

**PLANNING DIVISION REPORT  
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY  
AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
November 28, 2007**

**RE: ID # 07736: Zoning Map Amendment 3318 & 3319 Rezoning 1022 West Johnson Street from R6 (General Residence District) to PUD-GDP-SIP**

1. Requested Actions: Approval of a request to rezone 301-309 North Mills Street and 1022 West Johnson Street from R6 (General Residence District) to Planned Unit Development, General Development Plan/ Specific Implementation Plan (PUD-GDP-SIP) to allow demolition of two residential buildings and construction of a 14-story, 163-unit apartment building.
2. Applicable Regulations: Section 28.07 (6) of the Zoning Ordinance provides the requirements and framework for Planned Unit Developments; Section 28.12 (9) provides the process for zoning map amendments; Section 28.04 (22) provides the guidelines and regulations for the approval of demolition permits.
3. Report Prepared By: Timothy M. Parks, Planner and other Planning Division staff.

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

1. Applicant: John Leja, Ten Twenty-Two, LLC; c/o Bill White, Michael, Best & Friedrich, LLP; 1 S. Pinckney Street; Madison.  
  
Agent: J. Randy Bruce, Knothe & Bruce Architects, LLC; 7601 University Avenue, Suite 201; Middleton.  
  
Property owners: Luther Memorial Evangelical Lutheran Church of Madison; 1021 University Avenue; Madison, and Francis Wayland Foundation; 1127 University Avenue; Madison.
2. Development Schedule: The applicants wish to commence construction in spring 2008, with completion scheduled for summer 2009.
3. Location: Approximately 0.66 acres located at the northeast corner of West Johnson and North Mills streets, Aldermanic District 8; Madison Metropolitan School District.
4. Existing Conditions: The subject site consists of two, two-story multi-family residential buildings located at 1022 West Johnson Street and 307-309 North Mills Street and an approximately 20-space surface parking lot located at 301 North Mills Street, all in R6 (General Residence District) zoning.

ID #07736:  
1022 W. Johnson St.  
& 301-309 N. Mills St.  
November 28, 2007  
Page 2

5. Proposed Land Use: A 14-story, 163-unit apartment building. [Note: Some of the plans submitted incorrectly identify 162 units instead of the 163 proposed.]
6. Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:  
North: Luther Memorial Evangelical Lutheran Church, zoned R6 (General Residence District) and PUD-SIP;  
  
South: University of Wisconsin Department of Educational Sciences, zoned R5 (General Residence District);  
  
East: Porchlight residential building, zoned R6;  
  
West: University of Wisconsin Daniels Chemistry Building, zoned PUD-SIP.
7. Adopted Land Use Plan: The Comprehensive Plan generally identifies the subject site and nearby surrounding properties as part of the University of Wisconsin Campus. Residential uses such as the building proposed are identified among the myriad uses identified within the "campus" designation that are intended to serve the educational institution.
8. Environmental Corridor Status: The property is not located within a mapped environmental corridor.
9. Public Utilities & Services: The property is served by a full range of urban services.

#### **STANDARDS FOR REVIEW**

This application is subject to the demolition standards of Section 28.04 (22) and the Planned Unit Development District standards.

#### **PLAN REVIEW**

The applicant is requesting approval of planned unit development zoning to allow construction of a 14-story, 163-unit apartment building on a 0.66-acre site located at the northeast corner of North Mills and West Johnson streets following demolition of two residential buildings and a parking lot.

#### **Background**

The subject site is currently developed with two student rooming houses located at 307-309 North Mills Street and 1022 West Johnson Street, which are operated by the Francis Wayland

ID #07736:  
1022 W. Johnson St.  
& 301-309 N. Mills St.  
November 28, 2007  
Page 3

Foundation as part of their ministry based at 1127 University Avenue, and by an approximately 20-stall surface parking lot located at 301 North Mills Street, which is owned by Luther Memorial Church. The northern edge of the site is formed by Conklin Place, which is a narrow one-way eastbound public alley extending between North Mills and North Brooks streets, with Luther Memorial Church located further north between Conklin Place and University Avenue. The eastern edge of the site is shared with an 84-unit single-room occupancy residential facility operated by Porchlight, Inc., which is located at 306 North Brooks Street. The subject site and Porchlight currently share a driveway extending between West Johnson Street and Conklin Place that serves parking areas for the multi-family building at 1022 West Johnson Street and the 84-unit Porchlight facility. The site is characterized by a modest slope from north to south, with an approximately eight-foot grade change from the northwest corner of the site along North Mills Street to the southeastern corner.

The Conklin House at 307-309 N. Mills Street is a two-and-one-half-story, wood frame, Queen Anne style house constructed in 1887. A major remodeling in 1905, designed by the influential architectural firm of Claude and Starck, created the appearance that the building has today. It is eligible to be designated as a Madison Landmark because it is a fine and relatively intact example of a Progressive Queen Anne house. The Progressive version of the Queen Anne style was particularly popular during a major Madison boom period and is therefore important to the existing fabric of our City.

The two-and-one-half-story wood frame Queen Anne house at 1022 W. Johnson Street was built ca. 1910 as a single-family residence. The house was built with many bedrooms and was used from early on as an owner-occupied rooming house for girls. It is still used as a rooming house, although the first floor living room, dining room, etc. are now also rented rooms. This house is of a type quite common throughout downtown Madison, with a gable roof facing the street, a first story front bay window, an intact neo-classical front porch and a Palladian window in the front attic gable. Although it is probably not distinctive enough to be eligible to be a Madison Landmark, the building is structurally sound and relatively intact on the interior and would be quite suitable for reuse as a single-family or multi-family house.

Luther Memorial Church was primarily built as a church for students, but it was also one of the first Lutheran churches in the area to hold all of their services in English. Built in 1921-1923, it is one of the most imposing and architecturally intact church buildings in Madison and is the best example of religious design by the prestigious and prolific local architectural firm of Claude and Starck. The church is clearly eligible to be designated a Madison Landmark.

The University of Wisconsin campus forms much of the neighborhood context surrounding the subject site. With the exception the Porchlight facility, Luther Memorial Church and St. Francis House (located at 1001 University Avenue) that comprise the rest of the block on which the site is

ID #07736:  
1022 W. Johnson St.  
& 301-309 N. Mills St.  
November 28, 2007  
Page 4

located, the surrounding area is developed with a variety of University uses. Nearby University uses include the Educational Sciences and Zoology buildings located across West Johnson Street from the site and the Chemistry facilities located to the west across North Mills Street. Accordingly, the Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject site and surrounding area for future "campus" uses. In the Comprehensive Plan, campus areas represent specialized sub-areas that include a wide diversity of uses associated with a primary education mission. Campus-area development is recommended to be compatible with surrounding uses and their design characteristics. A wide range of land uses are recommended in campus areas in addition to the uses traditionally related to education, including research and employment uses, student, faculty and employee housing, and student-oriented retail, service, dining and entertainment. Outside of the University of Wisconsin core campus area generally located west of North Park Street and north of University Avenue, interlacing of University-related facilities with appropriate types of compatible non-University uses is specifically recommended.

#### Project Description

The proposed apartment building will contain 21 efficiency units and 33 one-bedroom, 37 two-bedroom, 27 three-bedroom and 44 four-bedroom apartment units. Parking for the project will be provided in 161 vehicular spaces and 73 bike parking spaces located on three levels of parking generally located below the building. Parking for an additional 37 bikes and 21 mopeds will be distributed along the perimeter of the building at street level. The entrance to the under-building parking levels will be located along the eastern wall with access provided by a reconstructed shared drive between the subject site and adjacent Porchlight property. The site plans propose 17 perpendicular parking spaces located along the east side of the reconstructed shared drive to replace 15 existing diagonal spaces. Trash service for the proposed apartment building will also be provided through the garage entrance, while loading for the project will occur along the north wall just off the travel lane for Conklin Place.

The lower four floors of the proposed building will be set back approximately 7 feet from North Mills Street, 14 feet from West Johnson Street and 11.75 feet from Conklin Place. The building will also be 15 feet from the eastern property line located in the driveway shared with Porchlight. A raised entrance terrace will be constructed at the southwestern corner of the building above the underground parking, with entrance doors facing both North Mills Street and West Johnson Street. The terrace area will be elevated slightly above the West Johnson Street sidewalk with stairs proposed to connect the terrace to the public sidewalk. The terrace, which will include bench seating along the sides of landscaping planters constructed atop the parking facility roof, will be located at the grade of North Mills Street. In addition to the building entry, the first floor will be occupied with an area identified as "apartment commons," an elevator lobby and four dwelling units. The second through fourth floors will contain 15 units each. Above the fourth floor, the mass of the building steps back approximately 16 feet on all four elevations, with 11

ID #07736:  
1022 W. Johnson St.  
& 301-309 N. Mills St.  
November 28, 2007  
Page 5

units located on each floor between the fifth and twelfth floors. Another lesser step back occurs between the twelfth and thirteenth floors, where the corners of the tower are indented to accommodate balconies for units on the top two floors. Thirteen units will be located on each of the thirteenth and fourteenth floors.

The lower four floors of the proposed building and the exposed walls for the under-building parking garage will be constructed using a combination of cut or cast stone and precast concrete panels with a precast concrete parapet located above the third and fourth floors. The fifth through twelfth floors of the building will primarily be faced with brick with the exception of the southwestern corner of the building, where precast panels will be used to provide vertical relief for the tower. A precast cornice will be used above the twelfth floor to aid the transition in materials from brick to an all precast concrete panel exterior for the top two floors with another precast parapet at the top of the fourteenth floor. All 163 apartments will have a private balcony or patio, which the letter of intent indicates will exceed 32 square feet in area. The plans also include a mechanical penthouse centered above the top floor of the building. While the exterior elevations included with the application materials are in black and white, a colored rendering of the building shown to staff indicates that both the precast concrete panels used at the top two floors, along the southwest corner and on portions of the lower four floors will be of a lighter color than the brick that comprises most of the fifth through twelfth floors, which will be darker in color.

All of the units within this development will be rental units. Therefore, inclusionary zoning does not apply.

Though the plans do not indicate a specific building coverage, the proposed apartment building will occupy most of the subject site, save for the setbacks along North Mills and West Johnson street sides. The project proposes a net density of 247 dwelling units per acre with a site population of approximately 385 persons based on the number of bedrooms proposed. This density equals 583 bedrooms an acre. The apartment building will total 175,810 square feet of gross floor area for a floor area ratio (FAR) of 6.29.

