

**PLANNING DIVISION REPORT
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY
AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
May 30, 2007**

**RE: I.D. NO. 05903 1815 UNIVERSITY AVENUE - ZONING MAP AMEMENTMENT
and DEMOLITION PERMIT**

1. Requested Action: Approval of a request to rezone property at 1815 University Avenue from the OR Office-Residence District to the PUD (GDP-SIP) Planned Unit Development (General Development Plan-Specific Implementation Plan) District to allow construction of a 64-unit apartment building known as "Brown Lofts" **and** approval of a demolition permit for a vacant 102-unit private student residence hall located on the site.
2. Applicable Regulations: Section 28.07(6) of the Zoning Code provides the framework and guidelines for approval of Planned Unit Developments; Section 28.12(9) provides the process for review and approval of zoning map amendments; Section 28.04(22) provides the guidelines and regulations for the approval of demolition permit applications.
3. Report Drafted By: Michael Waidelich, Principal Planner.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

1. Applicant: John Barton, Brownhouse, 202 W. Gorham Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53703.
2. Status of Applicant: Agent for Owner, Steve Brown Apartments, 120 W. Gorham Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53703.
3. Development Schedule: As soon as necessary approvals are received.
4. Parcel Location: Along the south side of University Avenue, at the southeast corner of the Princeton Avenue intersection. Aldermanic District 5.
5. Parcel Size: Approximately 0.586 acres (25,520 sq. ft.).
6. Existing Zoning: OR Office Residence District **and** HIST-UH University Heights Historic District overlay district.
7. Existing Land Use: The site is currently developed with a three-story, 102-unit student residence building, now vacant and proposed to be demolished.
8. Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:
 - North: University Avenue. Across University Avenue are a variety of relatively large, University-related buildings, including the University of Wisconsin Foundation building directly across the street; zoned OR Office Residence District. West of this, multi-family residential developments; zoned R6 General Residence District.
 - West: Princeton Avenue. West of Princeton Avenue along University Avenue, multi-family apartments on relatively small lots; zoned R5 General Residence District.

South: A mixture of residential buildings along the north frontage of Kendall Avenue, including a single-family home, a duplex, and apartment buildings ranging from three to 14 dwelling units; zoned R4A Limited General Residence District. South of Kendall Avenue, predominantly single-family homes; zoned R2 District.

East: A six-unit apartment building on University Avenue, and behind that on North Prospect Avenue, a three-unit apartment; zoned R5 General Residence District.

9. Adopted Land Use Plan: The *Comprehensive Plan* recommends this area for High Density Residential uses. There currently is no neighborhood or special area plan covering this area.

The proposed project is also within the University Heights Historic District, which includes the south frontage of University Avenue between North Breese Terrace and North Allen Street, and extends southward to encompass the south frontage of Regent Street.

10. Environmental Corridor Status: No Environmental Corridors are designated on this property.

PUBLIC UTILITIES AND SERVICES:

The full range of urban services are currently available to this property.

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION:

Summary Overview

This is an application to rezone the property located at 1815 University Avenue from the OR Office Residence District to the PUD (GDP-SIP) Planned Unit Development (General Development Plan-Specific Implementation Plan) District to allow construction of a four-story, 64-unit apartment building, known as Brown Lofts, on the site. Approval is also requested for a demolition permit to remove the vacant three-story, 102-unit student residence hall, known as Princeton House, currently located on the property.

The Planning Division staff consider the primary issue in considering this proposed development to be the compatibility of this relatively large, relatively dense building with the recommendations in the *Comprehensive Plan*, and with the existing character of the surrounding neighborhood and the University Heights Historic District. Since this project was first proposed, the applicant has made a number of design modifications to the building to try to address the concerns expressed by neighborhood residents; and the building has been significantly improved as a result. While it is larger and more dense than the *Comprehensive Plan* envisioned at this location, the Planning Division staff consider the proposed building to be an attractive design, with an "urban" look that is appropriate on University Avenue. But, it is still a very large, wide, tall structure compared to its neighbors; and it is located quite close to the lot boundaries on all sides---although successive design modifications have increased the basic setbacks slightly at several points, and increased building articulation has pulled more of the building mass away from its edges.

Staff consider a single building of this size probably to be, at best, marginally compatible with other buildings in the surrounding neighborhood, all of which are smaller and on smaller lots. On the other hand, this is an attractive, high-quality building with many good design features, and it is certainly superior to some other neighborhood projects that have been approved in similar situations. In addition, the applicant has made multiple modifications to the building design since this project was first submitted to seek to respond to neighborhood concerns; and while the basic size and scale of the

building has not changed dramatically from the earlier plans, the improvements are still meaningful. In the absence of an adopted neighborhood or special area plan that could provide more detailed guidelines regarding the recommended height, scale and massing of buildings along this segment of the University Avenue corridor, the Planning Division staff are unable to strongly recommend that this proposed project be approved; but neither do staff find a compelling reason to conclude that this project should not be approved. The Plan Commission and Common Council will need to evaluate whether or not the building, on balance, now represents an appropriate development within the context of its surroundings, based on the staff analysis, neighborhood input, the comments of reviewing agencies, and the testimony at the public hearing.

Subject to consideration the appropriateness of the proposed alternative use, the Planning Division staff have no objection to the proposed demolition of the existing Princeton House building.

Additional detail is provided below.

Project Description

The proposed project is a 64 unit apartment building located at 1815 University Avenue, on the site currently occupied by the vacant Princeton House, a 102-unit former private residence hall primarily occupied by University of Wisconsin students.

The proposed Brown Lofts apartments is a large, a four-story building with a flat roof. While the facade setbacks vary, the visible building is approximately 220 feet wide along the University Avenue frontage and about 96 feet deep. The proposed building occupies most of the site and is located relatively close to the lot boundaries on all sides. As discussed further below, the overall size of the building and the limited building setbacks were among the principal concerns with the project cited by neighborhood residents. In response to neighborhood concerns, the applicant redesigned the building to increase the setback for the four above-ground stories slightly at several points, so that now the visible part of the building does not extend quite as close to the property boundaries.

The front facade of the building is articulated with four "forward" elements separated by three "recessed" bays. The front building setback is only five feet from the property line at the most forward elements of the building facade. While the main entrance to the building is within the central recessed bay that is set back thirteen feet, this space also accommodates the steps, access ramp and raised planters associated with the entrance, and these features extend to the public sidewalk. The easternmost building element also has a five foot front setback, while the building element at the western end of the front facade has a slightly greater setback of seven feet to provide improved visibility at the Princeton Avenue intersection. The three recessed bays extend back about 8 feet from the forward facade, or a total of 13 feet from the property line. This additional setback is sufficient to allow windows to be located on the recess sidewalls, thereby providing additional light and views to the front apartments. Usable balconies for the units above the ground floor are provided on the front-facing walls of the two outer recessed bays. For the ground level units, small private enclosed patios are provided within the recessed area, with decorative metal fencing separating the patios from the planted area between the building and the public sidewalk. Units located on the forward elements of the front facade have sliding doors with railings facing University Avenue, but not actual balconies.

