

**TLNA Steering Committee Summary Report for the Houden Proposal for  
700 Block of E. Johnson (south side) 29 June 2017**

This report presents findings of the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Association's (TLNA) Steering Committee on the proposal by Chris Houden for 717 through 751 E. Johnson Street (south side only). These findings reflect committee work and input on the proposal versions that were presented on or before June 1, 2017.

Contents:

- 1. Purpose**
- 2. Committee Membership**
- 3. Committee Process**
- 4. TLNA Process**
- 5. Summary Findings**
- 6. Additional Concerns and Suggested Conditions**
- 7. Appendices**
  - Appendix A: Excerpts from Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan
  - Appendix B: Summary of House Tours
  - Appendix C: Results from Survey of Committee Members
  - Appendix D: Excerpts from City Zoning Code
  - Appendix E: TLNA Council letter of April 14, 2016
  - Appendix F: Affordable Housing FAQ from City

**1. Purpose:**

The report is provided to the TLNA Council as they prepare to consider the Council's position on the proposal. Prior to any Council Member forming a stance on the proposal the Committee encourages Council Members to carefully read this report and all materials on the TLNA Development Committee's website for the project which can be found here:

<http://www.tenneylapham.org/development.html>

**2. Committee Membership:**

The Committee has considered its members to be any neighbor who has come to one of its meetings, hence does not have fixed membership. We prefer not to hinder input from the community and recognize that other commitments can prevent perfect attendance, so agreed not to further limit membership.

These Tenney-Lapham neighbors attended at least one of the Committee meetings:

Patrick Heck (TLNA Development Committee Chair), Patty Prime (TLNA President), Richard Linster, Mark Bennett, Bob Klebba, Karla Handel, Elena Satut Duncan, Keith Wessel (all six TLNA Council members), Tim Meisenheimer, Greg Stroupe, Lori Wesel, Josh Day, Evelyn Atkinson, David Waugh, Chris Oddo, Beth Boeing, Doug Peterson, Joe Davis, Carol Weidel, Bob Hemauer, Matt Coogan, Liz Avenius, Brian Schildroth, Ross Kelley, Joe Harper, Joe Lusson, Jean Anderson, Mel Trudeau, Pat Kelly, Daniel Parker, Adam Chern, Megan Hellenbrand, Brian Haltinner, Susan Melum, Jonathan Lang, Beth Kubly, Kait Burrier, Joey Hoey, and Miles Walser. Given that the proposal evolved from the initial neighborhood meeting and over the subsequent 6 steering committee meetings, most committee members were unable to provide input on all proposal versions and to consistently attend meetings. That said, all committee members have been given the opportunity to provide feedback on this report's contents, so the range of neighbor opinions is well represented.

Houden team members who attended at least one meeting were Chris Houden (developer); Tom Miller (architect, Kahler Slater); Melissa Huggins and Katie Fadelli (both of Urban Assets), and Pat McCabe (Palisades Property).

Additionally, District 2 Alder Ledell Zellers attended several meetings. Heather Stouder initially represented the Planning Division of the Department of Planning and Community and Economic Development with Jessica Vaughn stepping in as the Department contact for the proposal after the Jan. 10 neighborhood meeting. Kevin Firchow took over as Planning staff representative for the last committee meeting. City Zoning Administrator Matt Tucker also attended a meeting and provided input on zoning matters.

Note that other neighbors have provided valuable input via email and other channels. Their opinions are reflected here, in meeting notes and in a separate Comments/Emails link on the [TLNA website](#) for the proposal.

The Committee formed after the January 10, 2017, neighborhood meeting called by Alder Zellers. As is typical, attendees were given the opportunity to join the soon-to-form TLNA Steering Committee and other neighbors were invited via the TLNA listserv in all meeting announcements. Alder Zellers sent postcard invitations for the neighborhood meeting to Tenney-Lapham (T-L) residences and businesses nearest to the proposal site.

### **3. Committee Process:**

Throughout the process the Committee aimed towards the issuance of this report rather than voting on a level of support for the proposal. In recent years TLNA Development Steering Committees have often not voted on a committee position, but have instead issued summary findings such as these to the full TLNA Council.

The Committee met on February 2 and 15; March 9, 16 and 20; April 20, and June 1. Email communication supplemented the meeting discussions. Note that some of the meeting dates were closer together than is typical for past proposals in Tenney-Lapham (T-L) due to the development team's desire to move quickly. The committee mostly accommodated these requests, but it did impact the ability of some neighbors to attend meetings as frequently as in past proposal evaluation processes. Per the request of many committee members, the March 16 meeting was held without the development team present. While meetings typically include the development team, those who wanted a neighbor-only meeting felt this approach would allow a freer exchange of opinions and a deeper discussion of the T-L Neighborhood Plan.

Depending on the desires and actions of the TLNA Council, as well as the input of the City and the Houden team, the Committee is prepared to hold additional meetings and provide additional feedback to the developer, although the Committee does not anticipate meeting again unless substantial revisions are to come forth.

### **4. TLNA Council Process:**

Prior to TLNA Council Members forming a stance on the proposal, the Steering Committee encourages a careful consideration of this report, its appendices, and website materials, but also recommends that they contact the Committee with any questions. The Steering Committee can be contacted via its Chair, Patrick Heck ([pwheck@gmail.com](mailto:pwheck@gmail.com)), and if a Council Member so desires, she can be included in any pertinent email dialogues with Committee members. Additionally, the Houden team is expected to present at a future TLNA Monthly meeting where additional questions can be posed and input can be obtained from the development team.