### **ANALYSIS & CONCLUSION**

The applicant is requesting approval to demolish two multi-family residential buildings to allow construction of a new 14-story, 163-unit apartment building at the northeast corner of North Mills and West Johnson Streets. The proposed building cannot be constructed under the existing R6 zoning, thereby requiring that Planned Unit Development zoning be sought. Unlike conventional R6 zoning, which requires a uniform amount of lot area, usable open space and off-street parking spaces per type of dwelling unit, planned unit developments are provided for in the Zoning Ordinance to establish individual lot area, usable open space and parking requirements to suit an

ID #07736:  
1022 W. Johnson St.  
& 301-309 N. Mills St.  
November 28, 2007  
Page 6

individual development based primarily on outstanding design that may otherwise require relief from conventional zoning standards.

The Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject site and surrounding area for uses related to the University of Wisconsin campus. Among the uses identified within the campus area are student, faculty and employee housing, with no density range identified. In the absence of a more specific neighborhood plan for the area, the Planning Division believes that the proposed use of the site for high-density residential development generally conforms to the land uses recommended in the Comprehensive Plan.

In reviewing projects developed since 1990, the densest development in the downtown and campus area as a whole is The Embassy Apartments located at 505 University Avenue (at North Bassett Street). That project, which was developed in 2001, has a net density of 315.9 units per acre (126 units on 0.399 acres). Of the projects that have been developed since 1990 in the south campus area, which generally extends from and includes University Avenue on the north, Frances Street on the east, North Randall Avenue on the west and Regent Street on the south, project densities have ranged from 53.8 to 178.2 units per acre. The proposed development will exceed this range at approximately 247 units an acre. Staff believes that despite the fact the project will exceed the density range established by other projects in the south campus area, the intensity of the project is generally appropriate given the highly developed nature of most of the nearby properties, including the UW Chemistry and Education Sciences facilities to the west and south, respectively.

There are significant concerns about the proposed demolitions of a potential local landmark and a reusable residential building in good condition to facilitate the proposed development. To address these concerns the applicant commissioned a local architect to study the two buildings (this report is attached). After reviewing this study and their staff report, the Landmarks Commission recommended that the two houses should not be demolished, but that if appropriate sites could be found to move the buildings, the City could consider allowing the houses to be moved. The Urban Design Commission has recommended that if the two existing buildings cannot be moved or relocated, the project is "moot (project cannot proceed)."

Concerns have also been raised regarding the physical compatibility of the 14-story project with Luther Memorial Church to the north of the site, in particular the effect of the new building on the visual prominence of the tower on the church, which is located on the southwestern corner of the building across Conklin Place from the proposed building. The Landmarks Commission believes that the building is clearly eligible to be a Madison Landmark and that the size of the proposed building would be so large, and its design so visually intrusive as to harm the historic character and context of the potential landmark (see report of the Landmarks Commission attached). The Landmarks Commission discussed with the applicant potential avenues to explore to mitigate the

ID #07736:  
1022 W. Johnson St.  
& 301-309 N. Mills St.  
November 28, 2007  
Page 7

adverse effect on the church. These included lowering the height of the proposed building, reducing the complexity of materials and details on the proposed building to provide a clearer "backdrop" for the tower, assessing the materials and their color of the proposed building to reduce the visual competition of the new building with the historic tower, changing the massing to further set back the new building where it is closest to the tower, and deleting the proposed change in materials in the north elevation of the proposed building which was intended to reference the old tower. The issue is not with the loss of views of the tower but with the loss of its visual prominence.

In reviewing this project, the Plan Commission is first asked to determine if the demolition standards can be met with this request. The development team has not provided any information for consideration that would suggest that the buildings are not structurally sound, not suitable for rehabilitation or repair or that their preservation or relocation would be economically unfeasible. The applicant has indicated that they are working diligently to find suitable sites to which the buildings could be relocated, but that the width of the Conklin House may make it difficult to find a suitable site.

Regarding review of the planned unit development, staff believes that the proposed use of the property for high-density residential development is appropriate and believes that there are alternatives available to the Plan Commission to address the final scale and massing of the project. During the discussions regarding the proposed development's impacts on the adjacent Luther Memorial Church, the Landmarks Commission discussed options including reducing the height of the proposed building that could lessen the impact on Luther Memorial Church, while other members suggested that simplifying the design of the building to lessen the potential impact. Similar comments have been expressed at the Urban Design Commission during its review at three meetings, including the November 21 meeting where initial approval was recommended.

Staff believes that the Plan Commission can request that the project be redesigned to be less than 14 stories in height if it believes that reducing the height of the building will have a beneficial effect on the context surrounding Luther Memorial Church. Staff also feels that it may be appropriate for the Commission to require the applicant to provide an alternative design at the top of the apartment building, regardless of the final height determined, if that too would lessen potential impact on the church. Alternatives for the Commission to consider include stepping the top floors of the building further away from the northern property line adjacent to Conklin Place or revising the architectural treatment of the top floors to simplify the appearance. Among the possible ways the appearance of the top two floors could be altered would be through the removal of the building material transition above the twelfth floor, where a precast cornice is currently proposed to mark the boundary between the darker colored brick below and the lighter colored precast panels above. This removal could potentially draw less attention to the top of the building

ID #07736:  
1022 W. Johnson St.  
& 301-309 N. Mills St.  
November 28, 2007  
Page 8

and result in a simpler backdrop for the church, but depending on how it's done this treatment could also draw more attention to the top of the building.

The Urban Design Commission recommended approval of the project subject to conditions which require the applicant to address several remaining design issues. The Plan Commission, in the past, has allowed projects to move forward following the Urban Design Commission's granting of initial approval on projects, recognizing that the projects will still need to go back to the Urban Design Commission following approval by the Common Council to resolve the final issues related to the design of the project and to finalize design details related to signage, lighting, building colors and landscaping for example. The Plan Commission has the option of recommending that the project be referred back to the Urban Design Commission to resolve the conditions recommended by the Urban Design Commission. If the Plan Commission chooses this option, staff recommend that the Plan Commission provide its recommendations on the scale and massing of the project to provide some direction for the Urban Design Commission.

In addition, both the Landmarks Commission and Urban Design Commission have recommended that the Conklin House and the second house on the property be preserved and that the proposed redevelopment project not move forward until a suitable alternative location has been found for these buildings. Staff support these recommendations especially as it relates to the Conklin House and believe that a suitable alternative location for the Conklin House and the other house should be found prior to the project receiving final approval by the Common Council.

Given the design issues which have been raised in this staff report, and by the Landmarks Commission and Urban Design Commission, staff believe that the project should be referred to allow more time for the applicant to address these design issues and to allow the applicant to resolve issues related to the preservation of the buildings on the site.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Division recommends that the Plan Commission open the public hearing on this item, and consider the appropriateness of the use, scale, mass and final design of the proposed 14-story, 163-unit apartment development and review the project carefully against the standards for demolition, zoning map amendments and Planned Unit Developments. Based on the recommendations of the Landmarks Commission and Urban Design Commission, and the issues raised in the staff report, the Planning Division recommends that the project be referred to allow the applicant additional time to consider the design recommendations and issues raised by the Commissions and Planning Division staff, and to allow the applicant to resolve the preservation of the Conklin House and other house on the property. These issues should be resolved prior to the Commission forwarding, to the Common Council for approval zoning map amendment 3318 and 3319, rezoning 301-309 North Mills Street and 1022 West Johnson Street from R6 (General



ID #07736:  
1022 W. Johnson St.  
& 301-309 N. Mills St.  
November 28, 2007  
Page 9

Residence District) to Planned Unit Development, General Development Plan-Specific Implementation Plan (PUD-GDP-SIP). Any approval of the project should be subject to the conditions below.

1. Comments and conditions from reviewing agencies and commissions.
2. That the zoning text be revised per Planning Division approval as follows:
  - a.) that the list of uses be revised to note " multi-family residential uses as shown on the approved plans;"
  - b.) signage shall be limited to the maximum permitted in the R6 district as approved by the Urban Design Commission and Zoning Administrator.
3. That the applicant provide a cross-access easement and maintenance agreement for the shared driveway between the proposed apartment development and adjacent Porchlight property at 306 North Brooks Street prior to the final approval and recording of the planned unit development. These easement agreements shall be executed by the owners of both properties and be in a form approved by the Planning Division.
4. The buildings at 307-309 North Mills Street and 1127 University Avenue shall be preserved and relocated. All land use approvals and permits for the relocation shall be approved prior to recording the PUD.

## Report of the Landmarks Commission

Title: 1022 West Johnson Street – demolish two houses for PUD(GDP-SIP) for a 14-story, 163-unit apartment building. 8<sup>th</sup> Ald. District (07295)

Author: Katherine H. Rankin, Secretary

Dated: November 28, 2007

### Summary:

The Landmarks Commission met twice, on October 24, 2007 and November 5, 2007 to consider a recommendation to the Urban Design Commission and the Plan Commission on this project.

At its October 24, 2007 meeting, the Landmarks Commission discussed the demolition of the two houses at 309 N. Mills Street and at 1022 W. Johnson Street. Appearing on behalf of the demolition were Mr. Steve Silverberg, Mr. John Leja, Mr. Randy Bruce, Mr. Bill White, Mr. William Fiore and Mr. Charlie Quagliana. Appearing in opposition to the demolition were Ald. Eli Judge, Mr. Gene Devitt, Ms. Ledell Zellers, Mr. Gary Tipler, and Ms. Carolyn Freiwald.

At its November 5, 2007 meeting, the Landmarks Commission discussed the potential impact of the proposed building on the historic character of Luther Memorial Church.

Appearing on behalf of the project as proposed were Mr. Randy Bruce, Mr. Leja, Mr. Bill White, and Mr. Steve Silverberg. Appearing in opposition to the project as proposed were Mr. Gene Devitt, Mr. Joe Lusson and Ms. Ledell Zellers. *The staff recommendation to the Landmarks Commission is attached.*

### Action:

On October 24, 2007, on a motion by Ms. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Stephans, the Landmarks Commission voted 4 (Levitan, Taylor, Stephans, Page) - 1 (Gehrig) to **recommend that the two houses not be demolished. If an appropriate site could be found to move the buildings, the City could consider moving of the houses.**

On November 5, 2007, on a motion by Mr. Stephans, seconded by Ms. Gehrig, the Landmarks Commission voted unanimously, with one abstention (Mr. Levitan), that **Luther Memorial Church is clearly eligible to be a Madison Landmark and that the Commission advises the UDC and the Plan Commission that this project as presented would have an adverse effect on the appearance of the church, and its size would be so large, and its design so visually intrusive as to harm the historic character and context of the potential landmark.**

Furthermore, the Commission members have suggested several avenues to explore in mitigating the adverse effect on the church.