The rear elevation is continuous along the western two-thirds of the first (ground level) story to allow for the interior ramp leading down to the lower level parking garage. At this point, the rear building wall is only 5 feet 6 inches from the rear property line. Then, a deeply recessed bay in the facade

separates another "forward" element which accommodates apartment units located within the southeastern portion of the ground floor of the building. The building setback is slightly greater at this point---about 8 feet from the property line. Beginning with the second story (above the access ramp to the parking garage), a second deeply recessed bay is provided along the western portion of the rear facade as well. These two recessed bays, each set back about 36 feet from the outer facade of the rear elevation, separate three "forward" building elements that extend forward nearer to the lot line. However, while the upper three stories of the two end building elements are aligned with the ground floor below, the upper three stories of the center element are stepped back an additional 8 feet 3 inches, providing additional articulation to the building and moving some of the building mass farther from the property line. The terrain slopes upward toward the south, and a retaining wall along the southeastern edge of the property creates an enclosed space below grade, and the windows for the ground floor units at the southeastern end of the building facing into this space are mostly below the level of the top of this wall. The balconies shown on the most recent set of building floor plans are not consistent with the balconies shown on the building elevations, so staff are unsure how many individual balconies are intended on the rear facade, beyond those located within the recessed areas. In addition to what balconies may be provided, larger patio areas are located on the "roofs" within the two recessed bays. For the easternmost bay, these patios are at the ground level; and for the westernmost bay and the center element that is stepped back at the second story, the patios are at the second floor level.

The Princeton Avenue facade of the building is set back about three feet at the middle of the building, and six feet at the northern end. As noted above, the building was pulled back slightly near the Princeton Avenue/University Avenue intersection to provide better visibility. There is a setback of five feet at the southernmost end of this facade to allow for five-foot deep balconies here, which then extend out to the property line. Additional balconies are located on this facade closer to University Avenue, but do not extend quite to the property line due to the greater building setback at this point.

The majority of the eastern facade of the building is set back about 5 feet 6 inches from the property line, with two segments of the facade set back 8 feet, primarily to provide visual articulation. There is one set of balconies on the segment of the facade with the 8-foot setback.

The proposed building materials are stone veneer for the ground floor and brick veneer for the three upper stories. While other materials were originally proposed for parts of the building, all of the outer walls now will be stone or brick, including the rear facade and the recessed bays. Limestone banding will separate the ground floor from the upper stories, and limestone quoins will decorate the outside corners along the front and end facades. The cornice treatment will include additional height detail above the "forward" building elements on all facades. The building has relatively large windows, and on the front and end facades, several types of brickwork arch features provide additional interest to the window groupings. Many of the units have usable balconies or false balconies that will still provide views and breezes to the apartments.

There are three general entrances to the building: on University Avenue at the center of the front facade, on Princeton Avenue, and at the east end of the building via a walkway from University Avenue. The main entrance on University Avenue leads to a small interior lobby area, the interior hallways, and an elevator lobby with two elevators. Resident mailboxes, the building office, and a laundry room are located near the lobby area. In addition to the elevators, two interior stairwells are provided near either end of the building. The two building side entrances are clearly secondary and not very inviting by comparison

A total of 64 rental apartments are included in the proposed project, including 24 one-bedroom apartments, 4 one-bedroom-plus-study apartments, 30 two-bedroom apartments, and 6 one and two-bedroom multi-story apartments. Although university students and personnel may be likely tenants of the apartments, the proposed mix of units should be attractive to a variety of smaller households, but probably less so to families with children.

Two levels of underground parking are provided, with access to the parking from Princeton Avenue. There is a covered vehicle entrance area located within the building envelope but outside the garage door and ramp down to the parking levels. In addition to providing access to the garage levels, this entry space provides limited parking, and is perhaps also intended for deliveries and refuse collection from the adjacent trash storage area on the first floor, although no loading area is designated on the plans. A total of 78 vehicle parking spaces, 60 bicycle parking spaces and 25 moped parking spaces are provided for the development. Two of the vehicle parking spaces, five bicycle parking spaces, and four moped spaces are located within the vehicle entrance area just outside the garage door---presumably to accommodate visitors, although this is not specified. While the majority of the bicycle parking for tenants is conveniently located just inside the garage door, it appears that only two bicycle parking spaces are located outside near the front building entrance, and five more within the garage entrance area. Staff consider this to be quite limited for a building that seems likely to have a significant number visitors using bicycles for transportation. Planning staff are also unsure whether the proposed parking is adequate for the intended occupancy. The comments from the Traffic Engineer and Zoning Administrator may include recommendations regarding this issue.

According to the most recent plans, a total of 6,693 square feet of usable open space for the development is provided by patios and balconies, as described above (note that Planning staff did not check this calculation). Considering the limited space available, this project includes quite a lot proposed landscaping, as shown on the plans submitted. This includes the formal planting beds and planters adjacent to the front building entrance and within the larger patio areas, and plantings around most of the building perimeter. However, because the planting areas are all so narrow, the plantings necessarily will be relatively low and concentrated at the base of the building. Any significant screening or visual softening of the building mass will depend upon larger canopy trees located in the University Avenue and Princeton Avenue street terraces. It is unclear from the application if the applicant proposes additional trees within these terraces.

Consistency with Adopted Plans

The *City of Madison Comprehensive Plan*, adopted in January 2006, recommends the properties located along the segment of the Old University Avenue corridor extending several blocks on either side of the proposed project for High Density Residential uses. The following excerpts from the Comprehensive Plan describe the general characteristics of the High Density Residential land use recommendation:

High Density Residential (HDR)

High Density Residential districts are multiple-family housing areas where relatively larger and taller apartment buildings are the predominant recommended building type.

Net Density Range

An average of 41 to 60 units per net acre for the High Density Residential district as a whole. Most developments within the area should fall within or below this range, although smaller area of higher density may be included.

Location and Design Characteristics

High Density Residential districts typically are relatively compact areas located adjacent to or close to larger Mixed-Use, Commercial and Employment districts, the Downtown and Campus districts, and other intensively developed lands. Isolated High Density Residential areas might be recommended at specified locations within a larger surrounding Medium or Low Density Residential area, but it is generally recommended that higher-density uses be located close to other activity centers.

Housing Types in High Density Residential Districts

- Apartment buildings, with no specific size limitation if compatible in scale and character with other neighborhood buildings and the recommendations of applicable plans.
- Townhouses or rowhouses.

