

**PLANNING DIVISION REPORT
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY
AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

January 9, 2008

RE: I.D. #12473, Zoning Map Amendment I.D. 3394, Rezoning of 201 & 229 West Lakelawn Place from R6 to PUD-GDP-SIP

1. Requested Action: Approval of a rezoning to PUD-GDP-SIP to allow construction of an 18 unit multifamily building adjacent to an existing building with lodging rooms R6 (General Residence District) zoning. This property also lies within a National Historic District and Downtown Design Zone 4.
2. Applicable Regulations: Section 28.12 (9) provides the process for zoning map amendments. Section 28.07 (6) of the Zoning Ordinance (attached, for reference) provides the requirements and framework for Planned Unit Development Districts, including Planned Unit Development Districts in Downtown Design Zones. Resolution 58533 (wording provided herein) provides the design criteria for Planned Unit Development Districts in Downtown Design Zones.
3. Report Prepared By: Heather Stouder, AICP, Planner

GENERAL INFORMATION:

1. Applicant and Project Contact: David Kaul, The Alexander Company, Inc.; 145 East Badger Road; Madison, WI
Property Owner: Acacia Foundation of Wisconsin, c/o Jim McFarland; 720 Wisconsin Avenue; Milwaukee, WI
2. Development Schedule: The applicant wishes to begin construction after all approvals are obtained, and complete it for occupancy in August 2009.
3. Parcel Location: 201 W. Lakelawn Place (Formerly 222 Langdon Street) and 229 W. Lakelawn Place comprise a 13,440 square-foot (0.31 acre) parcel generally located on the east side of West Lakelawn Place between Lakelawn Place and Langdon Street; Aldermanic District 2; Madison Metropolitan School District.
4. Existing Conditions: The site is currently developed with the four-story Acacia fraternity house, with a gravel parking lot in the area where the new building is proposed, zoned R6 (General Residence District).
5. Proposed Use: A new 18-unit multifamily apartment building, in addition to the conversion of the adjacent Acacia building into a building with 7 apartments and 9 lodging rooms, for a total of 25 units and 9 lodging rooms on the site.
6. Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:
North: Multifamily apartments and lodging houses zoned R6 (General Residence District).
South: Beyond the adjacent Acacia building, directly across Langdon Street at 221 Langdon Street, a fraternity house with 22 apartment units zoned PUD-SIP (Planned Unit Development-Specific Implementation Plan). Other buildings on the south side of

Langdon Street include multifamily apartments and lodging houses zoned R6 (General Residence District).

East: Lodging House (216 Langdon Street) zoned R6 (General Residence District).

West: Mixed-use building with 26 apartment units and MacTaggart's Market, a small convenience store, (228 Langdon Street) zoned R6 (General Residence District).

7. Adopted Land Use Plan: The Comprehensive Plan identifies this area as the Langdon Downtown Residential Subdistrict, where recommended land uses include but are not limited to mixed-use buildings and multi-unit residential buildings with 16-60 units per acre.
8. Environmental Corridor Status: This property is not located within a mapped environmental corridor.
9. Public Utilities & Services: This property is served by a full range of urban services.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

This application is subject to the zoning map amendment standards of the Zoning Ordinance, Section 28.12 (9). Section 28.07 (6) provides the requirements and framework for Planned Unit Development Districts. The application is also subject to the review standards for Downtown Design Zone 4.

RELATED ACTIONS:

At the September 15, 2008 Plan Commission meeting, the applicant was granted approval for a conditional use to remodel and reconfigure the existing 20 bedroom lodging house (the Acacia building at 201 West Lakelawn Place) as a building with nine lodging rooms and seven separate apartments. If the requested rezoning were approved for the entire site, the reconfiguration of the existing building would proceed as approved.

On November 24, 2008, the Landmarks Commission recommended rejection of this proposal as originally submitted, and the applicant has not returned for a second meeting with the Landmarks Commission since making revisions to the proposal. At their December 3, 2008 meeting, the UDC (UDC) referred the proposal to a later date.

After reviewing changes made in early December, staff to the Landmarks Commission provided a December 16, 2008 memorandum for consideration by the UDC, recommending that they not approve the project due to its incompatibility with the surrounding neighborhood and failure to meet design requirements for Planned Unit Developments in Downtown Design Zones. At their December 17, 2008 meeting, the UDC again referred the proposal. The applicant submitted additional changes for consideration at the January 7, 2009 meeting of the UDC, where the UDC recommended initial approval by a vote of 7 to 2.

The completed reports, approved minutes, and staff memoranda related to the Landmarks Commission and UDC are attached in reverse order by date. The report from the January 7 UDC meeting was not available at the time of this report.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The subject site is 201 and 229 West Lakelawn Place, located on the east side of West Lakelawn Place between East Lakelawn Place and Langdon Street in R6 General Residence district zoning. The applicant is requesting approval for a rezoning from R6 to PUD-GDP-SIP (Planned Unit Development - Specific Implementation Plan) for two multifamily buildings with a total of 25 dwelling units and 9 lodging rooms and an expected occupancy of 84 residents (see table below).