## **1022 W. Johnson Street**

**Staff Report to Landmarks Commission re Referral from Plan Commission staff  
October 24, 2007**

Developers proposes to demolish two residential buildings, at 309 N. Mills Street and 1022 W. Johnson Street to build a multi-story apartment building. The site is directly behind Luther Memorial Church at 1019 University Avenue.

## **309 N. Mills Street**

J. William Conklin House  
1887 with alterations in 1905  
designed by Claude and Starck

In my opinion, the Conklin House is eligible to be designated as a Madison Landmark because it is a fine and relatively intact example of a Progressive Queen Anne house. The Progressive version of the Queen Anne style was particularly popular during a major Madison boom period and is therefore important to the existing fabric of our City. Our recent turn-of-the-century has been a time to consciously assess the past and look toward the future, and the same thing happened at the turn-of-the-last century. The development of the Progressive version of the Queen Anne is also particularly a Midwestern trend which had at its core the young architects and apprentices in Chicago, including Louis Claude of Claude and Starck, who referred to themselves as "the Progressives."

### *Historical Background*

Part of this imposing, frame Queen Anne house was built in 1887 for early pioneer James Conklin, who in 1854 began a fuel company, starting at first with wood, then soon adding coal, and eventually running two large ice houses, along with selling building materials of all kinds, including cement, sand, gravel, lime, brick, tile and sewer pipe. The first occupant of the house, however, was son J. William, who, when he was a young man, joined his father in the business, along with two other brothers. After their father's death, the three brothers continued to run the firm until their deaths. J. William Conklin died in 1933. His wife's name was Margaret. J. William Conklin followed his father in public service by serving as an alderman; his father had served Madison as alderman, mayor and state senator. The family home was built ca. 1860 a block away at 310 S. Brooks Street (gone). This tradition of family members' houses being close together was not unusual in Madison in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, but is seldom seen today.

## *Architectural Significance*

In 1905 the locally renowned architectural firm of Claude and Starck designed a renovation project for the Conklin House that cost \$4500. In those days that amount of money would build a very nice house. Their work for the Conklins was so extensive that the exterior massing, fenestration, porches and details create a full example of the Progressive Queen Anne design of the early 1900s with little evidence of 1887 exterior construction.

The City's draft report of architectural styles, completed some time ago, lists the Conklin house as one of the best examples of the Progressive Queen Anne style and therefore of architectural significance (the sections of the document addressing Queen Anne residences is enclosed). The following is an excerpt from that document:

Conklin house, 309 N. Mills Street, 1887, remodeled in 1905. What remains of the 1887 house is unknown at this point, but the exterior design reflects the 20th century more than the 19th. It is a massive frame building trimmed with English details, including barge boards in the gable ends, diamond-paned sash, a steeply pitched cap roof over a corner tower, a wide veranda with soffits suggesting the curves of Mediaeval architecture and even Tudor arches in the lattice panels under the porch.

Regarding integrity, the nature of the interior of a building is not considered as part of the deliberations of whether or not a building is designated a landmark, since the Landmarks Commission approval authority extends only to the exterior of buildings. The Conklin House was sided in artificial siding in 1978. The house was included in the first survey of architecturally interesting buildings in Madison. The photograph from that survey, dating to ca. 1975, indicates that very little of the exterior fabric was removed in that siding project. The original windows were left intact. The only apparent major loss was the probable removal of bargeboards on the attic dormers.

Most of the original English design details remain intact. They include:

- Wood muntins in a diamond lattice pattern in some windows, including basement windows (it is quite rare that the decorative theme of a house extends to the basement windows). Some of the windows also contain delicate applied wood tracery in a Gothic arch design.
- A large flat-roofed polygonal bay on the north side lighting the interior stair landing, with panels above and below the windows decorated with delicate patterns of Gothic tracery.

- More bays on the front of the building and the south side.
- A witch's cap polygonal corner turret and a small attic dormer in the center front of the roof, also capped by a witch's cap roof, which is a very rare feature.
- Rusticated sandstone foundation stones with dressed edges.
- The original wrap-around front porch which features a foundation of stone that matches the house foundation, as do the plinths of the wooden columns.
- A decorative brick English style chimney.
- Doubled wood posts with Tudor and Gothic arches springing from low capitals, also trimmed with Gothic tracery.
- Large decorative lattice panels under the front porch with vertical posts placed closely together, overlaid with a diamond pattern lattice with metal fleur-de-lis in the center of most of the diamonds.

On September 26, I toured the building with Mr. Quagliana and Mr. White. It is my opinion that the building is structurally sound. It is in relatively good repair, although there is no doubt that major systems, such as heating, plumbing and interior surfaces could use a fair amount of work, as is typical of multi-tenant buildings of this age.

An assessment of all of the Progressive Queen Anne houses remaining in Madison, as outlined in the draft Architectural Styles document, demonstrates clearly that the Conklin House is one of the best remaining examples of the Progressive Queen Anne style in Madison.

#### *Recommendation*

The developers are proposing to move the Conklin house if possible and, if not possible, will reuse interior architectural features in their new development. While moving architecturally significant houses is typically not a good option, in this case, the residential neighborhood of the Conklin house has been almost completely replaced by large institutional buildings. If a suitable site could be found for the house, removal might be an acceptable alternative to demolition. However, due to the width of the house and the relative lack of vacant or underutilized residential lots within moving distance, it may be impossible to find a suitable location.

I recommend that the Landmarks Commission advise the Urban Design and Plan Commissions that the Conklin House is eligible to be a Madison Landmark and should not be destroyed. Relocation would be a possibility provided that a suitable site could

be found. If no site can be found the building should be retained in its original historic location.

### **House at 1022 W. Johnson Street**

#### *Architectural and Historic Background*

The two-and-one-half-story Queen Anne house was originally a single-family residence. The house was built with many bedrooms and was used from early on as an owner-occupied rooming house for girls. It is still used as a rooming house, although the first floor living room, dining room, etc. are now also rented rooms. This house is of a type quite common throughout downtown Madison. It has a gable roof facing the street, a first story front bay window, an intact neo-classical front porch in and a Palladian window in the front attic gable. The house was included in the 1975 survey of architecturally interesting buildings, but no detailed study of its history has ever been undertaken.

Because it is of a common type and was not identified as having association with historic individuals, events or phenomenon, it is unlikely to be eligible to be a Madison Landmark. I toured most of the interior at the same time as I toured the Conklin House. In my opinion the building is structurally sound and in a similar level of condition as the Conklin House. It is relatively intact on the interior, with original woodwork in good condition, including the original staircase and a quite distinctive fireplace with an embossed metal surround. The spaces are arranged in a way that would be quite suitable for reuse as a single-family or multi-family house.

#### *Recommendation*

The developers propose to move it, but if an acceptable site cannot be found, they propose to demolish it. While moving houses is never an easy proposition, it may be more likely that a site could be found for it because of its narrow, long footprint, which probably fit on a typical downtown half-lot. I recommend that the Landmarks Commission recommend to the Urban Design and Plan Commissions that the building is not eligible to be a Madison Landmark but that in the interests of retention of affordable housing and conservation of resources, the building may be moved if a suitable site can be found or else it should remain on its original site.

### **Luther Memorial Church**

1019 University Avenue

1921-1923

Claude and Starck, Architects

### *Historical and Architectural Significance*

Since the architectural significance of this building is not in dispute, I will keep this brief. Luther Memorial Church is both historically and architecturally significant. Built primarily as a church for students, it was also one of the first Lutheran churches in the area to hold all of their services in English. It is one of the most imposing and architecturally intact church buildings in Madison and is the best example of religious design by the prestigious and prolific local architectural firm of Claude and Starck. An earlier, smaller church by Claude and Starck for the same congregation, at 626 University Avenue (now known as the Church Key), has already been designated a Madison Landmark. The church is clearly eligible to be designated a Madison Landmark.

### *Recommendation*

The proposed development is on a site directly behind Luther Memorial Church. If the removal and relocation of the two houses proposed for demolition can be resolved, the impact of the new development on the church should be assessed. If the church building were designated as a Landmark, Madison General Ordinances would require that the Landmarks Commission advise the Plan Commission about whether or not the proposed development of an adjacent parcel would be so large or so visually intrusive as to detract from the architectural character of the landmark property. In my opinion the only potential effect of the new development on the church would be the height. At the back corner of the church is a fine, rectangular tower. The tower is only really visible from University Avenue due to the fact that University buildings block most of the views from the rear. The developers have not provided contextual information from which we can determine what the effect of the new buildings would be on the church, and in particular its tower. We do know that the building would be quite close to the tower and would be higher than the tower.

When the Landmarks Commission reviewed the development adjacent to the Presbyterian Student Center on State Street, care was taken to make sure that the new building would not destroy the prominence of the church tower on the skyline and as a significant element in the architectural integrity of the church. It is probable that the new development adjacent to Luther Memorial would detract from the architectural character of the church and its tower, because it would destroy the prominence of the church tower as a visual landmark on Madison's skyline. I recommend that the Landmarks Commission request that the developer report back to the Landmarks Commission providing a contextual study of the impact of the proposed building on the artistic and visual qualities of the church and its tower.

Prepared by K. H. Rankin  
October 22, 2007

## AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** November 21, 2007

**TITLE:** 1022 West Johnson Street – Demolish Two Houses for PUD(GDP-SIP) for a 14-Story, 163-Unit Apartment Building. 8<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (07295)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

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

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** November 21, 2007

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Chair; John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Bruce Woods, Richard Wagner, Bonnie Cosgrove, Jay Ferm and Todd Barnett.

### SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 21, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) for a 14-story, 163-unit apartment building located at 1022 West Johnson Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Bill White, 1022 LLC, John Lesa, Michael Best, Steve Silverberg, Michael Best, Gary Brown, Luther Memorial Church, and J. Randy Bruce, Knothe & Bruce Architects. Appearing neither in support nor opposition were Rebecca Flood, Ken Saiki Design, Nancy Thayer-Hart, Student Center Foundation, and Marty Evanson, Student Center Foundation. Bruce began with a Powerpoint presentation, which demonstrated the proposed 14-story structure's relationship with the adjoining Lutheran Memorial Church (specifically its tower), in conjunction with surrounding existing buildings of various heights. He emphasized that a combined 50-foot separation between the church's bell tower and the proposed residential structure consisting of the Conklin Place right-of-way and proposed building setback would provide an amiable separation between the two structures and provides reasonable visibility of the tower primarily from University Avenue. Bruce further elaborated on the Landmarks Commission issue with the view of the church's spire from Johnson Street, emphasizing in his opinion that the spire was designed to be viewed from University Avenue, not Johnson Street. It was further noted that a 5 or 6-story building would obscure the view from Johnson Street. Public testimony from operators of the adjacent Student Center Foundation (a separate entity from the Lutheran Memorial Church) Marty Evanson and Nancy Thayer-Hart spoke against the project noting the following:

- Not notified of the proposal.
- Concern with structure as planned which will overwhelm their building, eliminate light and air as well as potential issues with drainage.
- Impacts of the 14-story structure and the use of Conklin Place were noted as a problem for the 14-room residential facility.
- It was further noted that appropriate building height and mass for the redevelopment of the site should be comparable to that as provided with the "Pres House" student residential facility located at 731 State Street which is 6-stories in height.



Gary Brown representing Lutheran Memorial Church and the Lutheran Campus Center spoke in support noting satisfaction with the current design of the building. Att. Bill White representing the applicant further elaborated on the Landmarks Commission's recommendation not to support demolition in favor of relocation of the structures, in addition to the building's orientation and relationship with the church's bell tower, where existing sight lines already limit the tower's visibility. White further noted that the Landmarks Commission's recommendation not to support demolition with recommendation for location would be an impediment to the project if relocation could not be provided. He further noted that the building was appropriate at its proposed location where its current use of the site as parking is a place holder. Following the presentation and testimony the Commission noted the following:

- The issue of a shadow study being done for various times of the year in order to get a better idea of concerns from the adjacent residential building.
- The redevelopment proposal is a better use than the existing parking lot but have a major reservation that the building is too tall. Comparison to other buildings, situations and redevelopments in Downtown Design Zone No. 2 does not provide for fourteen stories as proposed, twelve stories it supports.
- Tired of the pancake representation of drawing lines across the top of the building where the Luther Memorial Tower should be higher. Drawing lines across the tops of buildings was not the objective of the Downtown Design Zones, the Lutheran Tower ought to stay taller building.
- Location of moped parking at Conklin could be a location for more trees; offset impact of adjacent student center as well as minimize impact from proposed use for moped parking, in addition to giving student residents a better view.
- In regards to landscaping, question the use of gingkos, as well as lawn and terraces/lawn pads on Mills Street; a maintenance issue. Consider alternative plantings such as no mow grasses or a ground cover. In addition, reexamine the use of dwarf/honeysuckle in regards to spreading issues.
- Look at the hierarchy of cornice treatment between the 12<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> stories.
- Twelve story building will be as tall as this building as proposed due to the structural efficiencies of a 9'6" floor to floor relationship.
- On the building entry problem with the relationship of the vestibule, lobby and terrace area not integrated yet; look at rounding at the entry at the corner.
- Bike parking on deck at Mills does not belong; space is too prime, could be used for a more interactive use.
- Generally the terrace plaza is much improved, but problems with the entry vestibule, lobby and street terrace still needs work.
- Moped space at Conklin Place an issue, will conflict with bike parking areas, relocate to the shared drive area to the east of the building.
- Like looks of the building generally, but building feels a little too big overwhelming space.
- Look at the building's stepbacks, building looks like a solid wedding cake, especially at the 5<sup>th</sup> floor level, break up the bottom of the building to make less predictable.
- Still concerned with height.
- Landmarks issue make it a concern; too many stories.
- A change such as the elimination of a story would effect the proportions of the building and create a problem with its design.
- Height not an issue but would be happy if shorter.
- Building height is at upper limits; if lower to deal with tower would have to be substantially lower and may not be necessarily appropriate.
- Height fine, setback and stepbacks; makes it feel better about the tower.
- Topography an issue in relating to other buildings, issue creating a line of standardized building heights around the area as a whole.

- Eliminate the 13<sup>th</sup> story as designed to be redone to match the character of the lower 12 stories.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) for a 14-story, 163-unit apartment building located at 1022 West Johnson Street. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-3-1) with Barnett, Slayton, Harrington, Host-Jablonski and Fern voting in favor, Cosgrove, Rummel and Wagner voting no, and Woods abstaining. The motion for initial approval required address of the following:

- Replace the location of moped bike parking on Conklin Place with landscaping in conjunction with the residents in the adjacent Student Center Foundation across Conklin Place to off-set impacts, including the proposed use for moped parking and give student residents a better view.
- Reexamine the location of bike parking on the plaza deck adjacent to Mills Street.
- The architectural treatment of corner tower to better address site/building interior and exterior circulation, including alternative plant species and details in regards to the use of ginko, "no mow" or ground cover in terrace planting areas and dwarf bush honeysuckle.
- Study integration of vertical treatment along the Mills Street other elevations including the utility/mechanical penthouse.
- If the two existing buildings cannot be moved or relocated, the project is moot (project cannot proceed).

Two prior motions were withdrawn by their sponsors after discussion as follows:

- A motion by Rummel to grant initial approval based on previous comments by Barnett regarding removal of the top floor, movement of parking off of Conklin Place, address of relocation of bike parking on the plaza adjacent to Mills Street and resolve of landscape issues was seconded by Barnett for discussion purposes. Discussion on the removal of a story provision was clarified by Barnett that his comment was intended to suggest that the thirteenth story's appearance should be more like the lower 5-12 stories in character. It was also noted by others that the list of modifications in the motion should be contingent on further review following referral of the item. Rummel withdrew the motion.
- A second motion by Slayton for initial approval requiring address of the tower entry refinement issues, the provision of a shadow study in context with the adjoining properties, development on Bascom Hill and within the general corridor was seconded by Barnett. Discussion on the motion emphasized that initial approval of the project would render the need for a shadow study useless since the overall bulk, massing and density of the project would be provided with initial approval. Following discussion Slayton withdrew the motion.

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 1, 4, 6, 6 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1022 West Johnson Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	2	4	3	-	-	3	5	4
	5	6	6	-	-	5	5	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	6.5	6	7	7	-	6	7	6.5

General Comments:

- Usable front porches with recognizable front doors. Too much garage frontage on streets.
- Connect units to sidewalks with walks.
- Despite pushing the height limit, this project is well-designed as to how it meets the street; it's stepbacks and architecture sensitive to the church and tower.
- Project has potential but many unresolved issues, appreciate how you have addressed many issues.
- Building is too tall for area and undermines historic character of church tower.
- Terrace section much improved. Reduce utility penthouse height? Penthouse corner balconies don't seem to be "there" yet.

## AGENDA # 10

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> August 22, 2007
TITLE: 1022 West Johnson Street – Demolish Two Houses for PUD(GDP-SIP) for a 14-Story, 165-Unit Apartment Building. 8 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (07295)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: August 22, 2007	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Michael Barrett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, Jay Ferm, Lou Host-Jablonski and Todd Barnett.

### SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 22, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a demolition and PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1022 West Johnson Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was J. Randy Bruce. The project according to Bruce provides for the development of a 14-story private housing facility featuring setbacks at the 4<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> floor levels. There are approximately 165-units proposed ranging from studio to 4-bedroom apartments. The purpose of the presentation was to provide for feedback on the building's bulk, mass and height. The building will feature 125 lower level parking stalls. In response to a request by Ald. Rummel, staff noted that the area in which the project is located does not have a specific neighborhood development plan which supports the redevelopment of the combined sites for private housing. The existing Comprehensive Plan as well as land use plan generally indicates an institutional use associated with the University on this site where the applicant has noted the University's non-objection and support for the project. Staff also noted that recently revised demolition standards require more careful determination on the historic and architectural elements of the buildings to be demolished. Kitty Rankin, Historic Preservation Planner has already determined that one of the two houses to be demolished, the "Conklin House" may require this assessment as part of the overall approval process. Following a review of various massing studies for the proposed structure, the Commission noted the following:

- A big project in terms of building placement edge to Johnson Street is evolving, needs to consider moving building's upper two stories toward the street.
- Question symmetry of building asymmetric if moved toward corner, need more other prominent corner treatment.
- Not sure if proportions and building setbacks work well together; looks disjointed.
- Concern about the preservation of the Conklin House. No greenspace on entire site, filled with impervious surface.
- Overall project looks good; setback at top looks weird from Mills Street, don't see any bike parking, provide covered bike parking in entry courtyard.
- An emphasis was placed on utilizing roofs for greenspace where the upper roofline was noted as too reminiscent of the "Aberdeen."
- The penthouse is too white, it is not a transparent element, needs to be more integrated.

- The amount of impervious area is an issue, be less impervious, reduce parking for more open space and infiltration.
- The area as a whole utilizes alternative means of transportation outside of the automobile, therefore less parking should be necessary.
- How building meets the street important, how building meets the corner is an opportunity to provide a common space as an alternative to retail; creates a public presence with a change in fenestration and landscaping.
- Look at an eclectic or fresh treatment on the façade, especially the building's top.
- Proportions off horizontally and vertically (Mills Street elevation), including the use of the two tabletops. The roof treatment needs to be restudied; no Aberdeen.
- Need to pay homage to church spire such as a corner tower element as is similar to the spire with a setback to occur on other areas of the elevations.
- The ground plank provides for a very masculine building. The landscaping needs to be as masculine as the building. As an alternative use only trees with benches and hardscape with a basin below for stormwater infiltration for the use of captured water (rain gardens).
- Provide a public space; alternatives for retail at the corner such as a gathering place.
- Deal with moped parking in a realistic fashion with numbers
- In response to a request on comments as to the appropriateness of the height and mass of the building:
  - It was noted that the area was surrounded by buildings of this height, therefore right on overall height and what's around it.
  - Need to provide actual elevations in height of building, in addition use the Pres House in terms of height as an example to look at.

**ACTION:**

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION**, no formal action was taken by the Commission.

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 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1022 West Johnson Street**

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

**General Comments:**

- Mass is fine, but close attention must be paid to how the building meets the street; particularly the need for active spaces in the building adjacent to the street, i.e. retail! Given the mass of the building and the fact that this area is “park deficient,” there should be extensive green roofs and gardens.
- Excellent presentation. Address: historic preservation of Conklin house; corner of Johnson/Mills; first floor uses; green roof elements at stepbacks/”tabletops”/terrace solar access; impervious surfaces; context of adjacent heights.
- Full building mass to south. Symmetrical building appropriate? Corner element?
- Solid site and massing analysis. This designer has the chops to resolve the issues at the top, and the corner, and the spire. Bulk and massing and height are appropriate.