In larger High Density districts, smaller scale and lower-density housing types may also be present, primarily reflecting the mixing of new with older and historic buildings. In general, however, the expectation is that most buildings will be relatively dense multi-family types.

The *Comprehensive Plan* provides supplemental map notes for some of its mapped recommended land use districts, and also specifies that its mapped recommendations are necessarily general, and need to be supplemented by additional, more-detailed planning to determine the specific land use recommendation applicable to a particular property:

...The [Generalized Future Land Use Plan] Map is a representation of the recommended pattern of future land uses at a large scale, and is not intended for application on a parcel-by-parcel basis; nor should it be interpreted as similar to a zoning district map. The recommended land use district designations used on the Generalized Future Land Use Plan Maps are supplemented by the Land Use Plan Map Notes keyed to specific locations on the maps. These notes provide additional explanation regarding the intent of the land use designation as applied to that location, and may indicate some of the additional land use and design issues and choices that should be addressed in more-detailed neighborhood plans or special area plans.

The *Comprehensive Plan* Generalized Future Land Use Plan Map applies the following note to the segment of the Old University Avenue corridor designed High Density Residential and which includes the proposed Brown Lofts apartments:

Note 9: Development density and the heights of buildings should be greatest adjacent to Campus Drive and then step down to lower densities and heights on the University Avenue frontage, and again along the south frontage of University Avenue to provide a good transition to the low density residential neighborhood to the south.

The proposed Brown Lofts apartment project will provide 64 dwelling units on an approximately 0.586 acre site, or a net density of 109 units per acre. This is considerably above the recommended range for High Density Residential districts, although individual projects outside the average range are to be expected--particularly near the central/campus area where much higher densities are found than elsewhere in the city. However, the *Comprehensive Plan* recommends that significant changes in land use and intensity should be guided by the recommendations of an adopted neighborhood or special area plan that establishes local objectives for the sub-area and provides the more-detailed land use and design recommendations needed to ensure that any new development is compatible with the existing and planned character of the surrounding neighborhood. At this time, no more-detailed plans exist for this area, although the Regent Neighborhood Association has received funding from the City of Madison to engage a consultant to assist in preparing development and design guidelines for the University Avenue Corridor from Breese Terrace to Grand Avenue. Recommendations from this planning process are expected in the Fall.

The *Comprehensive Plan* map note for this area recommends that within the High Density Residential area, the relatively higher densities should be located closest to Campus Drive; and that the density and the scale of development step down to the north frontage of University Avenue, and then step down again to the south frontage to provide a good transition to the smaller buildings and lower densities in the University Heights neighborhood to the south. Perhaps a more-detailed plan for this area might recommend even greater densities for properties along the north frontage of University Avenue and adjacent to Campus Drive, but absent such a plan, a four story building with 109 units per acre and high lot coverage seems at best only marginally consistent with the recommended “step down” in intensity along the University Avenue south frontage.

On the other hand, although the proposed building is significantly larger and covers more of its lot than the other buildings in the surrounding area, its “urban” character and design seem generally appropriate for the Old University Avenue corridor. The building is also more attractive than some of the other recently-approved developments in the area; and is definitely more attractive than the vacant student housing facility currently on the site.

Staff consider the overall building design and how well it fits within the neighborhood to be more important factors than its nominal density in evaluating the project’s consistency with the recommendations in the *Comprehensive Plan*. As noted above, the size of the building is probably larger than ideal in terms of fitting in best with the surrounding context. But this is not a bad building by any means, and its overall design, if not necessarily its size, is generally compatible with the neighborhood character of its surroundings. Replacement of the deteriorating Princeton House would also be consistent with general *Comprehensive Plan* objectives to promote selective infill within established neighborhoods, and on balance, this proposal may represent an acceptable redevelopment project for this large site.

Consistency with University Heights Historic District Criteria

This proposed project is within the University Heights Historic District and within the HIST-UH zoning overlay district. At their March 19, 2007 meeting, the Madison Landmarks Commission reviewed this project for consistency with the standards and criteria established for the University Heights Historic District, and the project received a Certificate of Appropriateness. The Landmarks Commission review did not consider either building height or building setbacks, since these elements are not among the criteria established for review of new construction in the University Heights Historic District. The Commission did consider the design of the front building facade, and the effect created by the forward-facing elements alternating with recessed elements of the facade, because the Commission does review the “rhythm of masses and spaces” on the facade of a new building. In that regard, the Commission concluded that the criteria had been met.

Compatibility with Surrounding Properties

From the beginning, a concern of many neighborhood residents has been whether the proposed building is a good fit within the neighborhood and the University Heights Historic District. The applicant has met frequently with the neighborhood throughout the course of this project, and has redesigned the project several times in response to neighborhood comments and concerns. The original proposal brought to the neighborhood was for a much taller mixed use building which was poorly received by the majority, who felt it was inconsistent with the character of the area. (This proposal also probably would have had difficulty obtaining a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Landmarks Commission). The project was subsequently redesigned as a four-story building, but as a consequence, the applicant believed it necessary to have very high lot coverage in order to provide

the number of units (and the parking for those units) necessary to make the project feasible. When the revised building proposal was taken to the neighborhood, the general consensus was that it was a great improvement over the first proposal, but many still were concerned that the building was too large and too close to the lot lines compared to other neighborhood buildings.

The minimal building setbacks were a particular point of discussion with the neighborhood as this project evolved. Among other comments, it was noted that the proposed building setbacks along University Avenue were less than the setbacks of other properties along the street, that a four-story building so close to the rear lot line might visually overwhelm the smaller properties to the south, and that the building blocked visibility at the Princeton Avenue corner. These observations were generally accurate, and the applicant has made several changes to the building setbacks during the review process in response to these concerns.

The applicant elected to leave the basic front setback along University Avenue largely unchanged, partly to allow some adjustment to the rear setbacks. However, the depth of the recessed bays on the front facade was increased from 5 feet to 8 feet, significantly enhancing the visual articulation and helping to break up the apparent mass of the building. The front setback of the element at the Princeton Avenue corner was increased by an additional 2 feet to provide improved visibility at this intersection; and the setback along the northern segment of the western facade of the building was also increased by 4 feet for the same reason. Along the rear facade, the first story setback at the western end of the building has been increased from 3 feet to 5 feet 6 inches compared to the original proposal. As a result of these design changes, the visible part of the building is now set back farther from the property lines than the below-ground parking levels, allowing setbacks to be increased without compromising the functionality of the parking garage.

While each of these changes are relatively modest, together they at least partially address the concerns expressed on this issue.

Urban Design Commission Action

The Urban Design Commission gave this project **Initial Approval** at their May 25, 2007 meeting. (See attached report.)