## **5. Summary Findings:**

The Steering Committee appreciates the developer's willingness to meet multiple times with the neighborhood and the Steering Committee to listen to concerns. The Houden team generally provided information, building renderings, and perspectives when the Committee made a request. They presented multiple versions of their proposal as it evolved and were in many cases willing to alter its composition when responding to neighborhood feedback.

### ***Initial Neighborhood Meeting and Initial Steering Committee Meeting***

The Houden team's preliminary proposal concepts were presented at the January 10, 2017 neighborhood meeting, including a discussion of their interpretations of what might be called for in the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan. The meeting focused on soliciting neighbor input for the block, including possible commercial/retail components and a mixed-use development. No building renderings were presented as the development team primarily took input from attendees on the possibility of a mixed-use and/or residential development, perhaps sharing some characteristics with City Row on the 600 block of E. Johnson. Housing affordability was the most mentioned concern from attendees, although almost all were open to seeing further developed concepts.

At the first Steering Committee meeting on February 2, 2017, the development team showed initial proposal concepts and renderings that were drawn from input at the wider neighborhood meeting and from discussions with city planning staff and Alder Zellers. The version they settled on included saving 751 and 745 E. Johnson, as well as moving 727 E. Johnson between those retained homes. The remaining 8 multi-flat homes were proposed for demolition, but they were open to a third party moving any homes if a third party could be identified. The 8 homes would be replaced by 3 new buildings with a 130-stall parking level partially underground and accessible from N. Livingston. The new buildings would be 4 floors, although the architect believed the 4<sup>th</sup> floor would be classified as a mezzanine, hence not be considered a 4<sup>th</sup> floor according to City zoning standards. The first floor of 751 E. Johnson would be converted to a commercial space. New commercial space was proposed for a space on the first floor of one of the new buildings atop the parking plinth. There would be a total of 80-90 market rate apartments.

Most attendees saw the first concept as having good potential. The addition of commercial space along E. Johnson was strongly supported by most, although a large majority felt that even more commercial space should be added. Most felt that the access to the new commercial spaces should be at ground level (similar to most existing E. Johnson and Willy St. businesses) rather than customers needing to go up stairs. Some felt that the new buildings' mass and size were inappropriately large and that more of the multi-flat rentals should be saved. The scale/mass and increase in units per acre density were also cited by some as better suited to the E. Washington corridor where infill has been welcomed by the neighborhood. Affordability was again mentioned as a concern as was a preference for more units with multiple bedrooms in order to support family housing options.

### ***Subsequent Committee Meetings***

On February 15 the proposal evolved to include more first floor commercial space in the new buildings, which was lowered to grade level per input from the previous meeting. This and increasing the new buildings' rear setback reduced the number of apartments and underground parking stalls to about 80 each, which was seen as a step in the right direction by most. The exterior design's evolution was not appreciably different than the previous version and a majority of attendees felt it was mostly positive, but needed work. The development team introduced an

offer to self-fund 10% of the 80 apartments as “affordable” units with tenant income capped at 80% of Dane County Median Income (CMI).

The developer expressed an unwillingness to pursue WHEDA tax credits for these affordable units or to expand the affordable component or further lower income caps because it would result in a large project delay and because they preferred not to have a larger affordability component. They did agree to discuss other affordable unit financing options with the City. TLNA’s Council’s 2016 statement supporting an overall goal of 20% affordable units with half of those at 50% CMI or lower in all new developments was discussed (statement available at [TLNA Development website](#)) as an indicator of the neighborhood’s goals.

The March 9 proposal version remained mostly the same, although some fine-tuning of the exterior design was shown. Unlike earlier committee meetings, more neighbors were able to attend and that new contingent expressed substantial concerns about the teardowns of 8 homes and scale/massing/footprints of the new buildings. They also objected to the removal of nearly 30 affordably priced apartments. There were extensive discussions indicating that the Neighborhood Plan has language supporting some aspects of the proposal and other language that does not. The Neighborhood Plan’s existing land use category of Medium Density Residential-1 (MDR1) and the proposed change to Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU) were discussed at length (see Plan excerpts in Appendix A). Those in attendance were split between general support of the proposal and opposition based primarily on objections to the number of teardowns and the scale of new buildings, as well as affordability concerns. The City’s FAQ on affordable housing CMI levels and resultant rents were discussed (Appendix F). It was noted that the rent figures on the FAQ should include utilities, so typically rents should be lower.

On March 16 the committee met without the development team present. Discussion focused on the Neighborhood Plan and how the proposal fit and/or did not fit, including what Plan modifications might be needed should the proposal move forward. Consensus was not reached as committee opinion was divided roughly into three camps (1) those strongly in support, (2) those strongly opposed, and (3) those supporting many components, but feeling the proposal needed more work.

Prior to the April 20 meeting, a group of committee members with experience in rehabbing/evaluating older homes toured 6 of the 8 properties proposed for demolition. A narrow majority of those who toured felt that many of the homes had potential to be rehabbed and to retain affordable rents. The minority felt most or all of the homes were not worth saving due to structural deficiencies, a history of neglect, removal of historical features, and/or internal rearrangement of walls/rooms. Summary tour results are in Appendix B and detailed tour reports from each individual are available at the development’s [TLNA website](#).