Floor	New Building		Remodeled Existing Building				
	2BR	3BR	Single Lodging	Double Lodging	1BR	2BR	3BR
1		2	4	2	1		
2		4		3			
3		4					2
4		4				2	
5	1	3					2
Total Units	18 (17x3BR, 1x2BR)		7 + 9 Lodging (1x1BR, 2x2BR, 4x3BR 4 Singles, 5 Doubles)				
Total Residents	53		31				

A new 18-unit apartment building is proposed behind the existing Acacia fraternity house, which would be reconfigured into a building with seven apartments and nine lodging rooms. The applicant hopes to initiate construction when all necessary approvals are obtained and complete by August 2009.

The site is currently developed with the Acacia fraternity house, originally built in 1927 as the Phi Mu Sorority. According to City records, the building was designed by noted local architects Law, Law and Potter and is listed in the Langdon Street National Historic District. The building has four levels with living space, including a finished walkout lower level and also a partial, unfinished fifth floor. Currently, the interior of the building is configured with sleeping rooms on the second, third, and fourth floors, and inhabitants share common bathrooms, kitchens, and living spaces. A gravel parking lot accessed from Lakelawn Place behind the building accommodates approximately 25-30 cars with an informal stacked parking arrangement. The reconfiguration of this building, which involves only minimal exterior changes and was approved as a conditional use in November 2009, would proceed as approved if the PUD-SIP for the entire site is approved.

Description of New Building

The proposed new building is a five-story, flat-roofed, rectangular building with the first level sunken between two and eight feet below grade. The building is approximately 108 feet long, 42 feet wide, and 49 feet tall. As proposed, the building would include two units on the first floor and four units on each of the second through fifth floors for a total of 18 furnished units (53 bedrooms). Interior floor plans show on each level a double-loaded central hallway with interior entrances to all units. Units are relatively small, with an average of 258 square feet per occupant (bedrooms are quite small, discouraging double-occupancy). The three-bedroom units range in size from 686 square feet to 857 square feet, and the two-bedroom unit is 567 square feet.

Eight of the units on the west¹ side of the building have access from a bedroom to narrow balconies (approximately 2' x 17', shared between two units). Three units on the fifth floor also have slightly deeper, more functional balconies approximately 60 square feet in size, each accessible from the common living space.

¹ For the purpose of this analysis, the West Lakelawn Place frontage is considered to be the western elevation.

The main entry is proposed in the southwest corner of the building, and leads to a small vestibule with stairs leading up to the elevator, interior stairwell, and a central corridor. Two additional entries proposed on the north and south ends of the building lead to stairs accessing all levels. Common laundry facilities are located on third and fourth levels, and the fifth level includes a small space for elevator mechanical equipment.

Nearly one half of the lower level accommodates 36 parking stalls for bicycles and 12 parking stalls for mopeds. This area can be accessed through a 6-foot wide garage door proposed on the north side of the building, as well as two interior doors.

The exterior of the building as proposed has a stone base and a brick middle and top, with brick soldier coursing along the roofline. Fiber cement board panels are proposed in conjunction with the balconies in the center of the west elevation. Window openings vary in width along the length of the building, and the rhythm and scale of openings complements that of the adjacent Acacia building, although they have a simpler, more contemporary design.

Site Description

The buildings as proposed are situated very tightly within the yards required in Downtown Design Zone 4, leaving little space for basic functional aspects of the site such as parking, loading, and trash storage, and negligible usable open space. The site plan incorporates several areas for bicycle parking, with 36 indoor stalls and 36 outdoor stalls. Outdoor bicycle parking for both tenants and visitors is well allocated among four parking pads located in the southeast corner of the site adjacent to Langdon Street, between the two buildings, next to the main entrance, and on the north side of the site behind the proposed new building. In addition, stalls are designated for 17 mopeds (12 indoor stalls, and 5 stalls located on the north end of the site). The trash storage area for both buildings is situated in the east central part of the site, between the two buildings and not easily seen from the streets. There is no designated loading area for the site, and the applicant has indicated that loading and unloading would occur on Langdon Street.

Landscaping improvements are proposed along the perimeter of the property, with a focus on shrubs, perennials, and four Ginkgo trees within the narrow side yard facing West Lakelawn Place adjacent to the proposed new building. Grasses and daylilies are proposed along the north side of the building. Along the east side of the new building, three existing trees ranging in caliper size from 10" to 16" would be removed and replaced with nine white pine trees. Construction of the proposed building would necessitate the removal of one 30" caliper oak tree. At the time of this writing, Planning Staff is aware that Fire Regulations may require the removal or relocation of one or two of the four Ginkgo trees proposed along the west side of the property. Additional space for landscaping will likely be available due to the need to eliminate the proposed driveway in the northeastern corner of the property.

There is little if any space on the site to provide usable open space. Required front and side yards may not be counted as usable open space, nor may designated parking areas or any area less than ten feet in width. Thus, the 240 square foot front patio of the Acacia building is the only area meeting the minimum size requirements of the usable open space definition. Since this area is only available to fraternity members and not to other residents, it too fails to meet the definition of usable open space. Under the R6 zoning, 5,530 square feet of usable open space would be required.