Inclusionary Zoning

The Brown Lofts apartments will consist entirely of rental units, so the project is not subject to inclusionary zoning regulations.

Demolition Permit Application for the Princeton House

The existing Princeton House was originally built in 1965 as a private residence hall for University of Wisconsin students. As noted in the materials submitted with the demolition permit application, this building is badly deteriorating and obsolete in today's market. The building does not meet current code requirements in many areas, including accessibility, fire protection, building insulation, hallway ceiling heights, and elevators. Windows, bathrooms, and most mechanical equipment, plumbing and electrical components would need replacing either due to age or lack of compliance with current building codes. All surfaces need refinishing. Constructed essentially as a dormitory, the units are small, plain sleeping rooms, and lack the living rooms, kitchens, and individual bathrooms minimally required to convert the building to apartments. The concrete block construction of the building would make it extremely expensive to rearrange the interior walls or to

retrofit the building with new heating, air-conditioning, plumbing, or electrical services. The applicant has determined that the building's construction and current condition make it financially unfeasible to upgrade it to another use, and staff have no information that contradicts this conclusion.

In addition, the architecture of the building is typical of the worst of the 1960's and doesn't fit in at all with the context of the University Heights Historic District, or with the other structures along the frontage. While scale may be an issue, the proposed Brown Lofts apartment building is a more attractive building whose overall design is much more in keeping with the architectural flavor of the University Heights area. Considering the badly deteriorated condition of the existing building, its obsolete design, and the multiple physical constraints and prohibitive cost to remodel the building for an alternative use, the Planning Division staff believe that its replacement with a new structure built to today's standards for today's market is reasonable.

CONCLUSION:

Proposed Rezoning from OR District to PUD (GDP-SIP) District

Planning Division staff consider the primary issue with this project to be the compatibility of the proposed building's size, scale and placement with the recommendations of the *Comprehensive Plan* and the context of the surrounding neighborhood. While the proposed density of 109 units per acre is outside the average density range recommended in the *Comprehensive Plan* for High Density Residential districts, staff is not as concerned with density *per se* as with the design implications of a building of this density---particularly in regard to lot coverage (building setbacks), height and mass. Although the building is larger, the effective person-density of the proposed 64-unit Brown Lofts apartments will be less than one-half the person-density of the former Princeton House---which had 102 dormitory-style rooms intended for double-occupancy.

As noted in the analysis above, the proposed four-story building is at least one story taller than most other buildings along the south frontage of this segment of University Avenue, although some of the shorter buildings south of the site may appear similarly tall due to the rise in elevation into University Heights. However, University Avenue is an important street recommended for relatively high density development, and staff do not consider four stories necessarily inappropriate at this location. The building will definitely appear large when viewed from the rear yards of the adjacent properties to the south, but the deep recesses and increased set back of some elements will help to offset this effect to some extent---although probably less than some residents of those properties would like.

A more significant design concern in staff's view is the width of the building, which extends for 220 feet along most of the block frontage between Princeton Avenue and North Prospect Avenue. Most other buildings along this four block south frontage of University Avenue are much narrower and occupy much smaller lots. Staff believe that it is the width of the building, rather than its height, that primarily makes it seem larger and out-of-scale with its surroundings. However, the articulation of the front facade creates a visual rhythm similar to the smaller buildings on individual lots---although it still will clearly appear as a much larger structure. The depth of the recessed elements has been increased since the project was initially proposed, and these now represent a substantial articulation of building form, not just a minor visual break. Both the Landmarks Commission and the Urban Design Commission considered the issue of maintaining a consistent rhythm of building spacing along University Avenue, and both concluded that the building recesses did provide sufficient articulation to create at least a sense of spacing more compatible with other buildings along the street. The deep recessed bays on the rear facade will have a similar effect, although in both cases the effect is not the same as having separate buildings on separate lots, particularly when viewed head-on.

Currently, there is no adopted neighborhood or special area plan to provide detailed land use and design recommendations for developments along the University Avenue corridor. But the proposed Brown Lofts apartment building is relatively large and tight on its site compared to other buildings along the south frontage of University Avenue, and the Planning Division staff cannot conclude that the project is fully consistent with all planning and design recommendations regarding compatibility with existing development. On the other hand, this is generally a well-designed and attractive project whose architecture, if not its scale, is generally compatible with the neighborhood character. During the long review process, design modifications have been made to the project which, while individually modest, have meaningfully improved the proposal compared to the initial application. The project as proposed would also clearly represent a significant improvement over the existing, now-vacant Princeton House. While concerns remain regarding the relative size of this very large building compared to its neighbors, considering the project as a whole, the Planning Division staff do not find a compelling reason to conclude that this project should be not be approved.

Demolition Permit Application

Planning Division staff concur with the evaluation of the existing Princeton House provided by the applicant. This building is obsolete, deteriorating, and its specialized former use and multiple physical constraints make it financially unfeasible to remodel the building for an alternative use. The building is also an unattractive, outdated design that detracts from the character of the street and the adjacent neighborhood. Provided that the proposed alternative use of the site is found acceptable, staff believe that the standards for approval of a demolition permit can be met. A recycling plan will need to be approved by George Dreckman, Recycling Coordinator, prior to issuance of the permit.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Proposed Rezoning from OR District to PUD (GDP-SIP) District

If, after considering the comments provided by residents of the surrounding neighborhood and the reviewing agencies, and hearing the testimony at the public hearing, the Plan Commission is comfortable that, on balance, the proposed Brown Lofts apartments represents an appropriate redevelopment generally compatible with the recommendations of the *Comprehensive Plan* and the context of the surrounding neighborhood and the University Heights Historic District, the Planning Division recommends that the Plan Commission forward the application to rezone property at 1815 University Avenue from the Office Residence District to the Planned Unit Development (General Development Plan-Specific Implementation Plan) District with a recommendation of **approval**, subject to:

1. Comments of the reviewing agencies.
2. The Zoning Text for the PUD shall be revised to specify multiple-family dwelling units as the allowed use.

Demolition Permit Application

If the Plan Commission supports the proposed rezoning to allow construction of the Brown Lofts apartment building, the Planning Division believes that the standards for approval of a demolition permit for the existing Princeton House can be met and recommends that the Plan Commission **approve** the demolition of the existing structure at 1815 University Avenue, subject to input at the public hearing and comments from the reviewing agencies.



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
608 267 8677 TDD

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

Principal Engineers
Michael R. Dailey, P.E.
Christina M. Bachmann, P.E.
John S. Fahrney, P.E.
David L. Benzschawel, P.E.
Gregory T. Fries, P.E.

Operations Supervisor
Kathleen M. Cryan

Hydrogeologist
Joseph L. DeMorett, P.G.