At the April 20 meeting, the proposal evolved to include the potential for moving 3 more existing homes to elsewhere in the neighborhood, thereby reducing the demolitions from 8 to 5. Details of the new buildings were further refined. Generally, committee opinions remained in the three camps previously described. The committee agreed to conduct an internal survey about the many issues that had been discussed so as to more objectively assess the level of support for various aspects of the proposal. The survey results synthesized committee input for the benefit of the development team, TLNA Council, city entities and other neighbors. Results are in Appendix C and also greatly informed the *Summary of Committee Opinions*, below. The developer reported that City affordable housing funds were not available for their project, but that they were willing to deed-restrict the site so that the affordable units would exist in perpetuity. This was looked upon favorably by most since WHEDA-financed affordable housing projects have a finite limit on the

number of years their units must keep income caps and affordable rents. The development team maintained that rents for their new market rate units, were comparable to those with the 80% CMI income cap, although skepticism was expressed by some committee members.

At the final committee meeting on June 1, the proposal evolved to address some of the issues brought up in the committee survey. Some fine-tuning of the proposal was presented, including removing the front gabled sections of the 4<sup>th</sup> floor mezzanine, which reduced the street presence of the new buildings. Opinions varied on the removal of the gables. The committee agreed to issue their summary report given that it appeared that committee members had settled into their opinions and given that the development team indicated it was unable to make substantial changes in scale/massing or in the number of apartments because the project would no longer be economically viable.

### ***Summary of Committee Opinions***

As previously indicated, the committee earlier divided roughly into three camps. By the conclusion of the committee process, and particularly as a result of the committee survey, the relative size of these camps can be estimated:

- (A) A strong **majority** of committee members is **opposed** to the new buildings' mass/scale/footprints and the number of teardowns, as well as the lack of a larger and wider-ranging affordable housing component.

The remaining **minority** is split between two groups:

- (B) Those **strongly in support** of the proposal as is, with some minor concerns, and
- (C) Those **somewhat in support** of the proposal but have some major concerns remaining.

While a great range of issues were discussed by the committee and opinions on most are reflected in the committee survey, perhaps most divisive were discussions about the developer's desire for a Neighborhood Plan amendment and zoning changes. The most applicable excerpts from the proposal site's current zoning category of Traditional Residential Varied 2 (TR-V2), along with the suggested zoning category of Neighborhood Mixed-Use (NMU) are contained in Appendix D while Neighborhood Plan excerpts are in Appendix A, as earlier mentioned.

The majority of committee members felt that TLNA Council's letter of April 14, 2016 (Appendix E) that expressed TLNA Council's support for the Plan's call for the preservation of existing housing stock and neighborhood character in the established portions of the neighborhood outweighed most portions of the Plan calling for additional commercial and mixed-use space on E. Johnson, including on the 700 block of E. Johnson in the future. This majority also felt that the Plan's other references to retaining neighborhood fabric were applicable. A large minority, however, felt that the Plan's visions for these blocks of E. Johnson were contradictory and that the Plan is not immutable; it needs to change as the City's needs evolve. This group generally felt that the development's scale and the teardowns were acceptable and desirable. This divide in opinions about the Plan's intent and applicability prevented the committee from carefully evaluating the development team's proposed changes to the Plan and zoning, so if the proposal should move forward, that evaluation should take place, perhaps by TLNA Council, a reconvened committee, and/or City staff. The implications and any unintended consequences of changing land use categories and zoning need to be fully explored for all prospective developments even if they have unanimous neighborhood support.

In the 2008 Neighborhood Plan, the suggested housing density for the entire block bound by E. Johnson, E. Dayton, N. Blount and N. Livingston Streets is 16-25 dwelling units per acre (MDR-1) with the exception of the Caribou/Laundromat parcel which is NMU at 16-40 du/acre. The City's Comprehensive Plan is similar, although the suggested density for the residential portions of the block is 16-40 du/acre. Recently, TLNA Council and the City approved a redevelopment project that will replace the two homes to the east of the Caribou (707-713 E. Johnson) by a mixed-use building with 92 du/acre density. These 21 apartments will be micro-units with a total bedroom count of 21, hence the density increase's impact is expected to be less than the du/acre might indicate. The neighborhood's approval of this project indicates that smaller projects with larger densities and accompanying zoning changes can be supported by the neighborhood on this same block. Some of the Houden Steering Committee, however, felt that allowing another large density project (the Houden proposal would result in 63 du/acre) is not in the best interest of maintaining the current fabric of the neighborhood. On the other hand, others felt that increased density would bring benefits that the neighborhood generally seeks, e.g., more demand for commercial space, increasing walkability/bike-ability, and chances for improved mass transit.

Regardless, for several years City Planning has recommended that the density for development proposals should be a consideration, but not the determining factor when assessing compliance with plans and zoning ordinances. In fact, the aforementioned density recommendations do not appear in City zoning ordinances at all; they are only in the Neighborhood and Comprehensive Plans. Density is not seen as a particularly objective predictor of a project's appropriateness, whereas building mass and form are, hence most Committee members did not to focus solely on the Neighborhood Plan's density recommendations.

Many committee members, however, are concerned about the impact of endorsing the teardown of multiple homes and the approval of this large redevelopment in an area where many other affordable multi-unit rental houses are owned by developers or could soon be purchased by developers. Developers could subsequently propose analogous new buildings that will require teardown of more rental houses and multi-flats, particularly given the real estate market on Madison's isthmus. The majority of committee members and neighbors expressed concern about momentum building towards similar teardown/rebuild proposals that could reduce affordability and negatively alter the neighborhood fabric.

