Requested Action: Approval of a PUD-GDP-SIP (Planned Unit Development-General Development Plan- Specific Implementation Plan) to allow the partial demolition and onsite relocation of a portion of an existing church/student center and the construction of a 90-unit apartment building.

Applicable Regulations & Standards: This project is subject to the standards for zoning map amendments and planned unit developments. Section 28.12 (9) provides the process for zoning map amendments. Section 28.07 (6) provides the requirements and framework for Planned Unit Developments. Section 28.12 (12) provides the guidelines and regulations for the approval of demolition permits.

Summary Recommendation: Subject to input at the public hearing, the Planning Division recommends that the Plan Commission find that the applicable demolition, zoning map amendment, and planned unit development standards are met and approve the demolition and relocation requests. The Division further recommends that the Plan Commission forward Zoning Map Amendment 3536, rezoning 1001 University Avenue from R6 (General Residence District) to the PUD-GDP-SIP (Planned Unit Development-General Development Plan-Specific Implementation Plan) to the Common Council with a recommendation of approval. This recommendation is subject to the conditions recommended by the Planning Division and other reviewing agencies.

Background Information

Applicant: John Leja; LZ Ventures, LLC; 1022 West Johnson Street; Madison, WI, 53715
Contact: Randy Bruce; Knothe & Bruce Architects, LLC; 7601 University Ave, Suite, 201; Middleton, WI 53562
Property Owner: University Commission of the Episcopal Church – WI; 1001 University Avenue, Madison, WI 53562

Proposal: The applicant proposes to demolish a portion of an existing church/student center, relocate a portion of that building, and construct a 90-unit apartment building on the balance of the property. The building is 12 stories at its tallest point, though the overall building height varies. The applicant would commence construction in the summer of 2011 with completion anticipated in summer 2012.

Parcel Location: The subject property is located on the south side of University Avenue, bounded by North Brooks Street on the east and Conklin Place on the south. Luther Memorial Church is located west of the site. The project is within the limits of Alderermanic District 8 and the Madison Metropolitan School District.

Existing Conditions: The subject now includes the St. Francis House, a church-based student center. The building includes two primary sections, the original 1929 building and the 1964 addition. As part of this proposal, the 1929 section would be relocated and 1964 section would be demolished. A 20-stall surface parking lot now sits at the rear of the site, accessed from Conklin Place.
Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:

**North:** University Avenue with UW’s Lathrop Hall beyond, zoned R5 (General Residence District);

**South:** Conklin Place with the Porchlight residential building to the south, zoned R6 (General Residence District);

**East:** North Brooks Street, with UW’s Grainger Hall beyond, zoned PUD-SIP (Planned Unit Development-Specific Implementation Plan); and

**West:** Luther Memorial Church and the “Grand Central” 162-unit apartment building. These properties are zoned R6 and PUD-SIP.

**Adopted Land Use Plan:** The Comprehensive Plan generally identifies the subject site and nearby surrounding properties as part of the University of Wisconsin Campus. Residential uses, such as the proposed building are identified among the many uses recommended for areas identified within the “campus” designation. There are no other more detailed neighborhood or special area plans to guide development at this location.

**Environmental Corridor Status:** The subject site is not located in a mapped environmental corridor.

**Public Utilities and Services:** This property is served by a full range of urban services. The Parks Division has raised concerns about the overall lack of available open space provided in this proposal and in the surrounding area.

**Zoning Summary:** The property is currently zoned R6 (General Residence District). Since this project is being rezoned to the Planned Development (PUD) district, and there are no predetermined bulk requirements, staff have reviewed it based on the criteria for the R6 district, because of the surrounding land uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bulk Requirements</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>5,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>0.57 Ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area per Dwelling unit</td>
<td>300 sq. ft. – efficiency</td>
<td>As shown on plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>450 sq. ft. – 1 bdrm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600 sq. ft. – 2 bdrm., plus 150sq. ft. per bdrm in excess of 2 per dwelling unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width</td>
<td>50’</td>
<td>As shown on plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable open space</td>
<td>64,800 sq. ft.</td>
<td>As shown on final plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front yard</td>
<td>20’</td>
<td>As shown on plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side yards</td>
<td>5’ for 1 story, plus 2’ per story exceeding one.</td>
<td>As shown on plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear yard</td>
<td>30’</td>
<td>As shown on plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor area ratio</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-Table is continued on following page-
### Site Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number parking stalls</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible stalls</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading</td>
<td>2 (10’ x 35’) areas</td>
<td>1 (10’ x 35’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Number bike parking stalls | 90    | 41 – surface  
33 – underground  
115 – underground/wall hung  
189 total |
| Landscaping           | Yes      | As shown on plans |
| Moped Parking         | 0        | 37 – surface  
21 – underground  
58 total |

### Other Critical Zoning Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban Design, Barrier Free (ILHR 69)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Prepared Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator**

### Project Review

The applicant requests approval of a demolition permit and rezoning to the PUD-GDP-SIP District (Planned Unit Development-General Development Plan-Specific Implementation Plan) to: 1) Relocate the original portion of the St. Francis House to a different portion of the property; 2) Demolish the 1964 addition to that building; and 3) Construct a new 12-story, 90-unit apartment building. This request is subject to the demolition, zoning map amendment, and planned unit development approval standards.