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> September 19, 2007
TITLE: 1022 West Johnson Street – Demolish Two Houses for PUD(GDP-SIP) for a 14-Story, 165-Unit Apartment Building. 8 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist.	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: September 19, 2007	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Jay Ferm, Richard Slayton, Bruce Woods, and Marsha Rummel, Lou Host-Jablonski and Todd Barnett.

### SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 19, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1022 West Johnson Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce, Rebecca Flood, Gary Brown, and Ledell Zellers. The modified plans as presented by Bruce featured the following:

- The overall building mass has been modified to create a building setback above the fourth story level on the West Johnson and Mills Street building elevations.
- The building still features a setback at the top of the 12<sup>th</sup> story with an additional two stories above (14 stories total) and elevator penthouse.
- A corner plaza has been created with an overall building setback at the apex of Mills and West Johnson Streets.
- The new design is a departure from the “wedding cake tiered” approach and eliminates the pitched roof/mansard roof elements as previously proposed with the corner façade featuring a tower like element to the ground at the plaza space on the corner.
- The interior floor plan adjacent to the corner plaza place will feature community space.

Following the presentation Ledell Zellers spoke in opposition and distributed photos of the existing Conklin House at 309 North Mills Street, as well as the house at 1022 West Johnson Street, both proposed to be demolished as part of the redevelopment of the combined sites. Zellers noted the Capitol Neighborhoods, Inc. opposition to the demolition of the Conklin House, which was built in 1887 and reflects a design by Claude and Stark. She recommended the Commission turn down or require a suitable place be found to relocate the home. Gary Brown, speaking as a representative of the Lutheran Memorial Church spoke in support of the project, noting the church’s previous concern with the height of the building and its relationship with the church tower, where with the current design the concerns have been satisfied. He also noted his affiliation with the Lutheran Campus Center, also in support of the project. Brown noted that the house was out of place with adjacent institutional uses. Staff noted to the Commission that the demolition of the Conklin House, as well as the adjacent house on Johnson Street would require consideration by the Landmarks Commission due to the Conklin House’s potential as a landmark, as well as the adjacent church. Staff noted that projects that require both Urban Design Commission and Landmarks approval have a protocol which requires Landmarks approval

of the project prior to any consideration by the Commission. Ald. Rummel noted that resolution of the Conklin House issue, as well as any landmark and relocation issues were critical to her support for any consideration on the redevelopment proposal. The following was further noted by the Commission:

- The design solution is far superior, creative, makes the corner work.
- How area has evolved doesn't make it appropriate if house stays, but needs to be resolved.
- Fantastic job on development/architectural issues.
- Like architecture, corner treatment successful, but the stair to Johnson Street needs work, discern corner treatment trees from streetscape, widen stairs, decrease decorative planters.
- Concern with the lack of services in the commercial area internally and externally. Need business to draw and activate space and bring people there.
- Bike racks far from the main entrance, presents security issues.
- Like direction of project, especially the plaza, the shape, landscaping and other features needs more work to be more fluid.
- Consider a more pronounced stair as an open corner feature, i.e. "Spanish steps."
- Area of Johnson on the plaza a good location for bikes, at the same time also will open up the corner.
- Make sure to provide adequate space for mopeds.
- Upon further consideration of the project, need a statement on the amount of impervious area before and after the site's redevelopment.
- Provide additional information and comment on the design and use of roof spaces.

Following the presentation the Commission generally noted its concern with the proposed demolition of the Conklin House and the need to resolve landmarks issues, especially its relocation to another site.

**ACTION:**

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION**, no formal action was taken by the Commission.

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, 7, 8 and 8.



URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1022 West Johnson Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>								info
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	info only 8
	5	6	-	-	-	5	5	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	8	8	-	-	-	8	9	8
	7	7	-	-	-	7	7	7

General Comments:

- Conklin House is worth preserving and relocating. Let's try to make this a win – win for your interesting infill project & the preservation of our city's history. Move previous surfaces.
- Great improvements, and fine awareness of the urban design issues of this corner. Please move the house!
- Without services (retail), wonderful plaza will not realize its potential.
- Great transformation from original concept.

Levitan then moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the skylight, seconded by Ms. Taylor and passed unanimously.

### Referrals from Other City Agencies

3. 1022 W. Johnson Street – referral from Plan Commission staff for Landmarks Commission opinion on demolition of existing buildings at 309 N. Mills Street and 1022 W. Johnson Street and construction of a new residential building adjacent to Luther Memorial Church, 1021 University Avenue (continued)

Mr. Bruce, the architect for the project, showed computer generated videos showing the proposed building and its relation to the other buildings in the area, particularly Luther Memorial Church. He also showed some perspective drawings of the proposed building and a drawing of the relative heights of buildings in the vicinity of the project. He said that he had heard some concerns about the views from John Nolen Drive and investigated it, but there were no places along John Nolen from which you could see the church tower. He noted that there is about 50 feet between the upper floors of the proposed building and the church tower.

Mr. Joe Lusson spoke next. He said that he was concerned about the Landmarks Commission reviewing the design for the new building when the fate of the two existing buildings had not yet been resolved. He said he has mixed feelings about the effect of the new building on the tower of the church, noting that the effect of a new building on an adjacent one is not always easy to ascertain. He used the five-story apartment building next to the Lamp House as an example in which the drawings made it appear that the new building would be less imposing than it turned out to be.

Mr. Gene Devitt noted that quite often it helps to assess the impact of a project on adjacent buildings by building a model.

Ms. Rankin explained that the questions being asked of the Landmarks Commission were "is the adjacent building eligible to be a landmark?" and, if so, "would the adjacent building be so large or so visually intrusive as to detract from the historic character of the potential landmark?" This wording comes from the Madison General Ordinances, which requires the Landmarks Commission to provide other boards and commissions advice on the affect of adjacent projects on designated landmarks.

Mr. Bruce said that he used a transitional design to better blend with and reflect the traditional design of the church and neighboring historic campus buildings.

Mr. Page asked what the parishioners at Luther Memorial felt about the design and Mr. Leja replied that they are in support of the project because the money they will get from the sale of the parking lot will provide them with an opportunity to reinvest in their ministry, noting the repair work now being undertaken on the tower.

Mr. Stephans then moved that Luther Memorial Church is clearly eligible to be a Madison Landmark and that the Landmarks Commission advises the UDC and the Plan Commission that this project as presented would have an adverse effect on the appearance of the church, and its size would be so large and its design so visually intrusive as to harm the historic character and context of the potential landmark. Furthermore, that the Commission members have suggested several avenues to explore in mitigating the adverse effect on the church. Ms. Gehrig seconded the motion. Mr. Page stated that the minutes of the Landmarks Commission should be submitted to the UDC. Mr. Levitan said he would abstain from the vote because of his friendship with people involved in the project. Mr. Page and other Commission members praised Mr. Bruce for the careful thought he gave to the new design and its surroundings, but that the current design was simply too massive to fit in well with the church and its tower.

The motion passed 4-0 with one abstention (Levitan).

4. 301 N. Hamilton St., Redevelopment of Block 258 – referral from Plan Commission staff for Landmarks Commission opinion on demolition of existing buildings at 318 E. Johnson St., 324 E. Johnson St., 308 N. Hancock St., 310 N. Hancock St., 303-309 N. Hamilton St., and 321-323 N. Hamilton St.

Mr. Ed Freer, of the Alexander Company, presented plans for the block. The developer, who owns the entire block, is putting together a GDP for demolishing six buildings on the block, and retaining the seventh, which is the Rinder Grocery Store at 301 N. Hamilton Street (now Pinkus McBride). The demolished buildings would be replaced by a four-story apartment building, with the



309 N. Mills Street  
proposed for demolition for multi-story apartment building  
see attached

### 309 N. Mills Street

#### J. William Conklin House

1887 with alterations in 1905 designed by Claude and Starck

This imposing, frame Queen Anne house was built in 1887 for early pioneer James Conklin, who in 1854 began a fuel company, starting at first with wood, then soon adding coal, and eventually running two large ice houses, along with selling building materials of all kinds, including cement, sand, gravel, lime, brick, tile and sewer pipe. The first occupant of the house, however, was son J. William, who, when he was a young man, joined his father in the business, along with two other brothers. After their father's death, the three brothers continued to run the firm until their deaths. J. William Conklin died in 1933. His wife's name was Margaret. J. William Conklin followed his father in public service by serving as an alderman; his father had served Madison as alderman, mayor and state senator. The family home was built ca. 1860 a block away at 310 S. Brooks Street (gone). This tradition of family members' houses being close together was not unusual in Madison in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, but is seldom seen today.

In 1905 the locally prodigious architectural firm of Claude and Stark designed a renovation project for this house that cost \$4500. In those days that amount of money would build a very nice house, so their work must have been extensive.

The City's draft report of architectural styles lists the Conklin house as one of the best examples of the Progressive Queen Anne style and therefore of architectural significance. The following is an excerpt from that document:

Conklin house, 309 N. Mills Street, 1887, remodeled in 1905. What remains of the 1887 house is unknown at this point, but the exterior design reflects the 20th century more than the 19th. It is a massive frame building trimmed with English details, including barge boards in the gable ends, diamond-paned sash, a steeply pitched cap roof over a corner tower, a wide veranda with soffits suggesting the curves of Mediaeval architecture and even Tudor arches in the lattice panels under the porch [recently removed].



Department of Public Works  
**City Engineering Division**

608 266 4751

Larry D. Nelson, P.E.  
City Engineer

City-County Building, Room 115  
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard  
Madison, Wisconsin 53703  
608 264 9275 FAX  
1 866 704 2315 Textnet

**Deputy City Engineer**  
Robert F. Phillips, P.E.

**Principal Engineers**  
Michael R. Dalley, P.E.  
Christina M. Bachmann, P.E.  
John S. Fahrney, P.E.  
Gregory T. Fries, P.E.

**Facilities & Sustainability**  
Jeanne E. Hoffman, Manager  
James C. Whitney, A.I.A.

**Operations Manager**  
Kathleen M. Cryan

**Hydrogeologist**  
Joseph L. DeMorett, P.G.

**GIS Manager**  
David A. Davis, R.L.S.

**Financial Officer**  
Steven B. Danner-Rivers

DATE: November 6, 2007  
TO: Plan Commission  
FROM: Larry D. Nelson, P.E., City Engineer *[Signature]*  
SUBJECT: *for* 1022 West Johnson Street Demolition & Rezoning

The City Engineering Division has reviewed the subject development and has the following comments.