Should the Houden proposal move forward, it is crucial that TLNA Council include language in any communication to the City stating that any zoning change and any Neighborhood Plan changes are not precedent setting and are not meant as a signal that similar developments are desirable. TLNA Council and the City should recognize that the Neighborhood Plan's recommendations continue to apply to the remainder of this and surrounding blocks. Some committee members expressed frustration that letters of support from TLNA Council for several recent development proposals in the neighborhood included similar language in communications with the City, yet teardown and rebuild proposals continue to be put forward.

Opinions about design issues varied substantially amongst committee members and even amongst the opinion camps identified above, but a slim majority seemed to be in favor of the direction that the exterior design was moving. Many though, were concerned that the building did not sufficiently reference or transition from the architecture of older neighborhood structures. The range of opinions on various design-related matters are detailed in the survey of committee members (Appendix C).

If the proposal should move forward as a result of a TLNA Council endorsement and/or in the City process, the committee suggests that the exterior design issues and concerns be addressed in a one-time charrette, meeting, or survey. We appreciate that consensus on design matters is unlikely to be reached or even approached, but since the development team's architect stated several times in the June 1 meeting that they are amenable to many exterior design changes, the neighborhood should take advantage of the opportunity to clarify design input should the proposal move forward. Note too that some committee members felt strongly that the design of any new building would be crucial to a project's success and that the impact of design on the neighborhood should be a primary concern.

#### **6. Additional Concerns and Suggested Conditions:**

In addition to the items presented above, a wide variety of concerns related to design, operations, and neighbor impact issues were also discussed by committee members and neighbors. Many of these were mentioned in the committee survey results in Appendix C. Given that there were a variety of opinions on these issues, we recommend carefully evaluating the survey results.

Should the development proposal move forward, several additional concerns and conditions that were either explicitly mentioned in committee process or are common in TLNA's evaluation of similar development proposals are listed below. We encourage Plan Commission to include these in a Conditional Use Permit whenever possible and/or for City staff to evaluate their applicability:

- The Committee strongly encourages the developer to station a Zipcar in the parking level. We recognize that Zipcar has nearby locations, but with the increasing density in the neighborhood, we feel that more locations are warranted. The Committee believes that a Zipcar stall in the development is crucial to encouraging new tenants to forgo car ownership. The Zipcar should also be available to other neighbors, providing an important benefit to the neighborhood.
- The developer should install electric car charging stations in the parking level.
- Indoor and outdoor bicycle parking for both proposal components should greatly exceed City requirements.
- The developer should underground all utility wiring.
- Retain any street trees and any yard trees if possible. Canopy-sized trees should be used for the street terrace since utility undergrounding will allow the planting of larger tree species. Wherever possible, the development should include canopy trees in side and/or rear yard areas to provide shade and a visual buffer for neighbors.
- The committee should have input on landscaping plans.
- Additional green features, including solar panels, rain barrels to decrease runoff, etc., should be considered whenever possible in all of the buildings.
- Gardening opportunities and green space for tenants should be maximized on the rooftop of the parking level, any green areas at grade, and on any patios and decks.
- Given the large decrease in useable soil/green areas, assure proper drainage away from neighbors' backyards and side yards on all sides of the development.

- Individual homes that are saved or moved onsite should not be connected to each other or to other buildings so as to maintain the rhythm of the neighborhood's existing structures and to provide visual breaks for tenants and neighbors.
- Any agreement, provision, or deed restriction that details the developer's self-funding of any affordable units should be fully vetted by TLNA Council and should TLNA Council hire an attorney to review proposed agreements, any legal fees incurred by TLNA Council will be paid by the developer.
- Residents of the proposed new apartment buildings should not have access to City residential parking permits should the program be in existence or established on nearby streets. The committee realizes that this is currently City policy for new developments, but wants to reiterate our concern. Current residents of any retained homes who have permits could be grandfathered into the parking permit program, but new residents should not be allowed to participate.
- Commercial entities that locate in the mixed-use building should appeal to neighbors, be locally owned and enhance the neighborhood. Office usage for the commercial spaces is undesirable and primary customer bases within the neighborhood are preferred so as to reduce parking pressures from commercial customers and employees.
- HVAC systems for new apartment buildings should create minimal noise and exterior venting/input for the apartments should be flush mounted. Usage of wall packs should be discouraged and if used should not face any neighboring buildings on any side.
- HVAC systems with exterior components should create minimal noise and be aesthetically unobtrusive for neighboring properties on all sides. Exterior venting/input for living and commercial units should be flush mounted if located on any front, rear or side facade. Usage of wall packs should be discouraged, but if used they should not face neighboring buildings on adjacent properties and across streets. Wall packs that are mounted on balconies should be mounted perpendicular to or towards the building's facade and face away from neighboring or across street properties.
- Any noise from rooftop HVAC systems and exhaust systems should not impact neighboring residential structures.
- TLNA Council should be made aware of the plan for residential and commercial garbage, as well as commercial deliveries.
- Should dogs be allowed, a station for the collection of dog waste should be included in the project so as to discourage dog waste from collecting on nearby streets.
- If a restaurant, tavern, bar or similar establishment is included, outdoor spaces should close by 10:00pm at the latest. The committee realizes that this condition will not be addressed until a potential business tenant files for city permits, but we want to assure this concern be addressed at that time.