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

DATE: April 11, 2007
TO: Plan Commission
FROM: Larry D. Nelson, P.E., City Engineer
SUBJECT: 1815 University Avenue Rezoning and Demolition

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. Applicant shall not be allowed to discharge roof water over public sidewalk. An internal storm system is required.
2. Applicant shall design and construct a terrace treatment along University Avenue to prevent terrace erosion, particularly at the bus stop.
3. Mailing addresses will need to be assigned to each apartment. Applicant shall submit for approval an addressing plan of each floor showing the apartment number designation. Contact Lori Zenchenko at 266-5952 or via email lzenchenko@cityofmadison.com.
4. If the Applicant installs a soil retention system within or along any portions of the public right of way, it shall be installed in accordance with a plan that has been stamped by a professional engineer and approved by the City Engineer. The Applicant shall assume full responsibility under this for any damage because of the soils retention system. The Contractor performing the installation shall be 'pre-qualified' to work in the City right of way.

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: 1815 University Avenue Rezoning and Demolition

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 The site plan shall include a full and complete legal description of the site or property being subjected to this application.

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.

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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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).
 - Control 80% TSS (5 micron particle).
 - Provide infiltration in accordance with NR-151.
 - Provide substantial thermal control.
 - Provide oil & grease control from the first 1/2" of runoff from parking areas.

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

NOTE: Email file transmissions preferred lzenchenko@cityofmadison.com . Include the site address in this transmittal.

- 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.

- 5.2 The applicant shall obtain all necessary sewer connection permits and sewer plugging permits prior to any utility work.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 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

April 13, 2007

TO: Plan Commission

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

SUBJECT: **1815 University Avenue – Rezoning – His to PUD (GDP-SIP) - 64 Unit Apartments**

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. A condition of approval shall be that no residential parking permits will be issued for 1815 University Avenue, this would be consistent with projects. In addition, the applicant shall inform all owners and/or tenants of this facility of the requirement in their condominium documentation, apartment leases and zoning text; however, the designated inclusionary dwelling units at 1815 University Ave., shall be eligible for residential parking permits according to the inclusionary zoning. The applicant shall provide addresses and apartment numbers for designated inclusionary dwelling units, eligible for residential parking permits to City Traffic Engineer/Parking Manager. The applicant shall note in the Zoning Text the inclusionary zoning dwelling units.
2. 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.

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMENTS

3. The applicant shall modify the driveway covered entrance be designed to provide adequate sight distance for a clear visibility triangle of 10 ft on both sides at the Princeton Ave. driveway approach. The applicant could modify this with a 2 ft high barrier and windows or air opening to 8 ft height clear for visibility for pedestrian and vehicle safety at the public right-of-way.
4. The applicant shall pull the first floor corner of the building and plantings back from the University Ave. and Princeton Ave. corner property line a minimum of 25 ft back in both directions to form a clear visibility triangle at the corner according to M.G.O.

5. The applicant shall modify the bike parking area on the north side of University Ave. so that the bicycle parking spaces do not encroach on the five (5) ft public sidewalk. Any encroachment onto the public right-of-way will need to be approved by City of Madison Real Estate Division prior to plans being submitted for approval.
6. The applicant shall indicate the type of bicycle racks to be installed both inside and outside.
7. The applicant should 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:

8. 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 and across the street, 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'.
9. A "Stop" sign shall be installed at a height of seven (7) feet at the driveway approach. 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. All existing driveway approaches on which are to be abandoned shall be removed and replaced with curb and gutter and noted on the plan.
11. 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.
12. 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: John Barton
Fax: 608-663-5151
Email: jbarton@brownhousedesigns.com

DCD: DJM: dm

**CITY OF MADISON
INTERDEPARTMENTAL
CORRESPONDENCE**

Date: April 10, 2007

To: Plan Commission
From: Kathy Voeck, Assistant Zoning Administrator
Subject: 1815 University Avenue, Demo and Rezoning

Present Zoning District: OR (Hist UH)

Proposed Use: Demolish apt. building & build 64-unit apt. building (28 one-bdrm, 36 two-bdrm units)

Requested Zoning District: PUD(GDP-SIP)

Conditional Use: 28.04(22) Demo of a principal building requires Plan Com approval

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

1. Meet all applicable State accessible requirements, including but not limited to:
 - a. Provide a minimum of **three** accessible stalls (**two in the garage and one in the covered parking area**) striped per State requirements. A minimum of one of the stalls shall be a van accessible stall 8' wide with an 8' striped out area adjacent.
 - b. Show signage at the head of the stalls. Accessible signs shall be a minimum of 60" from the bottom of the sign and the ground.
 - c. Show the accessible path from the stalls to the building entrance or elevator. The stalls shall be as near the accessible entrance and elevator as possible. Show ramps, curbs, or wheel stops where required.
2. Provide one 10' x 35' loading area with 14' vertical clearance to be shown on the plan. The loading area shall be exclusive of drive aisle and maneuvering space. **If this loading area cannot be provided, request and obtain approval of the Plan Commission to specifically waive this requirement or it will need to be provided.**
3. Provide a **minimum of fifty-seven** bike parking stalls in a safe and convenient location on an impervious surface to be shown on the final plan. The lockable enclosed lockers or racks or equivalent structures in or upon which the bicycle may be locked by the user shall be securely anchored to the ground or building to prevent the lockers or racks from

/

being removed from the location. NOTE: A bike-parking stall is two feet by six feet with a five-foot access area. Structures that require a user-supplied locking device shall be designed to accommodate U-shaped locking devices. (Note: Seven of the surface bike stalls appear to be encroaching into the right-of-way.)

4. Obtain approval from City Forestry for any trees being placed in the right of way area.

ZONING CRITERIA

Bulk Requirements	Required	Proposed
Lot Area	34,480 sq. ft.	25,520 sq. ft. *
Lot width	50'	110'
Usable open space	7,000 sq. ft.	4,046 sq. ft. *
Front yard	20'	5' *
Side yards	29.5' and 26.37'	5' and 3' *
Rear yard	30'	5.5' *
Floor area ratio	2.0	3.02 *
Building height	---	4 stories

Site Design	Required	Proposed
Number parking stalls	105 (of those 16 surface stalls)	78 garage 3 covered 81 total *
Accessible stalls	2 garage 1 covered 3 total	(1)
Loading	1 (10' x 35') area	(2)
Number bike parking stalls	57	(3)
Landscaping	Yes	(4)
Lighting	Yes	Rev. at building permit

Other Critical Zoning Items	
Urban Design	Yes
Historic District	University Heights Historic District
Landmark building	No
Flood plain	No
Utility easements	None shown
Barrier free (ILHR 69)	Yes

With the above conditions, the proposed project **does** comply with all of the above requirements.