PROJECT EVALUATION:

Introduction

Essentially, the proposed land use - two multifamily building with a mix of dwelling units suitable for the student market - is consistent with surrounding land uses and the land use recommended in the Comprehensive Plan. Despite the fact that it exceeds the density called for in the Comprehensive Plan, it has the potential to be a strong contribution to the surrounding neighborhood. However, the existing floor plan to accommodate 18 new units (53 new bedrooms) makes it challenging to meet the design criteria for Planned Unit Development Districts in Downtown Design Zones on this very small lot.

In this particular location, a well-designed project exceeding the proposed density may be acceptable for what will likely be a student-dominated market well into the future. Due in part to the narrow orientation of this specific lot, good design has proved to be challenging to accomplish, given the high proposed density.

Several interior and exterior changes - many of them positive - have been made since the original submittal back in October 2008, which included a 16-unit building with 9 automobile parking spaces on the first level. The proposal continues to maximize the developable area of the site for small living units, little indoor common area, and negligible usable open space. As proposed, The 108 foot long, five-story building would be built essentially to each required setback line with minimal articulation to break up its mass adjacent to a very narrow street. This has been a challenging building to design to meet the standards for Planned Unit Developments, and more specifically, the exterior or interior design criteria for Planned Unit Developments in Downtown Design Zones. However, after three meetings and a series of design changes, the UDC, at their January 7, 2009 meeting recommended initial approval for the project with conditions.

Land Use and Density

The site lies within a National Historic District, and the Comprehensive Plan includes it in the Langdon Downtown Residential Subdistrict, where recommended land uses include but are not limited to mixed-use buildings and multi-unit residential buildings with 16-60 units per acre. As proposed, this 0.31-acre site would have 34 “units” (25 apartment units and 9 lodging rooms for a total occupancy of 84 persons), so the proposed density is 110 units per acre and 272 residents per acre (see comparative table above). Located in the R6 (General Residence) zoning district, the area contains several lodging houses and multi-family buildings closely associated with the UW-

Address	Zoning	Units	Residents	Acres	Units/acre	Residents/acre
201-229 W Lakelawn Pl.	PUD SIP	34	84	0.31	110	272
210 Lakelawn Pl.	PUD SIP	19	48	0.20	94	238
237 W Lakelawn Pl.	R6	18		0.20	92	
201 Langdon St.	R6	24		0.28	87	
228 Langdon St.	R6	28		0.34	83	
240 W Lakelawn Pl.	R6	8		0.10	77	
221 Langdon St.	PUD SIP	22	59	0.34	65	175
234 Langdon St.	R6	9		0.15	59	
604 Howard Pl.	R6	2		0.05	37	
613 Howard Pl.	R6	1		0.05	18	
<i>Comp Plan - Langdon District*</i>		1,272		14.35	89	
<i>Downtown Design Zone 4*</i>		570		6.98	82	
<i>*Includes all properties with dwelling units, not including lodging rooms, data for which is not easily accessible within the City GIS database.</i>						

Madison campus community. Many of the existing buildings, some of which were approved as Planned Unit Developments, have densities exceeding 60 units per acre.

Staff believes that while the proposed density is higher than that of most buildings in the area, the mass of the building, the lack of usable open space, and the relationship of the building to the adjacent streets have been the biggest challenges. The number of units necessary to make the economics of the project feasible (as indicated by the applicant) seems to be driving the design of a massive building on a very small site. Repeated suggestions from staff to reduce the number of units in order to reduce the mass and provide more articulation, usable open space, and superior design have not been addressed in revised plans. Modifications to the plans have included additional units and bedrooms, while eliminating space for vehicle parking.

Design Criteria for Planned Unit Developments in Downtown Design Zones

The Zoning Administrator and Planning Division staff have determined that the building as proposed meets the height, floor area ratio and yard requirements for Downtown Design Zone 4 as required by MGO Sec. 28.97(6)(e)4. The proposed building does not exceed 5 stories, and the proposed Floor Area Ratio is less than the 3.0 maximum. The proposed building fits exactly within the required side yard and rear yard setbacks when Langdon Street is considered to be the front and West Lakelawn Place is considered to be the side of the new single lot. (This determination regarding the orientation of the lot allows for the most possible flexibility with regard to the potential development of the area behind the existing Acacia building).

With regard to the *design criteria* for Planned Unit Development districts in Downtown Design Zones (attached for reference), it is important to note that several changes to the design and function of the building and site have been made throughout the review process, including the following:

- First-level parking originally proposed for nine automobiles has been replaced by two dwelling units and a parking area for bicycles and mopeds.
- While the main entrance remains on a corner of the building, it has been moved to at-grade level to relate better to the street.
- Trash enclosures have been relocated from the Lakelawn Place frontage to an area between the buildings on the eastern portion of the site.
- EIFS originally proposed on the exterior of the building has been completely replaced by brick.
- A poured cement base with narrow vertical windows has been replaced with masonry and windows complementary to those on upper levels, which provides an improved interface with the sidewalk.
- Articulation to the western elevation of the building has been added in the form of two-foot deep balconies in the center of the building. (Note, however, that the Downtown Design Standards recommend 4' x 8' feet as a minimum balcony size.)
- Articulation has been added to the roof of the building, and balconies just under four feet deep have been incorporated to the corners of the fifth story to provide a small step-back.