## **7. Appendices:**



## Appendix A: Excerpts from Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan

The most pertinent excerpts from the T-L Neighborhood Plan are presented below. Key sections are highlighted in red. Note that some excerpts from the Plan support aspects of the proposed development and some do not.

### \*\*\*\*\* What is the **vision** for the commercial area?

#### **The Future of Tenney-Lapham – Looking Back from the Year 2020**

With the influx of more families and long-term residents, the business district has thrived and **expanded along the 700, 800 and 900 blocks of East Johnson Street**. The availability of shopping within walking distance of home and via alternative transportation, such as the Isthmus-circulating shuttles and streetcars has made neighborhood living much more viable. For all its residents, **but most particularly for people with fixed incomes, disabilities, or working at lower wages**, Tenney-Lapham offers a neighborhood where it is possible to be a no-car or one-car household without being culturally, economically or socially isolated from enjoying the full life of the City.

#### **Neighborhood Special Features:**

Neighborhood Shopping. The East Johnson Street Business District, where people can shop for groceries, do their laundry, get their hair cut, buy flowers, antiques, framing, wines and spirits, and more, **satisfies day-to-day needs** and provides a strong sense of community. **The historic character of buildings is also seen in this local business district.**

### \*\*\*\*\* What are the pertinent **issues** identified in the Plan?

#### 1. **Preserving the central city architectural history.**

The neighborhood has been influenced by prominent Madisonians and is rich in quality, historic structures. **Any revitalization efforts should both enhance Tenney-Lapham historic structures and places, while also updating them for current and future uses.**

#### 6. **Strengthening the vitality** of the neighborhood commercial core on East Johnson Street by encouraging **rehabilitation of existing buildings, some new commercial construction**, and installation of a shared parking area.

To strengthen the vitality of this neighborhood commercial district, it is important to concentrate business activity around the East Johnson and North Paterson Street core with the possibility of building a shared parking lot for the convenience of customers. It is important for the area to continue to **support a strong residential base by providing housing opportunities such as apartment units on the second floor of commercial buildings. Renovation of existing buildings and design of new construction should blend into the historic character of the area. New business locations, including adaptive re-use of existing residential structures, should occur first in the 800 block of East Johnson.**

#### 7. **Attracting and retaining businesses that blend with the artistic, Bohemian nature of the area.**

The East Johnson Business Association recognizes **the strength of the unique shopping experiences** in the area. Antiques, stained glass, clothing, musical instruments, furniture, wine and spirits, gallery and picture framing form the start of an artistic center.

#### 8. Ensuring that **affordable, quality housing opportunities** continue throughout the neighborhood.

It is the goal of the neighborhood to continue to provide a range of housing choices. The rise of property values within the City and the neighborhood affects the availability of a wide range of affordable housing opportunities for both renters and owners, especially seniors. We will continue to support organizations that provide housing options within the neighborhood **for individuals and families of low and moderate income, and we will promote both home ownership and renter programs for such individuals and families.**

#### \*\*\*\*\* Competing Land Use Goals?

Goal 1 implies preservation and affordability while Goal 3 points to more commercial, with caveats.

Land Use Goals, Action Steps/Projects, Design Standards, Implementers

**Goal 1:** Restore and preserve the residential character of the Tenney-Lapham neighborhood.

Discussion: ... the Johnson, Gorham, Dayton and Mifflin Street blocks are excellent examples of traditional early 20<sup>th</sup> century urban neighborhoods. The **preservation and rehabilitation of these areas can provide high-quality, affordable housing** within this desirable and convenient area of Madison...

Design Standards

... Infill sites should be thought of as the ‘missing teeth’ in an otherwise cohesive group of structures that are associated by age, style, and purpose. **New structures must be consistent with the established architectural context... Tear down and rebuilding can be acceptable in this context for structures that themselves are ‘toothaches’** with respect to the design standards discussed here...

Teardown Replacements

- Ratio of footprint-to-lot-size of replacement residential structures should be **comparable** to the surrounding neighborhood.
- Front porches are encouraged.
- **Consistency of scale, spacing, and general architectural vernacular of the surrounding neighborhood is required.**

Land Use Goals, Action Steps/Projects, Design Standards, Implementers

**Goal 3:** Plan for the growth of the East Johnson Street business district along the 700 and 800 blocks and part of the 900 block of East Johnson Street.

**Discussion:** ... The neighborhood seeks to increase the business use of these blocks while keeping the residential flavor. **Adaptive re-use of residential structures for specialty businesses is encouraged** for this district. **Replacement of existing structures with structures specifically designed for neighborhood mixed-use is also encouraged.**

Design Standards:

- Initial growth of business uses should be focused on the 800 block and the west end of the 900 block. The 700 block should remain more residential in the near term.
- **Ground floor retail with residential units above is an appropriate design for new structures built in this district.**
- **The neighborhood does not seek to eliminate all ground floor residential from these blocks. New structures may be 100% commercial or 100% residential, in addition to mixed-use. Adaptive re-use of existing residential structures to business uses (such as galleries or cafes) is also supported.**

#### \*\*\*\*\* Land Use Recommendations Map from Neighborhood Plan

700 Block of East Johnson Street

The west end of this block has businesses today. While near-term goals for growth of the E. Johnson Business District focus on the 800 and 900 blocks, **the long-range vision anticipates expansion of the NMU district to the 700 block** as well.