Since this project is being rezoned to the **(PUD)** district, and there are no predetermined bulk requirements, we are reviewing it based on the criteria for the **OR (R-6)** district, because of the surrounding land uses.

/



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: 4/13/07
TO: Plan Commission
FROM: Edwin J. Ruckriegel, Fire Marshal
SUBJECT: **1815 University Ave.**

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.)

1. None.

GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS

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

2. Provide fire apparatus access as required by Comm 62.0509 and MGO 34.19, as follows:
 - 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.
 - c. Provide a completed MFD "Fire Apparatus Access and Fire Hydrant Worksheet" with the site plan submittal.

Please contact Scott Strassburg, Fire Code Enforcement Officer at 608-261-9843 if you have questions regarding the above items.

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: May 23, 2007

TITLE: 1815 University Avenue – Demolition and
Development of a 64-Unit Apartment
Project, PUD(GDP-SIP). 5th Ald. Dist.
(05949)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: May 23, 2007

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 23, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1815 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Patrick McGowan, Laurel Brown, Steve Brown, Tim Wadlington, Robbie Webber and Joseph C. Hanauer. The presentation directed by McGowan emphasized the following changes to the proposed plans:

- The building material palette has been altered to provide that masonry brick will be used on all sides, in combination with a buff colored limestone banding and above the first floor level and stone veneer base.
- The masonry brick will be economy in size.
- Building setbacks have been adjusted from a previously proposed 2-feet to 6-feet at the corner abutting Princeton Avenue, in addition to 7-feet at the corner along University Avenue.
- The south side (rear of the building) has been pulled in to provide for a minimum setback of 5-feet along the rear property line to accommodate landscaping.
- The collective adjustments to the setbacks at Princeton Avenue and University Avenue provide for the resolve of safety issues with the site distance raised by neighbors.

Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- A good job with setback adjustments; look at the utilization of hydrangea and other species relevant to survival issues, in addition provide a more formal hedge treatment instead of alternating.
- Good work, better project; consider the full application of stone veneer on the center portion of the building featuring the main entry on the north elevation (University Avenue) with the ends of the building featuring all brick. Cornice details still detracting with the rear elevation fenestration needing more variety and window types.
- The design of the building should not preclude the potential for retail despite being beyond the purview of the Commission.

ACTION:

On a motion by Woods, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-1-1) with Barrett voting no and Wagner abstaining. The motion provided that the applicant return with final building materials and colors, as well as revised building elevations per comments within the staff report, along with consideration of dentils as a cornice treatment.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 5, 6, 6, 6/7, 7 and 7.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1815 University Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.5
	6	6	6	-	-	-	7	6/7
	6	6	6	-	-	-	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	6
	5	5	5	5	-	5	4	5
	7	7	6	6	-	-	8	7

General Comments:

- Nicely done. Good infill, appropriate massing and size.
- Much improved street interface.
- Very nice to see project continuing to improve.
- Not acceptable only because the design precludes retail. Yes, a street as major as old University Avenue must have retail; right now it is a retail desert.
- Look at amount of stone, window pattern at south façade.



Department of Planning & Development
 Planning/Inspection/Real Estate/Community & Economic Development
 Mark A. Olinger, Director

Bradley J. Murphy
 Planning Unit
 215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
 P.O. Box 2985
 Madison, WI 53701-2985
 (608) 266-4635

REVIEW REQUEST FOR:

- PRELIMINARY PLAT
- FINAL PLAT
- LOT DIVISION/CSM
- CONDITIONAL USE
- DEMOLITION
- REZONING
- INCLUSIONARY ZONING
- OTHER

1815 UNIVERSITY AVENUE
RZ: HIS 4H OR → PLD(LDP-SIP)
DEMOLISH APARTMENT BUILDING AND BUILD 64-UNIT APT BUILDING
STEVE BROWN APARTMENTS / JOHN BARTON - BROWNHOUSE

PLANNING UNIT CONTACT: MICHAEL WAIDGLICH

RETURN COMMENTS BY: 12 APRIL 2007

PLEASE ALSO EMAIL OR FAX ANY COMMENTS TO THE APPLICANT:

Applicant E-mail: jbarton@brownhouse.com Fax: 608-5151

Date Submitted: 21 FEBRUARY 2007 Plan Commission: 23 APRIL 2007

Date Circulated: 26 FEBRUARY 2007 Common Council: 01 MAY 2007

CIRCULATED TO:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> ZONING | <input type="checkbox"/> DISABILITY RIGHTS | <input type="checkbox"/> ALD. _____ DIST. _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> FIRE DEPARTMENT | <input type="checkbox"/> POLICE DEPT. - THURBER | <input type="checkbox"/> MADISON GAS & ELECTRIC |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PARKS DIVISION | <input type="checkbox"/> CITY ASSESSOR - SEIFERT | <input type="checkbox"/> ALLIANT ENERGY |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TRAFFIC ENG. | <input type="checkbox"/> MADISON METRO - SOBOTA | <input type="checkbox"/> A T & T |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CITY ENG. - GEBERT | <input type="checkbox"/> BOARD OF EDUCATION C/O SUPT. | <input type="checkbox"/> T D S |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CITY ENG. - PEDERSON | <input type="checkbox"/> PUBLIC HEALTH - SCHLENKER | <input type="checkbox"/> MT. VERNON TELE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> WATER UTILITY | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CDBG - CONSTANS | <input type="checkbox"/> NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> REAL ESTATE - EKOLA | | |

Review the above as per time schedule set in Chapter 16.23(5)(b)2; 16.23(5)(3)3; or Chapter 28, City of Madison Ordinance; OR your agency's comments cannot be considered prior to action.

One copy for your files; one copy for file of appropriate telephone company; PLEASE RETURN one copy with joint comments.

The above is located in your district. A copy is on file in the Planning & Development Office for review. If you have any questions or comments, contact our office at 266-4635.

The above is located within or near the limits of your neighborhood organization. A copy is on file in the Planning & Development Office for review. If you have any questions or comments, contact our office at 266-4635.

RETURN COMMENTS TO: PLANNING UNIT, DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

NO COMMENTS / YOUR COMMENTS:
S.W.

April 11, 2007

City of Madison
Urban Design Commission c/o Bill Fruhling
Plan Commission c/o Michael Waidelich
Landmarks c/o Kitty Rankin
Planning and Development
215 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd
Madison WI 53703

Re: Setbacks and Height of Proposed PUD for Brown Lofts, 1815 University Ave.

Dear Commission Members:

The undersigned have several concerns about the proposed Brown Lofts at 1815 University Ave.

1. Most importantly from our point of view, the rear setback is much too small. There will be a block wall across the entire rear of the 303 Princeton Ave. and 1818 Kendall Ave. properties which will be much higher than the current wooden fence. Perhaps as much as 10 feet higher – it is hard to tell from the drawings. This wall might even be higher than the 8-foot wooden fence on the 1818 Kendall Ave. property. On top of this there will be patios, from which the new residents will look down onto the existing back yards.