**MAJOR OR NON-STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS** (Comments which are special to the project and/or may require additional work beyond a standard, more routine project.)

1. Submit CAD file and PDF file to [zenchenko@cityofmadison.com](mailto:zenchenko@cityofmadison.com) to coordinate the address plan for this proposed PUD(SIP). This requirement may be deferred until the time a Conditional Use application is made, if necessary.
2. Any damage to street pavement will require restoration in accordance with the City's Patching Criteria.
3. Show property lines and right-of-way lines on all floor plans.
4. Consistent with the property to the west, the developer shall dedicate a 3-foot wide sidewalk easement along West Johnson Street.
5. Applicant shall show contours/grades at the entrance to the underground parking to show how the area will be kept free of flooding risks.
6. Downspout locations shall be shown and connected to the public storm system.
7. Provide details and Engineer stamped plans for any proposed pumping of stormwater.
8. If proposed sewer lateral is 8-inch diameter, the developer shall construct a new sanitary manhole.

**GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS**

In addition, we offer the following General or Standard Review Comments:

Engineering Division Review of Planned Community Developments, Planned Unit Developments  
and Conditional Use Applications.

Name: 1022 West Johnson Street Demolition & Rezoning

General

- 1.1 The construction of this building will require removal and replacement of sidewalk, curb and gutter and possibly other parts of the City's infrastructure. The applicant shall enter into a City / Developer agreement for the improvements required for this development. The applicant shall be required to provide deposits to cover City labor and materials and surety to cover the cost of construction. The applicant shall meet with the City Engineer to schedule the development of the plans and the agreement. The City Engineer will not sign off on this project without the agreement executed by the developer. The developer shall sign the Developer's Acknowledgement prior to the City Engineer signing off on this project.
- 1.2 The site plan shall identify lot and block numbers of recorded Certified Survey Map or Plat.
- 1.3 The site plan shall include all lot/ownership lines, existing building locations, proposed building additions, demolitions, parking stalls, driveways, sidewalks (public and/or private), existing and proposed signage, existing and proposed utility locations and landscaping.
- 1.4 The site plan shall identify the difference between existing and proposed impervious areas.
- 1.5 The site plan shall reflect a proper street address of the property as reflected by official City of Madison Assessor's and Engineering Division records.
- 1.6 Coordinate all necessary new interior addresses associated with this proposed development with City Engineering Program Specialist Lori Zenchenko [lzenchenko@cityofmadison.com](mailto:lzenchenko@cityofmadison.com) or (608) 266-5952
- 1.7 The site plan shall include a full and complete legal description of the site or property being subjected to this application.
- 1.8 The Developer is required to pay Impact Fees for the \_\_\_\_\_ Impact Fee District for Lot(s) \_\_\_\_\_ of the \_\_\_\_\_ Plat/CSM. The current rate is \$ \_\_\_\_\_ /1000SF for a total of \$ \_\_\_\_\_. The Developer shall select one of the following two options for payment of these fees:
  - 1) Impact Fees shall be paid in full prior to Engineering sign-off of the plat/csm.
  - 2) The Developer has elected to defer the payments until such time as the building permits are applied for, in which case the owner(s) shall have fourteen (14) days after receiving the invoices to pay the outstanding impact fees. The following shall be required prior to plat sign off;
    - a) The Developer shall supply an Excel spreadsheet with lot numbers, lot areas, and number of dwelling units per lot. The Developer shall supply a CADD file of the proposed FINAL plat, in a format compatible with Microstation J. This information shall be required to calculate the Impact Fees, which will then be recorded at the Register of Deeds against each lot in the subdivision..
    - b) All information shall transmitted to Janet Dailey by e-mail at [Jdailey@cityofmadison.com](mailto:Jdailey@cityofmadison.com), or on a CD to:
 

Janet Dailey  
City of Madison Engineering Division  
210 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd  
Room 115  
Madison, WI 53703
    - c) A minimum of three (3) weeks shall be required for staff to calculate the Impact Fees and record the documents prior to plat sign-off.

The Developer shall put the following note on the face of the plat:

**ALL THE LOTS WITHIN THIS SUBDIVISION ARE SUBJECT TO IMPACT FEES THAT ARE DUE AND PAYABLE WITHIN FOURTEEN DAYS OF THE ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMIT(S).**

Right of Way / Easements

- 2.1 The Applicant shall Dedicate a \_\_\_\_\_ foot wide strip of Right of Way along \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2.2 The Applicant shall Dedicate a \_\_\_\_\_ foot wide strip of Right of Way along \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2.3 The Applicant shall Dedicate a Permanent Limited Easement for grading and sloping \_\_\_\_\_ feet wide along \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2.4 The City Engineer has reviewed the need for pedestrian and bicycle connections through the development and finds that no connections are required.
- 2.5 The Applicant shall Dedicate a Permanent Limited Easement for a pedestrian / bicycle easement \_\_\_\_\_ feet wide

from \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_.

- 2.6 The Developer shall provide a private easement for public pedestrian and bicycle use through the property running from \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2.7 The developer shall be responsible for the ongoing construction and maintenance of a path within the easement. The maintenance responsibilities shall include, but not be limited to, paving, repaving, repairing, marking and plowing. The developer shall work with the City of Madison Real Estate Staff to administer this easement. Applicable fees shall apply.
- 2.8 The Public Sanitary Sewer Easement(s) dedicated to the City of Madison ("City") on the face of this Certified Survey Map or Subdivision Plat is/are subject to the following conditions:
  - a. The property owner reserves the right to use and occupy the Public Sanitary Sewer Easement Area(s) in a manner consistent with the rights herein conveyed, provided that such use and occupancy shall not interfere with or disturb the installation, operation, maintenance, repair, replacement and/or modification of the public sanitary sewer facilities.
  - b. No above-ground improvements shall be located in the Public Sanitary Sewer Easement Area(s) by the City or the property owner, with the exception that grates, sewer access structure (SAS) covers, and other access points to the public sanitary sewer facilities shall be permitted at grade level. **(Optional:** and with the exception that pavement and/or concrete for driveway purposes shall be permitted.)
  - c. Plantings and landscaping within the Public Sanitary Sewer Easement Area(s) shall not obstruct routine maintenance by the City. In the event of repair or reconstruction, plantings and landscaping may be removed by the City without replacement or compensation to the property owner.
  - d. The property owner shall not change the grade of the Public Sanitary Sewer Easement Area(s) without the prior written approval of the City's Engineering Division.
  - e. The Public Sanitary Sewer Easement(s) may not be amended, modified, terminated, or released without the written consent of all the parties hereto, or their respective successors-in-interest.
- 2.9 The Public Sidewalk Easement(s) dedicated to the City of Madison ("City") on the face of this Certified Survey Map or Subdivision Plat is/are subject to the following conditions:
  - a. The property owner reserves the right to use and occupy the Public Sidewalk Easement Area(s) in a manner consistent with the rights herein conveyed, provided that such use and occupancy shall not interfere with or disturb the installation, operation, maintenance, repair, replacement and/or modification of the public sidewalk improvements.
  - b. No above-ground improvements will be allowed in the Public Sidewalk Easement Area(s) by the property owner. **(Optional:** with the exception that pavement and/or concrete for driveway purposes shall be permitted.)
  - c. Plantings and landscaping within the Public Sidewalk Easement Area(s) shall not obstruct routine maintenance by the City. In the event of repair or reconstruction, plantings and landscaping may be removed by the City without replacement or compensation to the property owner.
  - d. The property owner shall not change the grade of the Public Sidewalk Easement Area(s) without the prior written approval of the City's Engineering Division.
  - e. The Public Sidewalk Easement(s) may not be amended, modified, terminated, or released without the written consent of all the parties hereto, or their respective successors-in-interest.
- 2.10 The Public Storm Sewer Easement(s) dedicated to the City of Madison ("City") on the face of this Certified Survey Map or Subdivision Plat is/are subject to the following conditions:
  - a. The property owner reserves the right to use and occupy the Public Storm Sewer Easement Area(s) in a manner consistent with the rights herein conveyed, provided that such use and occupancy shall not interfere with or disturb the installation, operation, maintenance, repair, replacement and/or modification of the public storm sewer facilities.
  - b. No above-ground improvements shall be located in the Public Storm Sewer Easement Area(s) by the City or the property owner, with the exception that grates, sewer access structure (SAS) covers, and other access points to the public storm sewer facilities shall be permitted at grade level. **(Optional:** and with the exception that pavement and/or concrete for driveway purposes shall be permitted.)
  - c. Plantings and landscaping within the Public Storm Sewer Easement Area(s) shall not obstruct routine maintenance by the City. In the event of repair or reconstruction, plantings and landscaping may be removed by the City without replacement or compensation to the property owner.
  - d. The property owner shall not change the grade of the Public Storm Sewer Easement Area(s) without the prior written approval of the City's Engineering Division.  
The Public Storm Sewer Easement(s) may not be amended, modified, terminated, or released without the written consent of all the parties hereto, or their respective successors-in-interest.
- 2.11 The Public Water Main Easement(s) dedicated to the City of Madison ("City") on the face of this Certified Survey Map or Subdivision Plat is/are subject to the following conditions:
  - a. The property owner reserves the right to use and occupy the Public Water Main Easement Area(s) in a manner consistent with the rights herein conveyed, provided that such use and occupancy shall not interfere with or disturb the installation, operation, maintenance, repair, replacement and/or modification of the public water main facilities.
  - b. No above-ground improvements will be allowed in the Public Water Main Easement Area(s) by the property owner. **(Optional:** with the exception that pavement and/or concrete for driveway purposes shall be permitted.)
  - c. Plantings and landscaping within the Public Water Main Easement Area(s) shall not obstruct routine maintenance by the City. In the event of repair or reconstruction, plantings and landscaping may be removed by the City without replacement or compensation to the property owner.
  - d. The property owner shall not change the grade of the Public Water Main Easement Area(s) without



- e. the prior written approval of the City's Engineering Division.  
The Public Water Main Easement(s) may not be amended, modified, terminated, or released without the written consent of all the parties hereto, or their respective successors-in-interest.