Initial growth of business uses should be focused on the 800 block and the west end of the 900 block. **The 700 block should remain more residential in the near term.**

For NMU: Net residential densities within a neighborhood mixed-use district generally **should not exceed 40 dwelling units per acre**, but a neighborhood or special area plan may recommend small areas within the district for a higher maximum density if the development is compatible with the scale and character of the neighborhood.

**\*\*\*\*\* About density for this block:**

- TLNP recommends Medium Density Residential 1 (MDR1): **16-25 units/acre**
- TLNP also suggests an expansion of Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU) to the 700 block: **16 to 40 units/acre**, but not seeking to eliminate all ground floor residential.
- City's Comprehensive Plan has existing commercial corridor as NMU and the 700 block as Medium Density Residential (**16-40 units/acre**).

## Appendix B: Summary of House Tours

### \*\*\*\*\* Overall Summary

#### Houses toured:

717, 719, 725, 731, 733, 737 E. Johnson

Dates built: 1874, 1874, 1905, 1900, 1905, 1892 (in order)

#### Houses not toured:

727 - proposed to be moved between 745 and 751

Date built: 1884

739/741, 743 - development team is exploring moving these two to another site

Dates built: 1906, 1895 (in order)

745 - proposed to be saved

Date built: 1901

751 - proposed to be saved

Date built: 1913

Those touring these homes recognized that any home can be rehabbed and saved with enough investment, however, whether or not it should be saved is a complex question to be answered by the owner, the neighborhood and the City. All contribute to the fabric and scale of the existing built portions of neighborhood.

- One house (717), furthest to the west, could be rehabbed if there is the will and dollars to do so, but it doesn't have much to offer other than its contribution to the fabric and scale of the neighborhood. 717 is in rough shape. 719 is in similar in condition, but had more to offer due to having more original features. Both likely need substantial foundation work and a lot of other work.
- The next three (725, 731, 733) generally have much more to offer. Most felt they could be rehabbed into solid long-lasting affordable apartments if the will is there. This could be done at a much more reasonable price than 717 and 719, particularly if some of the work is done by the owners. Some have a fair amount of their original features, others don't.
- Most agreed that 737 is a gem with a lot of original features. As with all, some issues.

Individual and detailed comments from those who toured the houses are available at [TLNA's Development website](#) for the project.

## Appendix C: Results from Survey of Committee Members

### TIER I Issues/Concerns (these are overarching issues)

Issue/Concern	Attended at least 2 of last 3 committee meetings	Attended 1 or more committee meetings
The scale/mass of the new buildings...		
1. is just right.	3	6
2. should be reduced.	16	17
3. could be increased..	2	2
No Answer.	1	2
The height of the new buildings...		
1. is just right.	4	7
2. is too tall.	17	18
3. could be increased.	1	2
No Answer.	0	0
The proposed increase in density (living units per acre)...		
1. is just right.	5	7
2. is too large.	12	15
3. could be even greater.	5	5
No Answer.	0	0
The open space and/or variation of spaces between buildings...		
1. is sufficient.	5	8
2. should be larger.	15	16
3. could be less.	2	2
No Answer.	0	1
The 20' setback between the new buildings and the rear property line...		
1. is sufficient.	8	10
2. should be increased to generally match typical rear yard setbacks on the block.	13	15
No Answer.	1	2
Tearing down 5 houses and moving 4...		
1. is okay.	7	8
2. is okay, but tearing down and/or moving more is okay too.	2	3
3. is too many – should tear down or move fewer.	13	16
No Answer.	0	0
Moving a house to elsewhere in the neighborhood is...		
1. as good as keeping it in place.	8	10
2. not as good as keeping it in place.	14	17
No Answer.	0	0

Moving a house to elsewhere on the proposal site is...		
1. as good as keeping it in place.	15	19
2. not as good as keeping it in place.	7	8
No Answer.	0	0
The four commercial spaces in the proposal are...		
1. sufficient.	13	15
2. too many.	5	6
3. not enough.	3	5
No Answer.	1	1
Saving or moving 6 houses, plus committing to 8 units at 80% CMI is...		
1. a sufficient affordability component.	7	11
2. an insufficient affordability component.	15	16
No Answer.	0	0
Zero parking stalls for the 4 commercial spaces is...		
1. a problem.	11	14
2. not a problem.	11	13
No Answer.	0	0
80 underground parking stalls for 80 apartments is...		
1. sufficient.	13	18
2. insufficient.	0	0
3. too many.	9	9
No Answer.	0	0

### **TIER II Issues/Concerns these are issues related mostly to design**

<b>Issue/Concern</b>	<b>Attended at least 2 of last 3 committee meetings</b>	<b>Attended 1 or more committee meetings</b>
Overall, the exterior design is...		
1. sufficient.	3	5
2. insufficient.	10	10
3. Overall, I like some exterior design aspects and dislike others.	8	11
No Answer.	1	1
The gabled mezzanine level...		
1. is a positive feature of the exterior design.	6	9
2. does not detract from the exterior design.	6	7
3. detracts from the exterior design.	5	5
No Answer.	5	6