Despite these changes and others, there are still questions about the massing, articulation, usable open space, and some aspects of interior floor plan in the proposal, and whether all of the

requirements for Planned Unit Developments in Downtown Design Zones are met. The following section of the report contains the *Exterior and Interior Design Criteria for Planned Unit Development Districts in Downtown Design Zones*, as adopted by resolution in January 2003 and referred to in the zoning code. Each criterion is followed by a brief assessment regarding this proposal, with emphasis on the proposed new building.

Exterior and Interior Design Criteria for Planned Unit Development Districts in Downtown Design Zones

Statement of Purpose

The Design Criteria serve to articulate community design principles, guidelines, and standards for Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) in the near-campus Design Zones with the goal of enhancing the community's overall value and appearance. These criteria reflect the fact that the general development density and intensity of occupancy are expected to be relatively high in these Design Zones compared to other locations in the City. PUDs that have residential components may be considered which are significantly larger, taller, and more massive than would be allowed in the underlying zoning districts. Because it is recognized that design professionals, including architects, landscape architects, and land planners, are trained to strive for creative excellence, the design criteria are not intended to restrict creative solutions or to dictate design.

These criteria will serve as a tool for City staff, the UDC, and the Plan Commission by providing a checklist of the primary elements to be considered when reviewing such PUD requests. This will also inform the design professionals of items that should be considered from the beginning of the design process. These standards will be used in addition to the standards in the zoning code which guide the review of PUD requests. The requirements described in Section 28.07(6)(e) are intended to be the outer limits of what will be considered through this PUD process. The review process for the overall design of the proposed building shall consider the requirements in Section 28.07(6)(e), the Criteria for Approval in Section 28.07(6)(f), and the design criteria described herein.

Exterior Building Design

Exterior design criteria were developed to ensure that such buildings are compatible on a City, neighborhood, and block level; have a pedestrian orientation; and have a design that reflects the residential use of the structure. The following criteria are guidelines for evaluating design of the proposed project.

1) Massing. The proportions and relationships of the various architectural components of the building should be utilized to ensure compatibility with the scale of other buildings in the vicinity. Appropriate transitions should be provided where a change in scale is needed to ensure this compatibility. Larger buildings should have their mass broken up to avoid being out of scale with their surroundings and to provide a more pedestrian-friendly quality. Stepping back the upper floors of the street facades a substantial distance from lower floors may be appropriate to achieve this quality. The shape of the building should not detract from or dominate the surrounding area.

The proposed building is slightly out of scale with surrounding buildings, which are 3-5 stories tall with hipped and gabled roofs. Height itself is acceptable, but the affect is a 49' tall, 108' long wall along West Lakelawn Place, a very narrow street. This is one of the central concerns of the Landmarks Commission, and seems not to have changed substantially as plans have been revised.

2) Orientation. Buildings create and define the public space (streets and sidewalks) and how the building faces this public way is important. Any building facade adjacent to a street should be oriented toward and engage the street. Buildings should respect the orientation of surrounding buildings, existing pedestrian paths and sidewalks, and the orientation of surrounding streets.

The building is well oriented to West Lakelawn Place, although it lacks the strong connection that a central entrance would offer. The Lakelawn Place frontage currently

functions as the rear of the building, and needs significant improvement, including a more prominent entrance and a narrower garage door.

3) *Building Components.* The building should have an identifiable base, body, and cap. the design and detailing of the base are critical to defining the public space, engaging the street, and creating an interesting pedestrian environment. Lower levels should be sufficiently detailed to ground the building. The top of the building should be clearly defined through treatments such as cornices or non-flat roof elements where appropriate. The middle of the building should provide a transition between the top and the base. Mechanical equipment (including rooftop) should be architecturally screened.

Since the original proposal, the building has an improved base, middle, and top. The base has changed from a poured concrete slab with vertical slit windows to a stone base with windows similar to those on upper levels. The middle has higher quality materials (see below). The roofline, although still fairly simple, has some variation, and is improved by the addition of corner balconies. Many of the surrounding buildings, and especially the Acacia building on this lot, have more interesting rooflines.

4) *Articulation.* Well-articulated buildings add architectural interest and variety to the massing of a building and help break up long, monotonous facades. A variety of elements should be incorporated into the design of the building to provide sufficient articulation of the facades. This may be achieved by having a variety in the mix of unit size and layout, or changes in floor levels, be reflected in the exterior of the building. This may also be achieved by incorporating the use of: vertical and/or horizontal reveals, stepbacks, modulation, projections, and three dimensional detail between surface planes to create shadow lines and break up flat surface areas. If large blank surfaces are proposed, they should be for some compelling design purpose, and the design should incorporate mitigating features to enrich the appearance of the project and provide a sense of human scale at the ground level that is inviting to the public.