This block wall will be only 3 feet from the property line. It should be noted that the property line is actually in the MIDDLE of some of the existing retaining walls. The rear walls of the main parts of the building, which go up about 35 feet more, will be only 6 (west), 10-12 (middle) and 8 (east) feet from the property line.

2. It should be noted that the only comparable recently approved building in the area, Old University Place in the 2300 block, has a significant rear setback (12 feet?).

3. The other setbacks are also too small. To preserve the current neighborhood feel, the setbacks on University and Princeton should be similar to those of the buildings around it (generally 10-15 feet), and preferably similar to the existing building. In the current design the front of the building will tower over the sidewalk, much closer to the sidewalk than almost all the buildings within several blocks on either side.

4. The building is too tall – exactly as high in absolute elevation as the buildings up the hill behind it on Kendall. This seems unreasonable on a hill. How much taller is the proposed building than the existing one? (Again not clear from the plans.)

5. How will construction be possible only three feet from the property line? Especially since some of the existing retaining walls actually encroach onto the Princeton House property? Will these be removed and rebuilt? How will the ground be stabilized during construction? And how will maintenance be accomplished on the rear walls once they are built?

6. Plantings of arborvitae are proposed for the central rear area. Will they really survive in such a narrow space (3 feet or less)? And how will access for maintenance (including weed removal) even be possible in such a narrow space?

/

April 11, 2007

Page 2

7. Currently there are electric lines as well as phone lines across part of the rear property line. A utility pole currently stands well onto Princeton House property. Will these be removed? They are within reach of, possibly touching, some the proposed balconies, which appear to come right up to the property line.

Thank you very much for considering these issues.

Sincerely,

Barbara A. Lewis
1818 Kendall Ave.

A. Baha Balantekin
1818 Kendall Ave.

/

April 9, 2007

City of Madison
Urban Design Commission c/o Bill Fruhling
Plan Commission c/o Michael Waidelich
Traffic Engineering c/o John Leach
Landmarks c/o Kitty Rankin
Planning and Development
215 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd
Madison, Wi 53703

Re: Setback and Material Standards for Proposed PUD for Brown Lofts, 1815 University Avenue

Dear Commission Members:

The undersigned, while pleased with the general direction of the design efforts for Brown Lofts at 1815 University Avenue, wish to express concern with the proposed setbacks and material choices for the proposed apartments. While the present plans for Brown Lofts are a dramatic improvement over what was originally shown to the neighborhood, the proposed footprint is still too large for the site. The existing setback lines along both University and Princeton Avenues are well established and are part of the feeling of the neighborhood. The proposed building clearly oversteps these lines, and the consequences for neighborhood aesthetics and traffic safety are not good.

Reduction of Established Neighborhood Setbacks

Princeton Avenue Setback- The setback for the existing 1815 building along Princeton Avenue is approximately thirteen (13) feet. The immediate neighboring apartment building, 303 Princeton Avenue, is ten (10) feet from the existing sidewalk. Across the street in the same block, the apartment building at 304 Princeton Avenue (also owned by Steve Brown) has a setback of eight (8) feet.

Brown Lofts proposes a setback along Princeton Avenue of only 3 feet, and three floors of balconies would actually reach the lot line along Princeton Avenue. We believe this reduction in setback is unwise for architectural and traffic safety reasons.

Setbacks and the University Heights Sense of Place- If the City were to approve the setbacks proposed for Brown Lofts, the established neighborhood balance between open space and structures would be seriously compromised. People approaching the proposed building on Princeton Avenue would be confronted by a substantial four-story building

invading the long established setback created by the existing apartments and residences. A reduction in building setbacks of the proposed magnitude would significantly erode the historic architectural rhythms that are essential to the overall sense of place in the University Heights Historic District, even at its edge.

University Avenue Setback-Anyone traveling west on University Avenue today has a sense of the traditional setback lines on both sides of the street. The setback for the existing 1815 building from University Avenue is about thirteen (13) feet. Its immediate neighbor, a brick apartment building at 1805 University Avenue, has an identical 13-foot setback. The proposed development reduces this University Avenue setback to five (5) feet. A limited setback similar to that proposed by Brown Lofts was used in the 2200 block of University Avenue (the former site of the Ivy Inn). We find the noticeable canyon effect created there a good reason not to approve the limited setbacks proposed for 1815 University Avenue.

Setbacks and Safety- In spite of the traffic calming measures recently installed on Spooner Street, Princeton Avenue still serves as part of a significant route that carries traffic between Monroe Street and University Avenue. A lot of cars wait at the stop sign at Princeton for a gap in the heavy traffic of pedestrians, bicycles, mopeds, cars and buses along University Avenue. Even with existing sight lines, the intersection is difficult.

The proposed 8-foot reduction in setback on University Avenue coupled with the 10-foot reduction in setback from the Princeton Avenue lot line, would severely limit visibility at this busy intersection. Since the existing Princeton Avenue stop sign is also about 5 feet behind the University Avenue property line and drivers are seated approximately 6 feet behind the front of their car, the seated driver (effectively 11 feet behind the University Avenue property line) will have no view of approaching traffic. The proposed building would block a motorist's view and drivers will need to inch out into the drive lane to view traffic approaching from the east.

Brick to be used for Construction

The design for proposed Brown Lofts building is clearly patterned after existing brick apartment buildings located at 1805 University and 303/304 Princeton Avenue. This is a welcome complement, but we note that each of these existing buildings is all brick on all facades. The exterior of the proposed building should also be constructed of attractive

City of Madison
Planning and Development
April 9, 2007
Page Three

brick on all facades. The University Heights Historic District has always striven to maintain meaningful architectural standards, even when budgets are stretched to do so. The prime example of this maintenance of standards is the Madison School District's use of a red clay tile replacement roof on Randall School.

Conclusion

The undersigned appreciate the efforts by Steve Brown to adapt his design to neighborhoods standards. We suggest three possible adjustments to the proposed plan:

1. Parking adjustments such as small car parking, angle parking, and modifications to stall width might help to reduce the building's width.
2. The dwelling units that form the corner of the building at Princeton and University should be reduced in size so that the building becomes more recessive at the corner and thus affords better sight lines for traffic safety.
3. Consider a below grade parking footprint that is larger than the above grade building structure. This combination would help to maintain parking options while creating

From a long-term perspective, these adjustments may benefit Steve Brown, because the building will seem to be part of the neighborhood, rather than a violation of its character. This feeling is particularly important to the future prospect of converting the building to a condominium.