The inter-building connectors between the 3 saved/moved buildings closest to Livingston are...		
1. appropriate.	2	5
2. inappropriate.	15	17
3. I need more information to make this determination.	4	4
No Answer.	1	1
The lack of space for future canopy-sized trees is...		
1. not a problem.	2	4
2. a problem.	19	22
No Answer.	1	1
The new buildings' material palette is going in the...		
1. right direction.	7	11
2. wrong direction.	11	11
No Answer.	4	5
The front façade design of the proposed new buildings...		
1. is sufficient.	4	6
2. is insufficient.	4	4
3. has potential, but needs work.	5	7
4. needs more variation.	5	5
5. I need more information to make this determination.	2	3
No Answer.	2	2
The rear façade design of the proposed new buildings...		
1. is sufficient.	3	5
2. is insufficient.	4	4
3. has potential, but needs work.	8	9
4. needs more variation.	1	2
5. I need more information to make this determination.	3	4
No Answer.	3	3
The side façades' design of the proposed new buildings...		
1. is sufficient.	3	5
2. is insufficient.	1	1
3. has potential, but needs work.	6	6
4. I need more information to make this determination.	7	10
No Answer.	5	5
The new buildings' overall exterior design references...		
1. should be more contemporary.	0	0
2. are just right.	4	6
3. should reference older buildings.	6	7
4. should be transitional – referencing both new and old.	8	10
5. I need more information to make this determination.	1	1
No Answer.	3	3

## Appendix D: Excerpts from City Zoning Code

### ***Current and Requested Zoning***

- Current zoning for 717 through 751 E. Johnson (all single-family or multi-unit rental buildings) is Traditional Residential-Varied 2, a Residential District zoning category (*MGO TR-V2 Zoning, Sec. 28.048*).
- Requested zoning for 707 through 713 E. Johnson is Neighborhood Mixed Use, a Mixed Use and Commercial District zoning category (*MGO NMX Zoning, Sec. 28.064*).

*For Traditional Residential – Varied Districts ((MGO TR-V Districts, Sec. 28.046):*

#### **(1) Statement of Purpose.**

The TR-V Districts are established to stabilize, protect and encourage throughout the City the essential characteristics of mature residential areas and to accommodate a full range of life-cycle housing while encouraging a suitable environment for family life. The districts are also intended to:

- (a) Promote the preservation, development and redevelopment of traditional residential neighborhoods in a manner consistent with their distinct form and residential character.
- (b) Ensure that new buildings and additions to existing buildings are designed with sensitivity to their context in terms of building placement, facade width, height and proportions, garage and driveway placement, landscaping, and similar design features.
- (c) Maintain and improve the viability of existing housing of all types, while providing for updating of older housing in a context-sensitive manner.
- (d) Maintain or increase compatibility between residential and other allowed uses, and between different housing types, where permitted, by maintaining consistent building orientation and parking placement and screening.
- (e) Facilitate the preservation, development or redevelopment goals of the comprehensive plan and of adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans.

\*\*\* TLNA Note - Many retail and commercial uses are not permitted or conditional uses in TR-V2, e.g., restaurants, taverns, shops but large multi-family dwelling are allowable as conditional uses permits granted by Plan Commission as indicated in *MGO Table 28C-1*

\*\*\* TLNA Note - *MGO Table 28D-2* lists all permitted and conditional uses for the proposed first floor commercial spaces for NMX. Restaurants, coffee shops, taverns, brewpubs, artisan workshops, and many other types of retail and professional offices, and are permitted, as are many other uses, some only with condition use permits granted by Plan Commission.

*MGO 28.064 Neighborhood Mixed Use District*, describes the zoning category and all applicable requirements for NMX districts, including

#### **(1) Statement of Purpose.**

The NMX District is established to encourage and sustain the viability of commercial nodes that serve the shopping needs of residents in adjacent neighborhoods. The district is also intended to:

- (a) Encourage pedestrian, bicycle and transit use as a means of accessing these commercial areas.
- (b) Encourage diversification of uses, including residential, commercial, and civic uses, in order to enhance the vitality and appeal of these areas.



(c) Facilitate preservation, development or redevelopment consistent with the adopted goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and of adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans.

(3) Dimensional Requirements.

- Rear yard setback. 20'
- Maximum lot coverage. 75%
- Maximum height. 3 stories/40'

(d) Rear or Side Yard Height Transition to Residential Districts. Where the NMX District abuts a residential district at the rear or side lot line, building height at the rear or side yard setback line shall not exceed two (2) stories/twenty-five (25) feet. From this point, building height may increase at a ratio of one foot of rise to one foot of horizontal distance away from the property line, (a 45° angle) up to the maximum allowed height. Transitions exceeding this height and/or ratio limitation require conditional use approval.

Related to parking requirements for the residential and commercial components of the NMX portion of the proposal:

*MGO 28.141 Parking and Loading Standards, Table 28I-2. Districts with No Minimum Automobile Parking Requirements; Exceptions.*

<b>District/Area</b>	<b>Parking Requirement</b>	<b>Exceptions</b>
Neighborhood Mixed-Use (NMX)	No minimum	2. Restaurants, restaurant-taverns, taverns, restaurant nightclub, nightclub, and brewpubs if located within three hundred (300) feet of another restaurant, restaurant-tavern, tavern, or brewpub.

*MGO 28.151 Subchapter 28J: Supplemental Regulations.*

Dwelling Units in Mixed-Use Buildings.

- (b) In the NMX District, more than eight (8) dwelling units requires conditional use approval
- (e) In the LMX, NMX, TSS and CC-T Districts, for building with a street-facing width greater than forty (40) feet, at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the ground-floor frontage facing the primary street, including all frontage at a street corner, shall be non-residential. Less non-residential frontage requires conditional use approval.

Multi-Family Dwelling.