The proposal has changed from a building with no articulation to one with a set of two-foot deep balconies in the center of the western elevation along West Lakelawn Place, and slightly deeper balconies on the corners of the top floor. In addition, there are subtle eight-inch deep changes on the ends of the building on both sides. Articulation is critical to break up the mass of buildings such as the one being proposed, and is found on the vast majority of surrounding buildings. Due to the narrow width of the lot and the already very small living spaces, a change of the interior floor plan is likely the only way to incorporate more meaningful articulation on this building.

5) *Openings.* The size and rhythm of openings (windows, doors, etc.) in a building should respect those established by existing buildings in the area and the residential and/or mixed-use nature of the building. The street facade should incorporate a sufficient number of windows, doors, balconies, and other opportunities for occupant surveillance of public areas. Visibility should be provided to areas accessed when entering or exiting a building. Lower floor facades should be more transparent and open than upper floors to provide a more detailed and human scaled architectural expression along the sidewalk. Window glass should have a high degree of transparency and should not be dark or reflective. Garage doors should not be visible from the street. If a design is proposed in which garage doors (or other service openings) are visible from the street, they should be sufficiently detailed and integrated into the building.

The windows respect the size of windows on the adjacent building, and the collection of openings as a whole has much greater variety than the original submittal. The main entrance is surrounded by glass for maximum visibility, and floor-to-ceiling windows accompany central balconies on the second through fifth floors. A narrow garage door is visible from Lakelawn Place. If it is indeed necessary for access to the first-level parking area for mopeds and bicycles, it seems that it has been located in the best possible spot on the building.

6) Materials. *A variety of materials should be utilized to provide visual interest to the building. Colors and materials should be selected for compatibility with the site and the neighboring area. All sides of a structure should exhibit design continuity and be finished with quality materials. Materials should be those typically found in urban settings. Durable, low-maintenance materials should be used—particularly on surfaces close to the street.*

The materials themselves have improved significantly since the original submittal, and now include brick and renaissance stone, with fiber cement and metal panels as accents.

7) Entry Treatment. *Buildings with obvious entrances contribute to the definition of the public way and promote a strong pedestrian feel along the street. The building should have at least one clearly-defined primary entrance oriented towards the street. Entrances should be sized and articulated in proportion to the scale of the building. This may be achieved through the utilization of architectural elements such as: lintels, pediments, pilasters, columns, porticoes, porches, overhangs, railings, balustrades, and others, where appropriate. Any such element utilized should be architecturally compatible with the style, materials, colors, and details of the building as a whole, as shall the doors.*

The main entry on the southwest corner of the building is at-grade, with a much better relationship to the street than that which was originally proposed. The entry is surrounded by glass, and would be noticeable from Langdon Street. On intermediate versions of the design (attached), the applicants proposed a more prominent secondary entryway in the northwest corner, which was removed in the latest set of revisions and replaced by a simple steel doorway accessing the central corridor. At the very least, a more prominent secondary entry on the north side of the building should be reincorporated into the design. Staff believes that for this size of a building, a centralized, significantly recessed entryway along West Lakelawn Place may be a significant improvement, recognizing that it would replace one of the other entries and necessitate a change in the floor plan.

8) Terminal Views and Highly-Visible Corners. *The design of buildings occupying sites located at the end of a street, on a highly-visible corner, or in other prominent view sheds should reflect the prominence of the site. Particular attention should be paid to views from these perspectives and the structures should be treated as focal points by demonstrating a higher degree of architectural embellishments, such as corner towers, to emphasize their location.*

No additional comments.

Site Design / Function

1) Semi-Public Spaces. *The space between the front façade of the building and the public sidewalk is an important transition area. It can vary in size, but should be thoughtfully considered with a variety of textures in ground treatment—particularly the area around the entryway. The emphasis should be on an urban landscape, incorporating elements such as raised planters, which could also be used as seating, street furniture, lighting, and landscape materials. These features should be architecturally compatible with the styles, materials and colors of the principal building on the lot and those in the immediate area.*

There is very little semi-public space on the site. The hardscape area surrounding the entryway lends opportunities for planters and seating, although they are not shown on the site plan. The light post shown in the eastern elevation adds interest.

2) Landscaping. *Landscaping should be integrated with other functional and ornamental site and building design elements, and should reinforce the overall character of the area. Landscaping can be effective in reducing the massiveness of a building and in creating a more inviting pedestrian environment. Landscaping should be provided in the front where the building meets the ground as appropriate in the context (maybe trees or planters depending on the setbacks, shape and size of the building) to anchor building to the ground and soften the edge. Plants should be selected based on their compatibility with site and construction features. Ease of maintenance should also be considered.*

Additional landscaping should replace the driveway currently proposed off of Lakelawn Place, which must be removed as per Traffic Engineering comments.

