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-uinit 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.