(c) In the NMX District, a multi-family dwelling shall contain no more than twelve (12) dwelling units.

\*\*\* TLNA note – This regulation applies to new residential-only buildings, so any new buildings with commercial spaces are exempt as they are mixed-use rather than residential.

## Appendix E: TLNA Council letter of April 14, 2016

14 April 2016

Dear Tenney-Lapham Neighbors, City Entities, Alder Zellers, and Interested Parties,

As you know, in recent years Tenney-Lapham has hosted some of the largest development projects in Madison. Almost all Tenney-Lapham neighbors have welcomed these projects, recognizing that the City and the neighborhood benefit from these projects and the many merits they bring. Increased density of quality housing and employment opportunities, when properly developed with neighborhood input, can contribute to sustainability, momentum for increased alternate and mass transit options, and many associated increases in quality of life.

Fortunately, the many changes to our neighborhood have, with some minor exceptions, followed the vision laid out by the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan as adopted in 2008 by both TLNA Council and Madison Common Council. The Plan has been invaluable as our neighborhood evolves, guiding quality infill development while maintaining a diversity of housing options and the character of established portions of Tenney-Lapham.

Concurrent with our neighborhood evolving, there has been increasing development pressure on older established portions of the neighborhood, particularly in those areas comprised primarily of older vernacular homes used as single- or multi-flat rentals. Recognizing these pressures, the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Association Council unanimously approved the following statement at our 14 April 2016 monthly meeting:

TLNA Council reiterates their support for the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan as adopted in 2008. We support the recommended Land Use Goals and Categories, including recommended housing densities.

The Council also reiterates the importance of the following excerpted sections of the Plan:

### **Land Use Goals, Action Steps/Projects, Design Standards, Implementers**

**Goal 1:** Restore and preserve the residential character of the Tenney-Lapham neighborhood.

Discussion: "... the Johnson, Gorham, Dayton and Mifflin Street blocks are excellent examples of traditional early 20<sup>th</sup> century urban neighborhoods. The preservation and rehabilitation of these areas can provide high-quality, affordable housing within this desirable and convenient area of Madison..."

**Goal 1:** Design Standards (for the area mentioned above)

"... Infill sites should be thought of as the 'missing teeth' in an otherwise cohesive group of structures that are associated by age, style, and purpose. New structures must be consistent with the established architectural context... Tear down and rebuilding can be acceptable in this context for structures that themselves are 'toothaches' with respect to the design standards discussed here..."

#### Teardown Replacements

- Ratio of footprint-to-lot-size of replacement residential structures should be comparable to the surrounding neighborhood.
- Front porches are encouraged.
- Consistency of scale, spacing, and general architectural vernacular of the surrounding neighborhood is required.

The full Neighborhood Plan is available at <http://www.tenneylapham.org/development.html>

Should you need clarification feel free to contact me.



Best regards,  
Patty Prime  
TLNA President

## Appendix F: Affordable Housing FAQ from City

This page is excerpted from a City-provided Affordable Housing FAQ and uses 2015 income figures. The rents calculated for various income levels and numbers of persons includes the cost of utilities.

### AFFORDABLE HOUSING FAQ

DECEMBER 2016

#### WHAT DOES "AFFORDABLE" MEAN?

Affordability of housing is generally associated with housing costs that consume less than 30% of a household's income. Households at all incomes have a limit to what is affordable to them. When a household spends more than 30% of its income on housing, it is considered "cost burdened." Households spending more than 50% of their household income on housing are considered "severely cost burdened" and are at high risk of homelessness.

#### WHAT DOES "LOW-INCOME" MEAN?

Typically, for City of Madison programs, low-income is defined as 80% of the Area (or County) Median Income (AMI) based on the number of persons per household. Section 42 Low Income Housing Tax Credit developments typically designate a portion of their units for 30%, 50%, and 60% of AMI, as well as market rate with no income restrictions.

Household Size	"Low and Moderate Income"				
	100% Median	80% Median	60% Median	50% Median	30% Median
<b>1 person</b>	\$58,800	\$46,000	\$35,280	\$29,400	\$17,650
<b>2 persons</b>	\$67,200	\$52,600	\$40,320	\$33,600	\$20,150
<b>3 persons</b>	\$75,600	\$59,150	\$45,360	\$37,800	\$22,650
<b>4 persons</b>	\$83,900	\$65,700	\$50,340	\$41,950	\$25,150
<b>5 persons</b>	\$90,700	\$71,000	\$54,420	\$45,350	\$28,440

Some of the common professions earning average incomes in this range are:

- Customer Service Representative - \$33,940
- Cashier - \$19,830
- Janitor - \$25,800
- Laborer - \$26,730
- Waiter/Waitress - \$20,600
- Administrative Assistant - \$35,340

#### WHAT CAN A LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLD AFFORD IN RENT?

Household Size	"Affordable" Rents by Income				
	100% of AMI	80% of AMI	60% of AMI	50% of AMI	30% of AMI
<b>1 person</b>	\$1,470	\$1,150	\$882	\$735	\$441
<b>2 persons</b>	\$1,680	\$1,315	\$1,008	\$840	\$504
<b>3 persons</b>	\$1,890	\$1,479	\$1,134	\$945	\$566
<b>4 persons</b>	\$2,098	\$1,643	\$1,259	\$1,049	\$629
<b>5 persons</b>	\$2,268	\$1,775	\$1,361	\$1,134	\$711