### Surrounding Context

The subject site is located on the northeast corner of a block bounded by University Avenue, North Brooks Street, and North Mills Street. The southern edge of the site is formed by Conklin Place, a narrow one-way eastbound public alley extending between North Mills and Brooks Streets. The subject block along University Avenue is somewhat unique in that portions of the street have relatively large setbacks. The current St. Francis House building is set back roughly 50 feet from University Avenue and 23 feet from South Brooks Street. The Landmarks Commission has indicated that the St. Francis House would likely be eligible to be a landmark, though it has not been designated a landmark at this time.

Luther Memorial Church is located immediately west of the site. That structure, built between 1921-1923, was designed by noted local architecture firm, Claude and Starck. This structure is also believed by the Landmarks Commission to be landmark-eligible. A formal nomination to make this church a local landmark has been submitted to the Landmarks Commission by Luther Memorial.

The Grand Central apartment building sits immediately south of Luther Memorial Church, on the opposite side of Conklin Place. That 14-story building was approved in 2007 and includes 162 units. A portion of that property was sold to the Grand Central developer by Luther Memorial Church. The Porchlight facility, a four story, 84-unit single-room occupancy residential facility is located south of this structure. That structure sits opposite the subject site from Conklin Place.

Aside from the above, the surrounding area is largely comprised of University uses. The five (5) story Grainger Hall is located across North Brooks Street from the subject site. Another five (5) story building, Lathrop Hall, sits on the opposite side of University Avenue. Several context photos are also provided with the applicant’s submittal.
Summary of the Proposal

The subject site currently includes the St. Francis House Student Center, comprised of the original 1929s building and a 1964 addition. The applicant proposes to demolish the 1964 addition and relocate the original building roughly 50 feet to the west and 25 feet closer to University Avenue. A new "L-shaped" multi-story structure would be constructed around the relocated building. The new building would include 90 apartment units and 63 underground parking stalls, located in two levels beneath the building. The parking garage would be accessed from a driveway on North Brooks Street.

The building is 12 stories at its tallest point, though the overall building height varies. The building generally steps down in height towards University Avenue and Luther Memorial Church. The portion of the building adjacent to Conklin Place is nine stories tall (including the exposed garage level) and steps back to 12 stories. The "backdrop" portion of the building, sited behind the relocated St Francis House, steps down from eight to four stories. The small wedge-shaped projection fronting University Avenue is four (4) stories in height.

Along University Avenue, the new building would be setback 25 feet and is generally in line with the relocated St. Francis House. Along Brooks Street, the twelve-story portion of the building is setback seven (7) feet. The west setback for both buildings is primarily 12 feet, though very small portions of the relocated St. Francis House are setback nine (9) feet. Along the narrow Conklin Place, the building would be setback 11 feet.

The proposed elevation drawings show the building features a significant amount of glass, vertically framed by precast concrete or stone panels. A darker precast concrete base is proposed along the building and staff note that the base along Conklin Place is roughly one floor out of the ground. The 12-story element fronting onto University Avenue features a curvilinear wall that is visible above the fourth floor.

The building includes 90 apartments with 255 total bedrooms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Total # of Bedrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Bedroom</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Bedroom</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-Bedroom</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Bedroom</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Bedroom*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>255</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff note that there is a discrepancy between the plans and letter of intent regarding the five-bedroom units. The letter of intent refers to these as four-bedroom units with dens while the site and floor plans refer to these as five bedroom units. That likely translates to 9 additional building residents. Considering the scope of the project, the additional nine bedrooms may not have significant impact, though this inconsistency should be addressed should the project be approved.

As noted above, 63 underground vehicle parking stalls are proposed. For bicycles, 74 parking stalls are provided with 33 provided underground and 41 at the surface. Additionally, 115 “wall-hung” stalls are provided. Site plans show that 37 moped parking stalls are provided within the North Brooks Street and Conklin Place setbacks.
In addition to this proposal, a follow up request to subdivide the property between the relocated St. Francis House and new apartment building has been submitted and is under review.

**Project Analysis**

The proposed project could not be constructed under the existing R6 (General Residence District) zoning. The proposed 4.2 floor area ratio exceeds the R6 standard of 2.0. Further, the flexibility needed to address the building relocation are more easily addressed as part of a planned unit development (PUD).