3) Lighting. Exterior lighting should be designed to coordinate with the building architecture and landscaping. Building-mounted fixtures should be compatible with the building facades. Exterior lighting levels should not be excessive and should provide even light distribution. Areas around the entryways should be lit sufficiently. Overall lighting levels should be consistent with the character and intensity of existing lighting in the area surrounding the project site.

Details are unknown at this time. Lighting details should be addressed by the applicant prior to a recommendation for final approval by the UDC.

Interior Building Design

The criteria for determining the acceptability of a residential planned unit development within the Downtown Design Zones recognize the particular importance of building layout, functionality, interior design, and general level of amenity in ensuring that the living environment provided will be attractive, desirable and practical in an area where the intensity of development is relatively high, many potential development sites are relatively constrained in size and limited in configuration, and opportunities for on-site features and amenities outside the building envelope may be necessarily limited. Relevant factors for consideration include:

1) Mix of Dwelling Unit Types. A variety of dwelling unit types, as defined by the number of bedrooms per unit, should be available within the project. There should not be an over-concentration of either very small (efficiency and one bedroom) or very large (four or more bedrooms) units so as to maintain residential choice and provide flexibility for shifts in housing market demand.

In the latest set of revised plans submitted for the new building, four 4-bedroom units and three 2-bedroom units were replaced by 3-bedroom units, eliminating much of the variation in unit types on the site. When assessing the site as a whole, the mix of dwelling units is dominated by the twenty-one 3-bedroom units, but the three 2-bedroom units, one 1-bedroom unit, and nine lodging rooms provide some variety. Further variety is provided by the presence or absence of outdoor balconies (new building), and the unit sizes, layouts, and number of bathrooms (existing building).

2) Dwelling Unit Size, Type and Layout. The size and layout of each dwelling unit shall be adequate to allow for reasonably efficient placement of furniture to serve the needs of the occupants and create reasonable circulation patterns within the unit.

a) The sizes of bedrooms within the dwelling units should be designed to discourage multiple occupancy of bedrooms when that would result in more than five unrelated individuals living in a unit (the maximum occupancy allowed in the R5 General Residence District). The bedroom sizes should not be large enough to encourage multiple occupancy in units with three or more bedrooms. To the extent compatible with this consideration, having at least one bedroom in each unit sufficiently large for double occupancy makes the unit more suitable for households that include a couple.

b) The size and design of the living room within each unit shall reflect and be adequate for the intended number of occupants of the unit. It is generally expected that the living area be capable of comfortably seating at least the number of residents expected to occupy the unit; however, appropriate size shall be determined as part of the overall project review.

Bedrooms and living spaces as proposed in the new building are small, with an average of 258 square feet of interior space per occupant, and most bedrooms approximately 80-90 square feet. (This compares to 310 square feet of interior space for each apartment occupant in the existing Acacia building, and 380 square feet of interior space per occupant in the Sigma Chi building directly across Langdon Street) The bedroom size certainly discourages multiple-occupancy, but staff believes that the living spaces proposed in all

units are nearly as small as they could possibly be. Further, the layout of units in the new building lacks variety, in contrast to what has been proposed in the adjacent Acacia building and others in the area. The functionality of the shallow balconies along the western elevation are compromised by their shallow depth, and also by the fact that they are accessed through bedrooms rather than common living areas. Deeper balconies accessible from common living areas would be preferred.

3) *Interior Entryway.* The interior entryway should create an inviting appearance and, when feasible, should include a lobby or similar area where visitors or persons making deliveries can wait. The entryway should be sufficiently transparent to see into or out of the building when entering or leaving.

The interior vestibule is approximately 30-40 square feet and visible from the street.

4) *Usable Open Space.* Project designs should provide attractive, safe and creatively designed yards, courtyards, plazas, sitting areas or other similar open spaces for building residents. Usable open space on balconies or roof decks may be provided as long as they are sufficiently large (a suggested minimum size for a balcony is 4 feet by 8 feet) and are provided or accessible to all residents. Usable open space on roof decks at lower elevations is preferred to rooftops. At some locations, side and rear yards sufficient to provide usable open space may be limited, and outdoor open space may not represent the most beneficial use of a limited site when the overall density of development is relatively high. Common recreational facilities and social activity spaces in the development may be considered toward meeting the need for usable open space.

There is very little open space on the site as a whole, and none that meets the City of Madison definition of usable open space (In R6 zoning, 5,530 sq. ft. of usable open space would be required for the unit mix proposed.) Of note for use by some tenants is the front patio of the existing building, the proposed balconies on the fifth level of the proposed building, and the hardscape area near the entrance of the proposed building. There are no courtyards, sitting areas, or rooftop areas provided for use by all residents, and the balconies provided are shallow. A significant centralized recessed entryway to the proposed building could provide a great opportunity for an additional plaza or courtyard to be utilized by tenants. In addition, a smaller building could provide for more meaningful open space between the two buildings. At the least, the applicant should provide seating opportunities in the hardscape area near the main entrance of the proposed building.