Respectfully Submitted by University Heights Neighbors

Annelle M. [unclear] 227 Princeton Ave 238-7544

Marion S. Meyer 115 Ely Pl 238-6944

Raymond S. Brown 115 Ely Pl 238-6944

Babara A. Lewis (Lewis) 1818 Kendall Ave. 233-1054

Stella Balantekin 1818 Kendall Ave. 233-1054

Colleen Scott COLIN SCOTT 1817 Kendall Ave 231-3341

Rose M. Scott ROSE M. SCOTT 1817 Kendall Ave 231-3341

Mary Linzer (Linzer) 1811 Kendall Av 232-1880

John M. Neujahr (Neujahr) 163 N. Prospect Ave. 233-5753

St. Cecilia (Claude) (CLAUDE) 225 Princeton Ave 233-2565

Just S. Pondrom Pondrom 210 Princeton 238-7548

Cyrena N. Pondrom 210 Princeton 238-7548

Hilda Neujahr 168 N. Prospect 233-5753

Robert Feuchel 1900 ARINGTON PL 231-1267

Mary Kne (Mary Vernon) 1900 Arlington Place

John Koffel Koffel 227 Princeton

Name-Signed and Printed

Address

Robert Wood 137 N. PROSPECT AVENUE

Patricia Wood 137 N. PROSPECT AVENUE

Jessie D. Giblin 113 Ely Place

Jane H. Ross 1819 Summit Ave

John Hess (Hess) 1819 Summit Ave.

Susan Shapiro Susan Shapiro 205 Princeton Ave

Mark Shapiro MARK SHAPIRO 205 PRINCETON AVE

Laura Wood 205 Princeton Ave

Antony W. Stetten 225 Princeton Ave.

Parks, Timothy

From: Cleveland, Julie

Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2007 9:26 AM

To: Al Martin; ALL ALDERS; Bill Roberts; Bill White; Bob March; Bruce Woods; Cathleen Feland; Chuck Heath; Dave Cieslewicz; David Dryer; Dean Mosiman; Doug; F Sanders; Jeanne Hoffman; Jeff Marx; Jennifer Smith; John Bieno; Katherine Rankin; Ledell Zellers; Lisa Geer ; Lou Host-Jablonski; Mark Olinger; Mary Yeater Rathbun; meetings@cityofmadison.com; Michael Waidelich; Mike Barrett; Mike Ivey; Mike Verveer; Nan Fey; Noel Radomski ; Paul Wagner; Peggy Yessa; Rebecca Cnare; Roger Hegg; Ruth Ethington; Timothy Parks; Todd Barnett; Veldran, Lisa; William Fruhling

Subject: Attachment from Noel Radomski

Please see attached forward from Ald. Noel Radomski:

From: Lynn Gilchrist [mailto:logilchrist1@charter.net]

Sent: Mon 3/19/2007 8:55 PM

To: Radomski, Noel

Subject: Urban Design Commission 3/21

Dear Noel:

I will be out of town when the Urban Design Commission meets on Wednesday to consider the 1815 University Avenue by Steve Brown.

I attended the Landmarks Commission today but when the issue of essentially the zero lot line was raised by Stuart Levitan, staff advised the commission that was not part of their consideration, only mass, flow of design etc. They said it was up to Zoning but I think that it is probably part of the UDC process.

I am concerned that zero lot line is inappropriate for this lot and for this neighborhood. Every other lot between Breeze and Allen, on University Ave. (south side) has front, side and rear set backs.

The project originally proposed an eight story building but is now down to 4 stories. At the last community meeting , which was only noticed to part of the district , Brown's folks stated that the front and side set back was 5 feet. It is now down to two feet front and side and only 3 feet in the rear.

If you visit the site, the old building footprint is a nice balance for the site and area. 13.6 feet is the front and side setback and 25 feet set back in the rear. This makes a nice balance of building and land. It should be the footprint or something close to it for any new building.

This really provides a 4 story wall up against the properties on Kendall Ave. Yes, PUD's are to be flexible but in this case, it seems to be a rationale to toss out the concept of a building having some set backs. Is this the future of buildings on University Ave? I hope not. Every other building has met reasonable set backs and I think that this building should also.

Hope you are enjoying your service on the Council.

Thanks for reading this.

Lynn Gilchrist
113 Ely Place

3/20/2007



INVESTMENT REALTY SERVICES

3800 REGENT ST.
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53705

PHONE (608) 238-8888
FAX (608) 238-4319
CELL (608) 345-2198

JEROME A. PASDO, C.C.I.M

March 15, 2007

Steve Brown
120 W. Gorham Street
Madison, WI 53704

Re: 1815 University Avenue

Dear Steve:

I support your plans for the building in the 1800 block of University Avenue. I feel that the overall massing along University Avenue and the height complement the other properties on the street and in the neighborhood.

The exterior design also complements our building at 1801-05 University Avenue which we've owned for over twenty years. In addition, your façade indentation creates the appearance of four individual buildings when approached by automobile from either direction on University Avenue. While the 5 foot setback and verticality may initially appear tall, the borrowed open space from the UW Foundation building across the street does not leave one with the tunnel effect that occurs further west on University Avenue.

I feel you did an excellent job of the indenting in the rear to create more light for your apartments and potential for additional green space within those bays. Your residents will benefit and your neighbors behind will benefit even more.

Some commendable amenity features are the under-cover trash area and guest parking incorporated beneath the structure. These help alleviate two of the neighborhood's concerns.

The use of the heavier, sandstone-appearing, lower level is attractive with the brick above. However, the minimal setback of 5 ft. should have some pedestrian-friendly landscaping or embellishment so it does not appear as if they are walking past a blank 50 ft. wall. Your staff's creative talents can come up with something to alleviate that feeling. Some of my own landscaping elements in the narrow setbacks on Capitol area projects get "yanked out" occasionally by the binge drinkers, but we just replant them. Fortunately, binge drinking doesn't occur every night and I consider this part of our cost of having a pedestrian-friendly building in the neighborhood.



Certified Commercial Investment Member of the
National Association of Realtors


Investment Real Estate Brokerage/Analysis
Investment Counseling Tax Deferred Exchanges



Please pay attention to the detail in the handicapped ramp so it doesn't appear an unfriendly, concrete, skateboard ramp. I forgot to ask about this at the meeting, but that ramp probably does come right up to the sidewalk line.

I think the most important point is that this is a quality product that fulfills a need for modestly dense, quality housing in the west campus area. Many of the near west residents must now drive or bus in from the neighborhoods that they chose to live because those neighborhoods have quality housing in a quiet neighborhood. Thanks for doing that close to campus.

Cordially,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jerry Pasdo", written in a cursive style.

Jerry Pasdo

Cc: City of Madison Plan Commission
City of Madison Urban Design Commission
City of Madison Landmarks Commission

A: pasdo/Brown (#103)