Planned unit developments are intended to promote improved environmental and aesthetic design by allowing for greater freedom, imagination, and flexibility compared to conventional zoning districts. Considering the general zoning map amendment standards, if the Plan Commission recommends approval of this proposal, it would need to make a finding that this rezoning is in public interest and is not solely for the interest of the applicant. In making their recommendation to the Council, the Commission will also need to find that the proposal meets the PUD approval standards and that the rezoning is consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

**Comprehensive Plan Recommendation**

Staff believes the proposal is consistent with the general recommendations provided in the Comprehensive Plan. That plan identifies the subject site and surrounding area for uses related to the University of Wisconsin campus. Among the recommended uses within the campus area are student, faculty and employee housing, with no density range identified. In the absence of a more specific neighborhood plan for the area, the Planning Division believes that the proposed use of the site for high-density residential development generally conforms to the recommended land uses. There is no City-adopted neighborhood plan providing more specific guidance.

**Planned Unit Development Standards**

The Planned Unit Development approval standards include the character and intensity of land use, economic impact, maintenance of open space, and the implementation schedule. In reviewing these, staff believe that the standards related to “Economic Impact” and “Implementation Schedule” can be met. Regarding the latter, the applicant is required by the zoning ordinance to provide proof of financing capability, unless this standard is waived by the Plan Commission or Plan Commission Secretary. Staff have recommended this be provided as a condition of approval. In considering the standard relating to the “Preservation and Maintenance of Open Space,” staff believe that while reduced from the existing condition, the redesigned courtyards fronting University Avenue could meet this standard.

The Planning Division believes that most of the issues on this proposal primarily relate to the “Character and Intensity of Land Use” standard. If the Plan Commission were to recommend approval, they would need to make finding that the proposed use, appearance, and intensity are compatible with the physical nature of the site or area. Staff believe the proposed building is attractive and well-designed. There are, however, several considerations related to its context.

- **Land Use.** In regards to the proposed use, as noted above, student housing is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s recommendation for this area. Staff do not believe it would be inappropriate to introduce a residential land use along a portion of the University Avenue
Frontage. As a clarification, staff recommend the proposed zoning text be amended to reflect the continued use of St. Francis House as a permitted use.

- **Density and Intensity.** The proposed project includes 90 units and 255 bedrooms and has a calculated density of 158 units per acre. The density is generally consistent with similar developments in the surrounding area. Of the projects that have been developed since 1990 in the south campus area, which generally extends from and includes University Avenue on the north, Frances Street on the east, Randall Avenue on the west and Regent Street on the south, project densities have ranged from 54 to 247 units per acre, with the highest densities located along Johnson Street. Staff note that the Grand Central development, located immediately behind Luther Memorial Church, is believed to have the highest density of these projects, at roughly 247 units per acre. A portion of that site was sold to the Grand Central developer by Luther Memorial Church.

A more qualitative measure of density is the ability for the site to provide adequate space for resident needs. In regards to on-site usable open space, exact figures have not been provided. From the floor plans and elevations, it appears that balconies are provided for most (if not all) of the dwelling units, though this is not clearly labeled on the floor plans.

The amount of bike parking is another qualitative consideration. A general guideline applied in the campus and downtown area is to provide one bike parking stall per bedroom. With 74 bike stalls (189 when counting the wall-mounted spots) for 255 bedrooms, the project is beneath that measure. When counting the wall mounted spaces, biking is provided for roughly 75% of the bedrooms. Traffic Engineering is recommending that the proposed 14 moped parking stalls along North Brooks Street be relocated to the building basement and that that space is used to accommodate additional bike parking. While staff does not know exactly how many stalls could be provided, this additional bike parking could bring the total number of stalls close to the one-per-bedroom guideline.

- **Bulk and Mass.** Considering the context, staff do not object to the creation of a taller building on this site. The “Neighborhood Context and Existing Building Heights Graphic” submitted by the applicant lists the height of the proposed structure at 1,013.5 feet (measured to the top of the penthouse). That is just beneath the 1,022 feet height of the recently constructed Grand Central building, located immediately south of Luther Memorial Church. Other similarly-scaled buildings in close proximity to the site include the 14-story UW Chemistry Building (1,012 feet) and the UW Educational Services Building (1,028 feet). While the new building is much taller than the adjacent Porchlight building, the St. Francis House, and Luther Memorial buildings, the height of the building does not appear to be out of scale given the taller buildings in the area.

The new building would step down in height towards Luther Memorial Church, the relocated St. Francis House, and University Avenue. The 12-story mass of the building is reduced along the University Avenue side with a curvilinear wall, which serves to frame the relocated St. Francis House and preserves some views of the Luther Memorial roof and church tower from University Avenue.