5) *Trash Storage.* The trash storage area for the building should be located where it is reasonable accessible to the residents, as well as to disposal pick-up crews. In general, it is recommended that the trash storage area be located within the building footprint. Trash storage areas shall not be located in building front yards. Trash storage areas at any location shall be adequately screened to preserve an attractive appearance from the buildings on the site, from adjacent buildings and uses, and from public streets and walkways.

The location of the trash storage is sufficient based on site constraints, and should be sufficiently screened on all sides.

6) *Off Street Loading.* Adequate off-street loading areas shall be provided, as specified in Section 28.11. The Plan Commission may consider arrangements to provide off-street loading and access from adjoining properties to satisfy the requirement provided that continued use of these arrangements is assured. For all residential developments where the off-street loading area is not adequate to accommodate the anticipated needs of residents moving into or out of the dwelling units, and in particular when significant numbers of residents are expected to want to make these moves within the same limited time period (as with student-oriented housing), a specific resident move-in plan shall also be submitted with the application for a residential development in a Downtown Design Zone describing in detail how the moving needs of residents will be accommodated without creating congestion or traffic problems on public streets or unauthorized use of parking and loading areas that are not part of the development.

No space is available for off street loading, nor has a resident move-in plan been submitted at the time of this writing. The applicant has indicated that the units in the proposed new building would be furnished, which would minimize loading needs during move-in and move-out. As a component of a Management Plan (see below), a plan for move-in and move-out will be required for review and approval by Planning Division Staff prior to final approval of the project.

7) Resident Parking.

a) Vehicles. *The adequacy of provisions for the off-street parking of residents' motor vehicles shall be evaluated as part of the review of the specific development plan. The Plan Commission may consider the likelihood that the types of residents expected will need or desire to keep private motor vehicles, the particular constraints of the development site and the resulting trade-off between the amount of parking provided and other potential site or building amenities, as well as alternate arrangements provided to accommodate the parking needs of residents, such as, provision of leased parking spaces at another location. Inadequate on-site parking may result in restrictions on residential eligibility to obtain Residential Street Parking Permits. Underground parking is preferred to surface parking lots.*

b) Bicycles. *Adequate on-site bicycle parking shall be provided to meet the needs of all the residents and users of the developments, as provided by Section 28.11(3)(e). Bicycle parking may be shared or assigned to individual dwelling units and should be located where it is reasonably convenient to the residents and to the public street system. It is recommended that at least some bicycle parking should be provided inside the building or in another location protected from the weather. If it is intended or anticipated that residents will store bicycles within individual dwelling units, the design of the units shall include provision for this storage, and hallways, elevators, and other building features shall be appropriately designed to facilitate the transport of bicycles to and from the units.*

c) Mopeds. *Adequate parking for mopeds should be provided to meet the needs of the residents. Indoor parking spaces should be provided within the parking area provided for other motor vehicles. Outdoor parking for mopeds may be provided within the parking area provided for other motor vehicles or within bicycle parking areas. Mopeds shall not be kept inside the building except within designated moped or motor vehicle parking areas.*

The configuration of parking has greatly improved since the original submittal to include more space for bicycles and mopeds, with a tradeoff of the elimination of vehicle parking stalls. Since the proposed apartments would be utilized primarily by students, many of whom do not have automobiles, it does not seem necessary to provide space for automobiles. However, the developer will need to provide language within the lease to inform residents that residential parking permits will not be made available for on-street parking in the area. With little space for storage within the units, and the likelihood of tenants having bicycles, the indoor bicycle storage area seems to be a necessity. Additional capacity for moped storage would likely be beneficial as well.

Building Security and Management. *Building security and adequate resident access to building management shall be provided as necessary to ensure the safety of residents and to protect them from excessive noise and other nuisances that might be created in and around the premises. Depending upon the size of the building, intensity of occupancy, and type of residents anticipated, adequate security might also require on-site management. A management plan shall be submitted with each application for a residential development in a Downtown Design Zone describing in detail how the necessary security and access to management will be provided. The Plan Commission shall retain continuing jurisdiction over the management plan, and in the event that security problems occur in the future, the Plan Commission may review the management plan and may require that additional actions be taken by the building owner to address specific problems or deficiencies determined to exist.*

Details are unknown at this time, although the applicant indicates that discussions about management are well underway. A management plan will be required for review and approval by Planning Division staff prior to final approval of the rezoning request.

CONCLUSION

A well-designed multifamily student apartment building may be an appropriate use for this site, but Planning Division staff believes that the proposed number of units and floor plan make it challenging to effectively meet the standards for Planned Unit Developments in general, and for projects in Downtown Design Zones in particular.

While several positive changes have been made to the design since it was first submitted, the primary remaining concerns relate to the massing in the proposed design, and the relationship between the proposed building and the surrounding streets. In some projects, these concerns can be addressed with slight changes to the exterior. More significant changes would require additional changes to the existing interior floor plan. One way to address these concerns would be to provide a more prominent recessed courtyard with an entryway near the middle of the West Lakelawn Place frontage, which would break up the mass of the building, provide additional open space, and relate much better to the street. This change would certainly necessitate a reconfiguration of the interior floor plans, perhaps with a reduction in the number of units or bedrooms. However, such a reconfiguration would move closer to meeting the exterior and interior design criteria for Planned Unit Developments in Downtown Design Zones.