**Streets and Sidewalks**

- 3.1 The Applicant shall execute a waiver of notice and hearing on the assessments for the improvement of [roadway] \_\_\_\_\_ in accordance with Section 66.0703(7)(b) Wisconsin Statutes and Section 4.09 of the MGO.
- 3.2 **Value of sidewalk installation over \$5000.** The Applicant shall Construct Sidewalk to a plan approved by the City Engineer along \_\_\_\_\_.
- 3.3 **Value of sidewalk installation under \$5000.** The Applicant shall install public sidewalk along \_\_\_\_\_. The Applicant shall obtain a Street Excavation Permit for the sidewalk work, which is available from the City Engineering Division. The applicant shall pay all fees associated with the permit including inspection fees. All work must be completed within six months or the succeeding June 1, whichever is later. This permit application is available on line at <http://www.cityofmadison.com/engineering/permits.cfm>.
- 3.4 The Applicant shall execute a waiver of their right to notice and hearings on the assessments for the installation of sidewalk along [roadway] \_\_\_\_\_ in accordance with Section 66.0703(7)(b) Wisconsin Statutes and Section 4.09 of the MGO.
- 3.5 The Applicant shall grade the property line along \_\_\_\_ to a grade established by the City Engineer. The grading shall be suitable to allow the installation of sidewalk in the future without the need to grade beyond the property line. The Applicant shall obtain a Street Excavation permit prior to the City Engineer signing off on this development. This permit application is available on line at <http://www.cityofmadison.com/engineering/permits.cfm>.
- 3.6 The Applicant shall close all abandoned driveways by replacing the curb in front of the driveways and restoring the terrace with grass.
- 3.7 **Value of the restoration work less than \$5,000. When computing the value, do not include a cost for driveways. Do not include the restoration required to facilitate a utility lateral installation.** The Applicant's project requires the minor restoration of the street and sidewalk. The Applicant shall obtain a Street Excavation Permit for the street restoration work, which is available from the City Engineering Division. The applicant shall pay all fees associated with the permit including inspection fees. This permit application is available on line at <http://www.cityofmadison.com/engineering/permits.cfm>.
- 3.8 The Applicant shall make improvements to \_\_\_\_\_ in order to facilitate ingress and egress to the development. The improvement shall include a (Describe what the work involves or strike this part of the comment.) \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.9 The Applicant shall make improvements to \_\_\_\_\_. The improvements shall consist of \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.10 The approval of this Conditional Use does not include the approval of the changes to roadways, sidewalks or utilities. The applicant shall obtain separate approval by the Board of Public Works and the Common Council for the restoration of the public right of way including any changes requested by developer. The City Engineer shall complete the final plans for the restoration with input from the developer. The curb location, grades, tree locations, tree species, lighting modifications and other items required to facilitate the development or restore the right of way shall be reviewed by the City Engineer, City Traffic Engineer, and City Forester.
- 3.11 The Applicant shall provide the City Engineer with a survey indicating the grade of the existing sidewalk and street. The Applicant shall hire a Professional Engineer to set the grade of the building entrances adjacent to the public right of way. The Applicant shall provide the City Engineer the proposed grade of the building entrances. The City Engineer shall approve the grade of the entrances prior to signing off on this development.
- 3.12 The Applicant shall replace all sidewalk and curb and gutter which abuts the property which is damaged by the construction or any sidewalk and curb and gutter which the City Engineer determines needs to be replaced because it is not at a desirable grade regardless of whether the condition existed prior to beginning construction.
- 3.13 The Applicant shall obtain a privilege in streets agreement for any encroachments inside the public right of way. The approval of this development does not constitute or guarantee approval of the encroachments.
- 3.14 The Applicant shall provide the City Engineer with the proposed soil retention system to accommodate the restoration. The soil retention system must be stamped by a Professional Engineer. The City Engineer may reject or require modifications to the retention system.
- 3.15 The Applicant shall complete work on exposed aggregate sidewalk in accordance with specifications provided by the city. The stone used for the exposed aggregate shall be approved by the City. The Construction Engineer shall be notified prior to beginning construction. Any work that does not match the adjacent work or which the City Construction Engineer finds is unacceptable shall be removed and replaced.
- 3.16 All work in the public right-of-way shall be performed by a City licensed contractor.

- 3.17 Installation of "Private" street signage in accordance with 10.34 MGO is required.

**Storm Water Management**

- 4.1 The site plans shall be revised to show the location of all rain gutter down spout discharges.
- 4.2 Storm sewer to serve this development has been designed and constructed. The site plans shall be revised to identify the location of this storm sewer and to show connection of an internal drainage system to the existing public storm sewer.
- 4.3 The plan set shall be revised to show a proposed private internal drainage system on the site. This information shall include the depths and locations of structures and the type of pipe to be used.
- 4.4 The applicant shall show storm water "overflow" paths that will safely route runoff when the storm sewer is at capacity.
- 4.5 The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Section 37.07 and 37.08 of the Madison General Ordinances regarding permissible soil loss rates. The erosion control plan shall include Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) computations for the construction period. Measures shall be implemented in order to maintain a soil loss rate below 7.5-tons per acre per year.
- 4.6 The City of Madison is an approved agent of the Department of Commerce. This proposal contains a commercial building and as such, the City of Madison is authorized to review infiltration, stormwater management, and erosion control on behalf of the Department of Commerce. No separate submittal to Commerce or the WDNR is required.
- 4.7 This development includes multiple building permits within a single lot. The City Engineer and/or the Director of the Inspection Unit may require individual control plans and measures for each building.
- 4.8 If the lots within this site plan are inter-dependent upon one another for stormwater runoff conveyance, and/or a private drainage system exists for the entire site an agreement shall be provided for the rights and responsibilities of all lot owners. Said agreement shall be reviewed and placed on file by the City Engineer, referenced on the site plan and recorded at the Dane Co Register of Deeds.
- 4.9 Prior to approval, this project shall comply with Chapter 37 of the Madison General Ordinances regarding stormwater management. Specifically, this development is required to:
  - Detain the 2 & 10-year storm events.
  - Detain the 2, 10, & 100-year storm events.
  - Control 40% TSS (20 micron particle) off of new paved surfaces
  - Control 80% TSS (5 micron particle) of of new paved surfaces
  - Provide infiltration in accordance with Chapter 37 of the Madison General Ordinances
  - Provide substantial thermal control.
  - Provide oil & grease control from the first 1/2" of runoff from parking areas.
  - Complete an erosion control plan and complete weekly self-inspection of the erosion control practices and post these inspections to the City of Madison website – as required by Chapter 37 of the Madison General Ordinances.

Stormwater management plans shall be submitted and approved by City Engineering prior to signoff.

- 4.10 The plan set shall be revised to show more information on proposed drainage for the site. This shall be accomplished by using spot elevations and drainage arrows or through the use of proposed contours. It is necessary to show the location of drainage leaving the site to the public right-of-way. It may be necessary to provide information off the site to fully meet this requirement.
- 4.11 A portion of this project comes under the jurisdiction of the US Army Corp of Engineers and WDNR for wetland or flood plain issues. A permit for those matters shall be required prior to construction on any of the lots currently within the jurisdictional flood plain.
- 4.12 The Applicant shall submit, prior to plan sign-off, a digital CAD file (single file) to the Engineering Program Specialist in the Engineering Division (Lori Zenchenko). The digital CAD file shall be to scale and represent final construction. The single CAD file submittal can be either AutoCAD (dwg) Version 2001 or older, MicroStation (dgn) Version J or older, or Universal (dxf) format and contain the following data, each on a separate layer name/level number:
  - a) Building Footprints
  - b) Internal Walkway Areas
  - c) Internal Site Parking Areas
  - d) Other Miscellaneous Impervious Areas (i.e. gravel, crushed stone, bituminous/asphalt, concrete, etc.)
  - e) Right-of-Way lines (public and private)
  - f) Lot lines
  - g) Lot numbers
  - h) Lot/Plat dimensions
  - i) Street names

- 4.13 NR-151 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code will be effective on October 1, 2004. Future phases of this project shall comply with NR 151 in effect when work commences. Specifically, any phases not covered by a Notice of Intent (NOI) received from the WDNR under NR-216 prior to October 1, 2004 shall be responsible for compliance with all requirements of NR-151 Subchapter III. As most of the requirements of NR-151 are currently implemented in Chapter 37 of the Madison General Ordinances, the most significant additional requirement shall be that of infiltration.

NR-151 requires infiltration in accord with the following criteria. For the type of development, the site shall comply with one of the three (3) options provided below:

Residential developments shall infiltrate 90% of the predevelopment infiltration amount, 25% of the runoff from the 2-year post development storm or dedicated a maximum of 1% of the site area to active infiltration practices.

Commercial development shall infiltrate 60% of the predevelopment infiltration amount, 10% of the runoff from the 2-year post development storm or dedicate a maximum of 2% of the site area to active infiltration practices.

- 4.14 The applicant shall submit, prior to plan sign-off, digital PDF files to the Engineering Division (Jeff Benedict or Tim Troester). The digital copies shall be to scale, and shall have a scale bar on the plan set.

PDF submittals shall contain the following information:

- a) Building footprints.
- b) Internal walkway areas.
- c) Internal site parking areas.
- d) Lot lines and right-of-way lines.
- e) Street names.
- f) Stormwater Management Facilities.
- g) Detail drawings associated with Stormwater Management Facilities (including if applicable planting plans).

- 4.15 The Applicant shall submit prior to plan sign-off, electronic copies of any Stormwater Management Files including:

- a) SLAMM DAT files.
- b) RECARGA files.
- c) TR-55/HYDROCAD/Etc...
- d) Sediment loading calculations

If calculations are done by hand or are not available electronically the hand copies or printed output shall be scanned to a PDF file and provided.

- 4.16 The area adjacent to this proposed development has a known flooding risk. All entrances shall be 2-feet above the adjacent sidewalk elevation or 1-foot above the 100-year regional flood elevation (whichever is greater). This includes garage entrances.

#### Utilities General

- 5.1 The Applicant shall obtain a Street Excavation permit for the installation of utilities required to serve this project. The Applicant shall pay the permit fee, inspection fee and street degradation fee as applicable and shall comply with all the conditions of the permit. This permit application is available on line at <http://www.cityofmadison.com/engineering/permits.cfm>.

- 5.2 The applicant shall obtain all necessary sewer connection permits and sewer plugging permits prior to any utility work. This permit application is available on line at <http://www.cityofmadison.com/engineering/permits.cfm>.

- 5.3 All proposed and existing utilities including gas, electric, phone, steam, chilled water, etc shall be shown on the plan.

- 5.4 The applicant's utility contractor shall obtain a connection permit and excavation permit prior to commencing the storm sewer construction. This permit application is available on line at <http://www.cityofmadison.com/engineering/permits.cfm>.