Staff understands that different bulk and mass models have been explored by the applicant, including a concept to create a taller, narrower building at the rear of the lot. In this scenario, the St. Francis House was not altered, though the new building became the “back drop” for the entire structure. This was discussed early in the Urban Design Commission review process.
**Setbacks.** A unique feature along both sides of this block of University Avenue are the relatively deep setbacks for most buildings, with the notable exception of Luther Memorial Church, which is set back approximately eight (8) feet from the sidewalk. The St. Francis House is currently setback roughly 50 feet from the street. The setback is currently aligned with the easterly addition to Luther Memorial Church. With this proposal, the setback of the new building and most of the St. Francis House will be reduced to roughly 25 feet. The setback for a portion of the relocated St. Francis house will be eight (8) feet. Considering the context, staff believe that even with a reduced setback, the 25 foot setback would continue to provide a unique green space frontage through most of the subject site.

**Landmarks Commission Recommendation.** There are somewhat conflicting recommendations from the Landmarks Commission and the Urban Design Commission (UDC) on this proposal. After their review of the proposal, the Landmarks Commission unanimously approved a motion to convey the following comments to the Urban Design Commission and Plan Commission.

The Landmarks Commission believes that St. Francis House and Luther Memorial Church are both eligible for local landmark designation. The Landmarks Commission is further aware that an application is pending for local landmark designation for Luther Memorial Church. While the Landmarks Commission has no jurisdiction over this proposal at this time, the Commission has concerns that given jurisdiction, it would not grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new development proposal adjacent to a landmark unless the following concerns were addressed: 1) The development on the adjacent site shall not adversely affect the natural light that reaches the sanctuary at Luther Memorial Church. 2) The development on the adjacent site shall not adversely affect the enjoyment of the Luther Memorial Church site with increased noise and privacy issues.

**Urban Design Commission Recommendation.** On a split 4-3 vote, the UDC recommended initial approval of the project. As part of that action, the UDC noted their support for the proposed modern building design. In that motion, the UDC also expressed "concerns about retaining the religious corridor and how the massing of the building can support that, allowing some flexibility in the change of massing but deferring to the Plan Commission’s opinion on maintenance of the religious corridor." This is an atypical recommendation from the UDC, but staff believe it indicates that a majority of Commission members generally supported the proposed mass and design direction. The attached report notes that while members of the UDC were supportive of the design, other land use concerns were raised that were outside of that body’s purview. The detailed reports are attached.

**Shadow Impacts.** One of the most contentious design issues is that of the shadow impacts from the proposed building on Luther Memorial Church. Both the applicant and Luther Memorial church have prepared shadow studies. Both studies show that shadow impacts on the church will be greatest in the early morning. Correspondence from the Church and its members have raised specific concerns regarding the loss of natural light during morning services and maintenance concerns regarding the lack of sunlight on the building. The applicant concludes that shadow impacts on the sanctuary will be minimal after about 9:00 am. That is generally consistent with the detailed shadow study prepared for Luther Memorial Church, however, that study shows that the eastern sanctuary windows will be in shadow up until about 10:00 am during portions of March-April and again in September-October. It appears that after 10:00 am, shadow impacts on the sanctuary windows would be minimal.
A summary of that study is included in the packets. Their entire study is 168 pages and can be viewed online at the following site:

http://legistar.cityofmadison.com/attachments/f25779ab-2452-4b76-8528-03770c01317a.pdf

While it is true that shadows will be cast over the church windows during certain times of the day, the developer has taken steps to ensure that the tallest element of the building is located the furthest from the sanctuary. The 12 story element is 80 feet from the Luther Memorial property line, 90 feet from the Luther Memorial eastern addition, and 120 feet from the closest stained glass window. The balance of the stained glass windows on the sanctuary are at least 140 feet from the 12 story element. Staff believe that on balance, this physical separation is adequate for an urban location and that the proposed building will not loom over the Luther Memorial Church Sanctuary.

Demolition and Removal Standards

This proposal is also subject to the demolition and removal standards of the Zoning Ordinance. In considering these standards, the Plan Commission must find that the proposed demolition/removal is both 1) consistent with the intent and purpose of the zoning district and 2) that the proposed future use is compatible with the purpose of the demolition/removal section of the ordinance. Regarding the former, staff note that since this request is proposed in conjunction with a PUD zoning map amendment, that portion of the standard can likely be met. Many similar PUDs for high-density residential and mixed use projects have been approved throughout the Downtown and Campus area.

Regarding the latter, the Statement of Purpose of the demolition and removal ordinance states, in part, that the purpose of these standards are to aid in the implementation of adopted City Plans, protect neighborhood character, preserve historic buildings, and encourage the relocation of existing buildings. These standards also state the project should be consistent with adopted plans. When making its finding, the ordinance states the Plan Commission shall consider and may give decisive weight to any relevant facts. Among the items the Commission could consider are the effects the proposed demolition and removal may have on the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding properties. In considering potential impacts, staff note that the entire block is already developed.