A secondary concern, related to the massing, is the overall number of units and bedrooms on the site. While the 110 unit per acre density proposed on the lot is higher than that of the majority of residential buildings in the Langdon Street area and Downtown Design Zone 4, the real issue is that the design includes very little functional open space on the lot for tenants to use, as well as small indoor living spaces and common areas. Staff believe that fewer units in building with a smaller footprint would be needed in order to provide additional open space on the site. However, the proposed density in and of itself is not a major concern in a building that can meet necessary design criteria as noted above.

It should be noted that the two adjoining lots directly east of this proposal have similar layouts with unimproved surface parking lots behind existing buildings. If these lots were to develop at a similar density as what is being proposed, the result could be approximately 300 college residents on just over one acre of land adjacent to narrow Lakelawn Place. This would greatly increase the importance of the street presence along the south side of Lakelawn Place. It may or may not be a prudent way for this unique block to develop over time, and the potential ramifications that the decision on the current proposal might have on the long-term character of the area should be carefully considered.

This original project design was reviewed by the Landmarks Commission on one occasion with a recommendation for rejection. The original project and subsequent revisions has also been reviewed on four occasions by the UDC, including an informational presentation. While there was continued discussion by some members about the preference for a less massive building with a centralized recessed entry and fewer units, at its January 7, 2009 meeting, the UDC recommended initial approval for the project on a seven – two vote subject to seven conditions

that can likely be accomplished within the framework of the existing floor plan. The conditions can be summarized as follows:

1. Significant work must be done on the northern elevation to provide a better relationship to Lakelawn Place. Specifically, the applicants must propose a much more prominent entryway and reduce the width of the garage door.
2. Bicycle parking stalls located in the front yard shall be relocated elsewhere on the site.
3. Balconies on the center of the western elevation must either be larger, or include more glass.
4. Ground level landscaping must be improved to reflect the lines of the building.
5. All changes in brick color between the fourth and fifth levels should be accompanied with a change in plane if a two-color brick design is maintained.
6. The applicant must resolve termination of vertical vents on western elevation of the building with the extension of the cornice treatment or alternative measures.
7. The alignment of windows within the northern part of the western elevation shall be centered within the recessed portion of the building.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Division believes that the Plan Commission should consider one of two options for this proposal.

- A) If the Plan Commission believes that the applicants have done enough to address the concerns discussed in this report and can find that all standards are met, Planning Division staff recommends forwarding the proposal with a recommendation of approval to the January 20, 2009 Common Council meeting, subject to input at the public hearing and the following conditions:
1. Comments from reviewing agencies.
 2. That 201 West Lakelawn Place and 229 West Lakelawn Place be combined into one parcel prior to the recording of a PUD-GDP-SIP for the property.
 3. That the Urban Design Commission recommends final approval for the project prior to the submittal of the final plan set for recording the PUD-GDP-SIP.
 4. The applicant shall work with the Zoning Administrator and Planning Division staff to revise the zoning text in order to limit the occupancy of each unit to one person per bedroom (not including double lodging rooms). This policy shall also be clearly outlined in the lease for the building, which shall be submitted to Planning Division staff for review and approval prior to the final approval of the PUD-GDP-SIP zoning.
 5. Final plans for approval by Planning Division staff will include a revised northern elevation with a prominent entryway similar to that proposed in intermediate versions of the design, and a narrower garage door.

6. Final plans for approval by Planning Division staff will include an elevation of the trash enclosure area, which should be designed with materials similar to the proposed building.
 7. The small hardscape area outside of the main entrance on the southwest corner of the building shall include seating opportunities, to be approved by Planning Division staff.
 8. The applicant shall submit a Management Plan for review and approval by Planning Division staff prior to final approval of the PUD-GDP-SIP zoning. The Plan Commission shall retain continuing jurisdiction over the Management Plan, and may review it and require additional actions by the building owner to address problems or deficiencies determined to exist. The Management Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following items:
 - a) The location and contact information of the entity responsible for the management of the property
 - b) A plan for snow removal and storage, and the name and contact information for a private snow removal provider, if applicable
 - c) Trash removal policies, and the name and contact information for a private trash removal provider, if applicable
 - d) Clear policies regarding access to each building and part of the site by residents
 - e) Clear policies regarding what is and is not allowed on outdoor balconies
 - f) Clear policies and enforcement procedures regarding noise and other nuisances
 - g) A specific operating plan for move-in and move-out times
 - h) Security policies and procedures
- B)** Alternatively, if the Plan Commission believes that more should be done to address the criteria for Planned Unit Developments in Downtown Design Zones, the Planning Division recommends that the Plan Commission find that while the proposed land use may be consistent with adopted plans and the surrounding land uses, the design criteria for Planned Unit Developments in Downtown Design Zones are not met and **refer** the rezoning request for 201-229 West Lakelawn Place.