- 5.5 The site plans shall be revised to show the location of existing utilities, including depth, type, and size in the adjacent right-of-way.

- 5.6 The developer shall provide information on how the Department of Commerce's requirements regarding treatment of storm water runoff, from parking structures, shall satisfied prior to discharge to the public sewer system. Additionally, information shall be provided on which system (storm or sanitary) the pipe shall be connected to.

#### Sanitary Sewer

- 6.1 Prior to approval of the conditional use application, the owner shall obtain a permit to plug each existing sanitary sewer lateral that serves a building that is proposed for demolition. For each lateral to be plugged the owner shall

deposit \$1,000 with the City Engineer in two separate checks in the following amounts: (1). \$100 non-refundable deposit for the cost of inspection of the plugging by City staff; and (2). \$900 for the cost of City crews to perform the plugging. If the owner elects to complete the plugging of a lateral by private contractor and the plugging is inspected and approved by the City Engineer, the \$900 fee shall be refunded to the owner. This permit application is available on line at <http://www.cityofmadison.com/engineering/permits.cfm>.

- 6.2 All outstanding Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD) and City of Madison sanitary sewer connection charges are due and payable prior Engineering sign-off, unless otherwise collected with a Developer's / Subdivision Contract. Contact Janet Dailey (608-261-9688) to obtain the final MMSD billing a minimum of two (2) working days prior to requesting City Engineering signoff.
- 6.3 Each unit of a duplex building shall be served by a separate and independent sanitary sewer lateral.
- 6.4 The site plan shall be revised to show all existing public sanitary sewer facilities in the project area as well as the size, invert elevation, and alignment of the proposed service.



## Traffic Engineering and Parking Divisions

David C. Dryer, P.E., City Traffic Engineer and Parking Manager

Suite 100  
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard  
P.O. Box 2986  
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-2986  
PH 608 266 4761  
TTY 866-704-2315  
FAX 608 267 1158

November 8, 2007

TO: Plan Commission

FROM: David C. Dryer, P.E., City Traffic Engineer and Parking Manager

SUBJECT: **1022 West Johnson Street – Demolish / Rezoning – R6 to PUD (GDP-SIP) 162 Unit Apartments, 14 Story Building**

The City Traffic Engineering Division has reviewed the subject development and has the following comments.

**MAJOR OR NON-STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS** (Comments which are special to the project and/or may require additional work beyond a standard, more routine project.)

1. City of Madison radio systems are microwave directional line of sight to remote towers citywide. The building elevation will need to be review by Traffic Engineer to accommodate the microwave sight and building. The applicant shall submit grade and elevations plans if the building exceeds four stories prior to sign-off to be reviewed and approved by Keith Lippert, (266-4767) Traffic Engineering Shop, 1120 Sayle Street. The applicant shall return one signed approved building elevation copy to the City of Madison Traffic Engineering office with final plans for sign off.
2. A condition of approval shall be that no residential parking permits shall be issued for *1022 West Johnson Street*, this would be consistent with other projects in the area. In addition, the applicant shall inform all tenants of this facility of the requirement in their apartment leases and record in zoning text. The applicant shall note in the Zoning Text that no residential parking permits shall be issued. In addition, the applicant shall submit for *1022 West Johnson Street* a copy of the lease noting the above condition in the lease when submitting plans for City approval.
3. The approval of this facility does not include the approval of the as proposed improvements in the street right-of-way. The applicant should remove all proposed improvements in the right-of-way on the site plan sheets or note: "All right-of-way improvements require separate approval by the Board of Public Works and Common Council for the public right-of-way changes to be requested by the developer."
4. The developer shall work with the City to resolve construction-related issues prior to submitting final plans for approval. The site has limited areas on and off site for construction-related use, West Johnson Street traffic lanes, pedestrian sidewalk and bike lanes shall be maintained during building construction. Staff cannot commit to anything until it can perform a detailed review with the applicant.

## PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMENTS

5. The applicant shall indicate the type of bicycle racks to be installed both inside and outside.
6. The applicant shall provide an area for visitor outside and inside tenant moped parking spaces and access. Moped standard parking spaces recommend 4 ft in width and 6 ft in length with a 6 ft access aisle.

## GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS

In addition, we offer the following General or Standard Review Comments:

7. When the applicant submits final plans for approval, the applicant shall show the following: items in the terrace as existing (e.g., signs and street light poles), type of surfaces, existing property lines, addresses, one contiguous plan (showing all easements, all pavement markings, building placement, and stalls), adjacent driveway approaches to lots on either side, signage, percent of slope, vehicle routes, dimensions of radii, aisles, driveways, stalls including the two (2) feet overhang, and a scaled drawing at 1" = 20'.
8. When site plans are submitted for approval, the developer shall provide recorded copies of the joint driveway ingress/egress and easements.
9. "Stop" and "One Way" signs shall be installed at a height of six (6) feet to the bottom of the first sign at the driveway approach to W. Johnson Street. All signs at the approaches shall be installed behind the property line. All directional/regulatory signage and pavement markings on the site shall be shown and noted on the plan.
10. The intersection shall be so designed so as not to violate the City's sight-triangle preservation requirement which states that on a corner lot no structure, screening, or embankment of any kind shall be erected, placed, maintained or grown between the heights of 30 inches and 10 feet above the curb level or its equivalent within the triangle space formed by the two intersecting street lines or their projections and a line joining points on such street lines located a minimum of 25 feet from the street intersection in order to provide adequate vehicular vision clearance.
11. The applicant shall design the underground parking areas for stalls and backing up according to Figures II of the ordinance using the 9' or wider stall for the commercial/retail area. The "One Size Fits All" stall shall be used for the residential parking area only, which is a stall 8'-9" in width by 17'-0" in length with a 23'-0" backup. Aisles, ramps, **columns**, offices or work areas are to be excluded from these rectangular areas, when designing underground parking areas. The applicant shall modify the underground parking backup 23 ft to exclude columns. In addition, the applicant shall dimension 306 North Brooks Street modified parking spaces along the driveway to W. Johnson Street.
12. All existing driveway approaches on which are to be abandoned shall be removed and replaced with curb and gutter and noted on the plan.
13. The applicant shall redesign the West Johnson Street driveway approach according to the design criteria for a "Class III" driveway in accordance to Madison General Ordinance Section 10.08(4). In addition, the applicant shall dimension the approach and flares according to M.G.O.

14. The Developer shall post a deposit and reimburse the City for all costs associated with any modifications to Traffic Signals, Street Lighting, Signing and Pavement Marking, and conduit and handholes, including labor, engineering and materials for both temporary and permanent installations.
15. Public signing and marking related to the development may be required by the City Traffic Engineer for which the developer shall be financially responsible.

Please contact John Leach, City Traffic Engineering at 267-8755 if you have questions regarding the above items:

Contact Person: J. Randy Bruce  
Fax: 608-836-6934  
Email: [rbruce@knothebruce.com](mailto:rbruce@knothebruce.com)

DCD: DJM: dm



# CITY OF MADISON FIRE DEPARTMENT

## Fire Prevention Division

325 W. Johnson St., Madison, WI 53703-2295

Phone: 608-266-4484 ♦ FAX: 608-267-1153

DATE: November 9, 2007  
TO: Plan Commission  
FROM: Edwin J. Ruckriegel, Fire Marshal  
SUBJECT: **1022 W. Johnson Street**

The City of Madison Fire Department (MFD) has reviewed the subject development and has the following comments:

**MAJOR OR NON-STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS** (Comments which are special to the project and/or may require additional work beyond a standard, more routine project.)

none

## **GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS**

In addition, we offer the following General or Standard Review Comments:

1. Provide fire apparatus access as required by Comm 62.0509 and MGO 34.19, as follows:  
**(commercial structures only)**
  - a. The site plans shall clearly identify the location of all fire lanes.
  - b. Provide an aerial apparatus access fire lane that is at least 26-feet wide, with the near edge of the fire lane within 30-feet of the structure, and parallel to one entire side of the structure, if any part of the building is over 30 feet in height.
  - c. Provide a completed MFD "Fire Apparatus Access and Fire Hydrant Worksheet" with the site plan submittal.

Please contact Scott Strassburg, New Construction Inspector at 608-261-9843 if you have questions regarding the above items.

cc: Bill Sullivan



**Parks, Timothy**

---

**From:** Mindi Potter [mindpotter@principia.edu]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 06, 2007 10:15 AM  
**To:** Parks, Timothy  
**Subject:** 1022 West Johnson

To the City of Madison Planning Commission:

The Board of Directors responsible for the facility located at 315 North Mills Street has concerns about the 1022 West Johnson Street project. Our building is directly adjacent to the proposed development, at the corner of N. Mills and Conklin Place. Among our concerns are:

1. With a projected height of 14 stories this project would not conform to other nearby structures. It would block nearly all daylight at our facility for most of the day;
2. With the projected 162 apartment units there would be a significant increase in congestion and noise in the area. We would appreciate information and input as to the parking entrance(s) and exit(s), as well as loading zones, trash containment and removal, and sound abatement measures for the apartments;
3. Conklin Place provides the only access to the parking garage below our facility. We would appreciate information and input as to plans to lessen the impact of construction. Also, we are concerned about problems with access for our trash removal, snow and ice buildup in the winter, lighting and security.

Up to this point we have received no communication from either the developers or the city on this project. We would appreciate being informed and included as to the progress of the project. For future updates and communication please contact Marty Evanson and Mindi Potter, members of the Board of Directors of the Student Center Foundation.

Marty Evanson  
tevanson@chorus.net  
608-267-2713

Mindi Potter  
mindpotter@sbcglobal.net  
608-233-7007

Thank you for your attention,  
Board of Directors  
Student Center Foundation

--

*Mindi Potter*  
*4409 Woods End*  
*Madison, WI 53711*  
*608-233-7007 home*  
*608-332-2821 cell*

Dear Al Martin,

I am unable to attend the Urban Design Commission hearing Wednesday, Nov. 7 to speak on the proposed demolition of the Conklin House at 309 N. Mills and the house at 1022 W. Johnson, Item 6 on the agenda.

The Landmarks Commission recently unanimously agreed that the buildings should be preserved, preferably in place, and not demolished. The Madison Trust for Historic Preservation concurs with the Commission's stand on the issue. I also personally agree as a citizen of this fair and diverse city that the buildings should remain on site and preserved.

James R. Westring  
*President*  
**Madison Trust for Historic Preservation**