Finally, this section of the ordinance also notes the Plan Commission should consider the report of the Preservation Planner. That report is attached. In summary, she concurs with the Landmarks Commission in that both the St. Francis House and Luther Memorial Church are landmark-eligible. She notes that it is also possible that the 1964 addition to St. Francis would be eligible for local and national landmark status, except that buildings must be a minimum of 50 years old to be considered. That addition is 47 years old. A formal nomination to make Luther Memorial a local landmark has been submitted since the submittal of this application. Staff also note that at its June 13 meeting, the Landmarks Commission had its initial meeting to discuss the Landmarks designation. This will be forwarded to the Plan Commission at an upcoming meeting for an advisory recommendation. Staff anticipate final action by the Landmarks Commission on this nomination could occur later this summer.

Public Input

As summarized above, staff have received a large amount of correspondence in opposition to this proposal. These comments have come primarily from Luther Memorial Church and its members. Copies of this correspondence is attached for the Plan Commission’s review. Various concerns have
been raised including the incompatibility of the land uses, negative impacts from shadows on both building maintenance and loss of sunlight during morning services, and concerns over the proposed building character. Staff also note that there is a letter of support from the Madison Trust for Historic Preservation. This is located in the packets.

**Conclusion**

The applicant requests approval of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) zoning map amendment and demolition/removal permit in order to relocate the original portion of St. Francis House, demolish the 1960s-era addition to that building, and construct a 90-unit apartment building on the balance of the property.

Staff believe the proposed building is generally attractive and well-designed. This 12-story structure steps down to eight (8) and then to four (4) stories on the portions of the building closet to Luther Memorial Church, the relocated St. Francis House, and University Avenue. Considering the urban context, staff do not object to the development of a taller building on a portion of this site. While the project has 255 bedrooms and a calculated density of 158 du/ac (dwelling units per acre), this is well within the general density range of other projects approved in this area. Since 1990, similar student-oriented housing projects have a density range of 54-247 du/ac. In fact, the “Grand Central” apartment building, located behind Luther Memorial Church has more total units (162), a higher density (247 du/ac), and more bedrooms (355) than the proposed apartment building.

There are several context considerations that warrant close review. In particular, the relationship of the proposed building to both the St. Francis House and Luther Memorial Church should be considered. A considerable amount of opposition has been raised from Luther Memorial Church and its members. Various concerns have been expressed including shadow impacts and the overall incompatibility of uses.

The Landmarks Commission offered an advisory recommendation to the Plan Commission noting that while neither the St. Francis House nor Luther Memorial Church are currently designated landmarks, both are believed to be eligible. While the Landmarks Commission has no formal jurisdiction on the project at this time, the Commission indicated their concerns on the proposal. That body stated that given jurisdiction, they would not support the proposal unless plans were revised to not adversely affect the natural light reaching the sanctuary and to not adversely affect the enjoyment of the Luther Memorial Church site with increased noise and privacy issues.

The recommendation of the Urban Design Commission (UDC) should also be considered. That body granted initial approval and their reports are also attached. In their motion, they noted their support for the proposed modern architecture of the building. The UDC also expressed concerns about the mass of the building and its impact on the block, referred to in their report as the “religious corridor.” That body has not yet granted final approval. Planning staff believe that the introduction of residential use and a four-story element along the block frontage is appropriate and that the University Avenue façade of the building is appropriately scaled.

Given the development that has already occurred in this area of the City that is of a similar scale as the building proposed, staff does not believe that the density, bulk, and mass is inappropriate for the location. Staff acknowledge the concerns that have been expressed about the shadow impacts and that new building will cast shadows on Luther Memorial’s east facing stained glass windows during the early to mid-morning hours. The tallest elements of the proposed building, however, have been located
the furthest away from the sanctuary. Staff believe this physical separation is adequate for an urban location and that the proposed building will not loom over the Luther Memorial Church sanctuary.

Staff believe that the applicable standards can be likely be met, though careful consideration should be given to the raised concerns. The Plan Commission should carefully consider the public hearing testimony and the submitted materials in making their own conclusion regarding the appropriateness of this proposal and its ability to meet the demolition, zoning map amendment, and planned unit development standards.

**Recommendations and Proposed Conditions of Approval**

| Major/Non-Standard Conditions are Shaded |

**Planning Division Recommendation** (Contact Kevin Firchow, 267-1150)

Subject to input at the public hearing, the Planning Division recommends that the Plan Commission find that the applicable demolition, zoning map amendment, and planned unit development standards are met and approve the demolition and relocation requests. The Division further recommends that the Plan Commission forward Zoning Map Amendment 3536, rezoning 1001 University Avenue from R6 (General Residence District) to the PUD-GDP-SIP (Planned Unit Development-General Development Plan-Specific Implementation Plan) to the Common Council with a recommendation of approval. This recommendation is subject to the conditions recommended by the Planning Division and other reviewing agencies.

1. That the site and floor plans be made consistent with the letter of intent to eliminate the discrepancies regarding the proposed number of bedrooms. This shall be submitted for staff approval.

