 2016 7:38 am  
**Subject:** Krupp Towers on Division st.

Hi Marsha,

I want to thank you for setting up the meeting for Krupp's newest project, it is vital that we have people like you who keep us informed of the changes in our neighborhood. You are doing a Great job. I do have some real concerns about this project at Division st. I feel like a lot of people have concerns about this project and many people I talked to this week who couldn't make the meeting last night have major concerns. I wonder if those concerns were really heard by the developer and or if he plans to make changes to his proposal based on those concerns. What I am hearing from neighbors and what I took away from last nite are these;

1. Too many apartments for the amount of parking spaces provided
2. Concerns about the way the development interacts with the neighborhood.
3. How the project will utilize public right of way

After the meeting last night, I walked the property and really have a major concern with the way they want to in-fill from the bike path towards the building, this area is public property, I don't think this area was thought through very well on the plans shown and I really think those plans need to be revisited to make the neighborhood happy with this proposal. With that in mind I want to get much more involved and would like to work with who ever I can to make sure this gets done in a decent way. Can you inform me of who I can meet with or how we can further discussions on this development? Please let me know, and again thank you for your good work.

Keith K, Kobs

Urban Design Commission  
Meeting of July 27, 2016  
Agenda item #11, Legistar #43725

MGO 33.24(2) provides, in part, that a purpose of the ordinance is to "encourage the ... proper use of properties."

Is TSS zoning a proper use of 418 Division Street/2096 Helena Street?

As the map on the next page reflects (part of the City's Zoning Map), surrounding properties are primarily comprised of TR-C3 (single family detached) and TR-V2. The nearby TSS all fronts on Atwood with entrances on Atwood, or through the parking lot further west.

Further, the Comprehensive Plan, Note 1 states with respect to this TE area:

"This is currently the site of a long-established ice cream production facility located within a predominantly residential neighborhood. If this site is redeveloped at some future time, a mix of residential development and neighborhood-serving commercial or employment uses is recommended rather than redevelopment with a new industrial use. The existing grocery adjacent to the ice cream plant is a significant amenity to the surrounding residential area, and a neighborhood grocery should be retained as part of any future redevelopment. Buildings should be generally compatible in scale with existing residential and commercial buildings in the area."

The proposed building is not compatible in scale. Other than the surrounding Schoep's buildings at one to two stories, the surrounding properties are primarily one and two story single family homes.

In a relatively recent (2014) infill at Tennyson Lane, that project had appropriate open space. In contrast, the use of TSS zoning for this proposed project allows for the most intensive use possible.

- 77.5 dwelling units per acre;
- Usable open space of 40 square feet per unit (in contrast NMX would require 160 square feet for a one-bedroom unit);
- Lot area of 500 square feet per unit (NMX would use TR-V2 standards); and,
- Maximum lot coverage of 85% (NMX maximum is 75%).

There is not any interaction with the public bike path -- other than re-grading the area to make it more flat. The sidewalk to entrances along the bike path is on the property line.

At the recent Marquette Neighborhood Association Board meeting, the Board voted unanimously against TSS zoning.

I hope the UDC, when it reviews this proposed project, will consider whether TSS zoning is appropriate and whether the building should have more interaction with the public right-of-way and more open space for residential uses.

Respectfully Submitted,

Linda Lehnertz



TE: Traditional Employment

NMX: Neighborhood Mixed Use (grocery store)

TSS: Traditional Shopping Street

TR-C3: Traditional Residential - Consistent District 3 (only single family detached dwellings)

TR-V2: Traditional Residential - Varied District 2

**Wells, Chris**

---

**From:** Rummel, Marsha  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 07, 2016 6:29 PM  
**To:** Firchow, Kevin; Wells, Chris  
**Subject:** Fw: 418 Division St meeting July7

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

FYI

---

**From:** Monica H [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 7, 2016 1:17 PM  
**To:** Rummel, Marsha; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Brad Hinkfuss  
**Cc:** John  
**Subject:** Re: 418 Division St meeting July7

hi Marsha et al.,  
for your/our records, here are the comments people on the "helenahood" listserv wanted to share about the project.  
-Monica

I like the proposal - 3 stories seems a reasonable compromise between density and the surrounding neighborhood, as long as parking is addressed appropriately.  
[D.]

I'm not in town this week to attend, but i'll share with you my knee-jerk (and yet sincere) comments, upon first hearing about the site plans, etc.:  
'great. More difficult, confusing, congested, dangerous traffic issues for that little area. Maybe the Schoeps factory will move, tho, and JSM could actually expand. or something. will property values go up? property taxes increase, too? (guess I'll be moving)  
i wish that goofy old building could house something else.  
Urgh.  
[L.]

This looks great. I like it a lot and think it fits in well with the neighborhood. I greatly appreciate infill, as it prevents subdivisions gobbling up our gorgeous countryside and farmland, it accommodates good and efficient mass transit and it is very sustainable development. Cities that are spread out cost immensely more money to maintain for all the increased road repair and snow maintenance, emergency service costs, etc. that are needed.