2. That the applicant provides proof of financing which provides assurances that the project will be completed once started, in a form acceptable to the Director of the Department of Planning and Community and Economic Development prior to the sign-off and recording of the PUD and any permits being issued. This information shall include a letter of commitment from a bank or other lending institution and a letter from a construction company indicating their intent to proceed with the project.

3. That the permitted uses in the zoning text be revised, for staff approval, to reflect the continued use of the St. Francis House as a religious institution.

4. That the applicant provides additional on-site bike parking along North Brook Street for approval by Traffic Engineering, Zoning, and the Planning Division.

5. That all balconies be clearly labeled on plans and that useable open space calculations are provided for approval by Zoning and the Planning Division.
The following conditions/comments have been submitted by reviewing agencies:

**City Engineering Division** (Contact Janet Dailey, 261-9688)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The St. Francis House will retain the address of 1001 University Avenue. The new apartments will have a base address of 350 N. Brooks Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The Certified Survey Map shall be approved and recorded prior to issuance of occupancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The proposed plan calls for a storm discharge to the surface mid site along a sidewalk. Additional information shall be provided on how this shall be accomplished and how it shall be made safe during ice melt conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Proposed sanitary lateral to serve St. Francis House requires a private easement across 1001 University Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The construction of this building will require removal and replacement of sidewalk, curb and gutter and possibly other parts of the City’s infrastructure. The applicant shall enter into a City / Developer agreement for the improvements required for this development. The applicant shall be required to provide deposits to cover City labor and materials and surety to cover the cost of construction. The applicant shall meet with the City Engineer to schedule the development of the plans and the agreement. The City Engineer will not sign off on this project without the agreement executed by the developer. The developer shall sign the Developer’s Acknowledgement prior to the City Engineer signing off on this project. (MGO 16.23(9)c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The approval of this Conditional Use or PUD does not include the approval of the changes to roadways, sidewalks or utilities. The applicant shall obtain separate approval by the Board of Public Works and the Common Council for the restoration of the public right of way including any changes requested by developer. The City Engineer shall complete the final plans for the restoration with input from the developer. The curb location, grades, tree locations, tree species, lighting modifications and other items required to facilitate the development or restore the right of way shall be reviewed by the City Engineer, City Traffic Engineer, and City Forester. (MGO 16.23(9)(d)(6))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The applicant shall provide the City Engineer with a survey indicating the grade of the existing sidewalk and street. The Applicant shall hire a Professional Engineer to set the grade of the building entrances adjacent to the public right of way. The Applicant shall provide the City Engineer the proposed grade of the building entrances. The City Engineer shall approve the grade of the entrances prior to signing off on this development. (POLICY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The Applicant shall replace all sidewalk and curb and gutter which abuts the property which is damaged by the construction or any sidewalk and curb and gutter which the City Engineer determines needs to be replaced because it is not at a desirable grade regardless of whether the condition existed prior to beginning construction. (POLICY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>All work in the public right-of-way shall be performed by a City licensed contractor. (MGO 16.23(9)(c)5 and MGO 23.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. All damage to the pavement on Brooks Street and Conklin Place, adjacent to this development shall be restored in accordance with the City of Madison’s Pavement Patching Criteria. For additional information please see the following link: http://www.cityofmadison.com/engineering/patchingCriteria.cfm (POLICY)

16. The plan set shall be revised to show a proposed private internal drainage system on the site. This information shall include the depths and locations of structures and the type of pipe to be used. POLICY AND MGO 10.29

17. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Section 37.07 and 37.08 of the Madison General Ordinances regarding permissible soil loss rates. The erosion control plan shall include Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) computations for the construction period. Measures shall be implemented in order to maintain a soil loss rate below 7.5-tons per acre per year.

18. Prior to approval, this project shall comply with Chapter 37 of the Madison General Ordinances regarding stormwater management. Specifically, this development is required to Complete an erosion control plan and complete weekly self-inspection of the erosion control practices and post these inspections to the City of Madison website – as required by Chapter 37 of the Madison General Ordinances.

19. The applicant shall submit, prior to plan sign-off, a digital CAD file (single file) to the Engineering Program Specialist in the Engineering Division (Lori Zenchenko). The digital CAD file shall be to scale and represent final construction. The single CAD file submittal can be either AutoCAD (dwg) Version 2001 or older, MicroStation (dgn) Version J or older, or Universal (dxf) format and contain only the following data, each on a separate layer name/level number: a) building footprints, b) internal walkway areas, c) internal site parking areas, d) other miscellaneous impervious areas (i.e. gravel, crushed stone, bituminous/asphalt, concrete, etc.), e) right-of-way lines (public and private), f) all underlying lot lines or parcel lines if unplatted, g) lot numbers or the words “unplatted”, h) lot/plat dimensions, i) street names, and all other levels (contours, elevations, etc) are not to be included with this file submittal.

NOTE: Email file transmissions preferred addressing@cityofmadison.com. Include the site address in the subject line of this transmittal. Any changes or additions to the location of the building, sidewalks, parking/pavement during construction will require a new CAD file. (POLICY and MGO 37.09(2) & 37.05(4))

20. The applicant shall submit, prior to plan sign-off, digital PDF files to the City Engineering Division (Jeff Benedict or Tim Troester). The digital copies shall be to scale, shall have a scale bar on the plan set, and shall contain the following items: building footprints; internal walkway areas; internal site parking areas; lot lines and right-of-way lines; street names, stormwater management facilities and; detail drawings associated with stormwater management facilities (including if applicable planting plans).

21. Prior to approval of the application, the owner shall obtain a permit to plug each existing sanitary sewer lateral that serves a building that is proposed for demolition. For each lateral to be plugged the owner shall deposit $1,000 with the City Engineer in two separate checks in the following amounts: (1). $100 non-refundable deposit for the cost of inspection of the plugging by City staff; and (2). $900 for the cost of City crews to perform the plugging. If the owner elects to complete the plugging of a lateral by private contractor and the plugging is inspected and approved by the City Engineer, the $900 fee shall be refunded to the owner. (POLICY) This permit application is available on line at http://www.cityofmadison.com/engineering/permits.cfm.
22. All outstanding Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD) and City of Madison sanitary sewer connection charges are due and payable prior Engineering sign-off, unless otherwise collected with a Developer’s / Subdivision Contract. Contact Janet Dailey (608-261-9688) to obtain the final MMSD billing a minimum of two (2) working days prior to requesting City Engineering signoff. (MGO 16.23(9)(d)(4))

23. The site plan shall be revised to show all existing public sanitary sewer facilities in the project area as well as the size, invert elevation, and alignment of the proposed service. (POLICY)

Traffic Engineering Division (Contact John Leach, 267-8755)

24. City of Madison radio systems are microwave directional line of sight to remote towers citywide. The building elevation will need to be review by Traffic Engineer to accommodate the microwave sight and building. The applicant shall submit grade and elevations plans if the building exceeds four stories prior to sign-off to be reviewed and approved by Keith Lippert, (266-4767) Traffic Engineering Shop, 1120 Sayle Street. The applicant shall return one signed approved building elevation copy to the City of Madison Traffic Engineering office with final plans for sign off.

25. The applicant shall submit with the parking lot plans a letter of operation of the garage door to the underground parking area, and modify the ingress/egress showing a detail drawing of the area showing queuing of at least one vehicle of 20 ft. from the behind the property line to the garage door that will not be blocking the public sidewalk to the lake access.

26. A condition of approval shall be that no residential parking permits shall be issued for 1001 University Avenue, this would be consistent with other projects in the area. In addition, the applicant shall inform all tenants of this facility of the requirement in their apartment leases and record in zoning text. The applicant shall note in the Zoning Text that no residential parking permits shall be issued. In addition, the applicant should submit for 1001 University Avenue a copy of the lease noting the above condition in the lease when submitting plans for City approval. Please contact William Knobeloch or Bill Putman, Parking Utility at 266-4761 if you have questions regarding the above items:

27. The applicant will need to demonstrate how the truck will ingress/egress the truck loading area on Conklin Place.

28. The applicant is proposing 14 moped parking spaces along the public sidewalk on N. Brooks Street. These proposed moped parking create additional pedestrian and moped conflicts on the public sidewalk with high pedestrian traffic. The applicant should remove the moped parking, relocate the moped parking spaces into the basement, install bike rack in place or create a moped corral 6 ft for moped parking and 4 to 6 ft drive aisle with a 4 ft wall to separate the public sidewalk and moped corral (Like the UW’s Moped Carrols across the street.) The applicant should provide detail moped parking spaces and access. Moped standard parking spaces recommend 4 ft in width and 6 ft in length with a 6 ft access aisle.

29. The applicant shall indicate the type of City approved bicycle racks to be installed and locations. The bike rack should be located by the entrances to the buildings.
30. When the applicant submits final plans of one contiguous plan for approval, the applicant shall show the following: items in the terrace as existing (e.g., signs and street light poles), type of surfaces, existing property lines, addresses, showing all easements, all pavement markings, building placement, and stalls, signage, percent of slope, vehicle routes, dimensions of radii, aisles, driveways, stalls including the two (2) feet overhang, and a scaled drawing at 1" = 20'.

31. The attached Traffic Signal/Street Light declaration of conditions and covenants shall be executed and returned with site plans. The development shall acknowledge on their proportionate share of traffic signal assessments. The development shall further agree in writing to not oppose their proportionate share of the traffic signal assessments as part of the City’s Special Assessment districts for traffic signals.

32. The driveway from the parking area behind the building to the street right-of-way for two-way operation shall be a minimum eighteen (18) ft in width according to M.G.O. 10.08(6)(a)4. The applicant shall show the dimensions of ramps and drive aisles that is greater item “E” or 18 ft for two-way traffic.