This is efficient, sustainable development with lots of bike parking. Definitely no more car parking needed! The developer is correct. Driving rates have been decreasing. Each underground parking stall adds \$35,000 to the cost of development, making the apartments much more expensive and encouraging residents to own cars

since they are already paying the cost of those parking stalls in their increased rent. We want to encourage and support the ability to live without cars -- creating less noise and less traffic in our neighborhood and city streets, enabling us to walk and bike throughout our neighborhood much easier and safer. We want to encourage cheaper development costs so apartments lean more toward the affordable side of the equation than to the luxury, high end side. I like the design and the industrial sense the metal will add, although I am only looking at b/w illustrations. Joe Krupp has good design sense and knows how to fit buildings nicely into our neighborhood.

Please pass on my comments to Marsha.

Thank you so much.

[Donna Magdalina]

My comments for the meeting and Marsha:

Without seeing all the details, I'm generally in favor of this plan. I think the height sounds reasonable, I am so happy to hear there will be a setback! I approve of that heartily!

I am grateful that our neighborhood is vital and that it is desirable. Any chance this will have mixed-income/subsidized housing? I care about that quite a lot. That would be very, very worth an increase in my taxes. [We can talk later about how willy-nilly the \$ is actually used in our town...] We are a city, and I am in favor of thoughtful in-fill.

I'm with you on the design features, Monica. I would like to see an alternate facade. Something that blended better into the historic nature of the 'hood.

I think it may be worth looking at some sort of a speed - limiter for the Division side...like a small divider in the middle (like at Few St. and Willy St. by the Weary traveler). Otherwise, I don't find any troubles at that corner, currently, being a dog-walking pedestrian, cyclist and driver.

I hope Schoep's doesn't leave. They are a really good neighbor, and who else can say they have an (historic!) ice cream factory right in their neighborhood?

PS - I am just glad it isn't another hair salon.

PPS - There should be a rider on any unit's contract that they must attend the Helenahood Block Party.

[Susan]

The "failed" effort he is talking about, some may recall, if the Inclusionary Zoning ordinance that was on the Madison books for awhile. To his credit, Mayor Cieslewicz got it passed; but among the reasons it failed so badly is that to get it passed he capitulated to developers so much in developing the law that it became impossibly complicated and doomed itself to failure.

The Stonehouse development team seems strongly committed to and very good and projects that include affordable housing. Sadly, it seems like everyone else, including Krupp (whom I generally count as among the better developers out there) have flat out taken themselves out of considering projects with elements of affordability. Why wouldn't they given today's market, there's too much money to make.

Anyhoo, I agree it is important in our 'hood and important to keep pressing.

[MJ]

I am sorry I missed the meeting(s); I was working. I am not a big fan of "infill", though like others, I appreciate that the plan is for only 3 stories.

Though I didn't look up the design, I would really prefer something that matches historical neighborhood architecture. (No corrugated metal..)

It's not that I dislike modern construction under all circumstances, but I feel we've gotten enough of it with

other buildings that have already come into the neighborhood in the last 5-10 years, starting with the United Way Bldg and the condos on the corner between Eastwood & Winnebago at First.

It's at times like this that I miss Kitty Rankin, who was the voice of historic preservation in the Madison Planning Department.

It's great to see the dialogue here.

[J.]

Thanks, MJ - we are clearly surfing on the same waves! That is helpful information. I agree about Krupp! He really does seem to have community in mind for his projects, and has overall been open to engaging in this way.

Monica - I would like to emphasize that we need mixed income housing, too. I am sure I'll follow up with Marsha on the side, but please convey this to her, again. The city needs to make it easier for the developer to do this. Our vital neighborhood depends upon diversity of all kinds. What would it take to make it happen? I am willing to be pointed in the right direction.

[S.]

---

**From:** Rummel, Marsha <district6@cityofmadison.com>

**Sent:** Sunday, July 3, 2016 9:34 AM

**To:** [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Brad Hinkfuss

**Cc:** John

**Subject:** 418 Division St meeting July7

Hey everyone-

Thanks for agreeing to be part of the neighborhood steering committee. We agreed to meet at Mike Schill's apt [REDACTED] Atwood on July 7 at 7p.

On the list is Kent Hill, Monica Harkey, Brad Hinkfuss, and Mike Schill. I copied John Coleman, the MNA rep, who indicated he would be out of town.

Here is the link to the submission <http://www.cityofmadison.com/dpced/planning/418-division-street/2044/>

418 Division Street - Planning - DPCED - City of Madison ...

[www.cityofmadison.com](http://www.cityofmadison.com)

City of Madison DPCED Planning. Katherine Cornwell, Director. DPCED Menu

See you Thursday-

Marsha