33. The applicant should show the dimensions for proposed parking stalls’ items B = 8ft-9 in, C = 17 ft, E = 23 ft, F = 20 ft, and degree angle parking width and backing up, according to “One Size Fits All” parking design standards. Stair cases, Elevators shafts, Aisles, ramps, columns, offices or work areas are to be excluded from these rectangular areas, when designing underground parking areas. The applicant should modify parking spaces according to “One Size Fits All,” and excluded items in the parking spaces.

34. Overhead Mirrors, and "Stop" sign shall be installed at the driveway approach to North Brooks Street. All signs at the approaches shall be installed on site or behind the property line. All directional/regulatory signage and pavement markings on the site shall be shown and noted on the plan.

35. The intersection shall be so designed so as not to violate the City’s sight triangle preservation requirement which states that on a corner lot no structure, screening, or embankment of any kind shall be erected, placed, maintained or grown between the heights of 30 inches and 10 feet above the curb level or its equivalent within the triangle space formed by the two intersecting street lines or their projections and a line joining points on such street lines located a minimum of 25 feet from the street intersection in order to provide adequate vehicular vision clearance. The applicant may need to modify the wall to be in accordance to M.G.O.

36. The developer shall post a deposit and reimburse the City for all costs associated with any modifications to Traffic Signals, Street Lighting, Signing and Pavement Marking, and conduit and handholes, including labor, engineering and materials for both temporary and permanent installations.

37. Public signing and marking related to the development may be required by the City Traffic Engineer for which the developer shall be financially responsible.
Zoning Administrator (Contact Pat Anderson, 266-5978)

38. Meet all applicable State accessible requirements, including but not limited to:
   a. Provide the minimum number of accessible stalls striped per State requirements. A minimum of one of the stalls shall be a van accessible stall 8’ wide with an 8’ striped out area adjacent for both interior and surface parking areas.
   b. Show signage at the head of the stalls.
   c. Show the accessible path from the stalls to the elevator. Parking stalls shall not block the entry to the elevators.

39. The zoning text needs to be clarified in regard to signage. Signage shall be amended to include “Signage will be allowed as provided by MGO 31, including all provisions of MGO31, and further as regulated for the R6 district, with signage as approved by the Urban Design Commission and Zoning Administrator.”

40. Modify zoning text to allow religious institution as a permitted land use, along with accessory uses.

41. PUD zoning text indicates Useable Open Space is “as shown on plans” where plans do not call out said open space. Please identify useable open space areas in final plans.

42. Exterior lighting is required and shall be in accordance with City of Madison General Ordinances Section 10.085.

43. Provide a reuse/recycling plan, to be reviewed and approved by The City’s Recycling Coordinator, Mr. George Dreckmann, prior to a demolition permit being issued.

44. Sec 28.12(12)(e) of the Madison Zoning Ordinance requires the submittal of documentation demonstrating compliance with the approved reuse and recycling plan. Please note, the owner must submit documentation of recycling and reuse within 60 days of completion of demolition.

45. Combine the lots to legally make two lots via a Certified Survey Map. A property line cannot go through a building without a fire wall down the property/lot line pursuant to Section 705.1.1 of the International Building Code.

46. Meet applicable State building and State setback requirements. Contact Mike VanErem at 266-4559 in the building permit review division regarding these requirements for the existing church being moved onto the proposed Lot 1.

47. Provide a minimum of 90 bicycle parking spaces on site for the residential units. Wall-hung bicycle racks do not meet minimum zoning requirements for bicycle parking facilities, and therefore cannot be counted toward meeting bicycle parking requirement unless as approved with the PUD.

48. Work with Planning and Zoning staff to identify additional areas for bicycle and scooter parking, as well as to devise methods to restrict bicycle and scooter parking from terrace and other non-designated areas on the site.
**Fire Department** (Contact Scott Strassburg, 261-9843)

49. Sheet A-1.2 implies that the building crosses the property line.

50. Building shall comply with all building and fire code requirements including high-rise requirements with an occupied floor 75 feet above the lowest level of fire access lane.

**Parks Division** (Contact Kay Rutledge, 266-4714)

51. The developer shall pay $191,852.97 in park dedication and development fees for the new 90-unit apartment building (3 units are efficiencies and fees have been determined based on the E-SRO rate for those units).

52. The developer must select a method for payment of park fees before signoff on the PUD-GDP-SIP.

53. Approval of plans for this project does not include any approval to prune, remove or plant trees in the public right-of-way. Permission for such activities must be obtained from the City Forester, 266-4816.

54. This development is within the Vilas-Brittingham park impact fee district (SI27).

**Water Utility** (Contact Dennis Cawley, 261-9243)

55. All wells located on this property shall be abandoned if no valid well operation permit has been obtained from the Madison Water Utility. This property is not in a Wellhead Protection District. The Water Utility will not need to sign off the final plans, and not need a copy of the approved plans.

**Metro Transit** (Contact Tim Sobota, 261-4289)

This agency did not submit a response for this request.