



## Report to the Plan Commission

October 17, 2011

**Legistar I.D. #23715**

**6854 Stockbridge Drive**

**Zoning Map Amendment – Planned Unit Development**

Report Prepared By:

Kevin Firchow, AICP

Planning Division

**Requested Action:** Approval to rezone the property from PUD-GDP (Planned Unit Development Plan-General Development Plan) to PUD-GDP-SIP (Planned Unit Development-General Development Plan-Specific Implementation Plan) to allow for the construction of three (3) multifamily buildings with 86 apartment units.

**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.

**Summary Recommendation:** The Planning Division recommends that the Plan Commission find that the standards for zoning map amendments and planned unit developments are met and forward Zoning Map Amendment 3561, rezoning 6854 Stockbridge Drive from PUD-GDP (Planned Unit Development Plan-General Development Plan) to PUD-GDP-SIP (Planned Unit Development-General Development Plan-Specific Implementation Plan), to the Common Council with a recommendation of **approval**, subject to input at the public hearing and the conditions recommended by the Planning Division and other reviewing agencies.

### Background Information

**Applicant :** Dan Schmidt; Forward Management, Inc; 110 South Brooks St; Madison, WI 53715

**Contact:** Brian Stoddard; Avenue Architects, Inc; 550 Sunrise Drive #201; Spring Green, WI 53588

**Property Owner:** Hayes Holdings, LLC; 2985 Triverton Pike; Fitchburg, WI 53711

**Proposal:** The applicant proposes to construct a three-building apartment complex. The plans include two (2) two-story buildings, each with 24 units and a three-story building with 38 units. There are 124 total bedrooms within a mix of studio, one, and two-bedroom units. Plans also show that there are 142 parking stalls.

**Parcel Location:** The subject site is Lot 262 and Outlot 29 of the Reston Heights subdivision, located at the northeast corner of Stockbridge Drive and East Hill Parkway. The site is in Aldermanic District 3 and within the boundaries of the Madison Metropolitan School District.

**Existing Conditions:** This site is one of four sites identified in the Reston Heights PUD for multi-family development and is currently undeveloped.

### Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:

North: An intermittent stream and city-owned drainage corridor is immediately to the north, with another multi-building apartment development (Lot 263) zoned PUD-SIP, beyond;

South: Single-family residential development, zoned PUD-SIP;

**East:** Undeveloped city-owned Outlot used for stormwater management purposes with single-family residential development, zoned PUD-SIP, beyond; and

**West:** Multi-family development (Lot 198) and other undeveloped land, zoned for up to 61 units of multi-family development (Lot 254).

**Adopted Land Use Plans:** The Comprehensive Plan recommends low density residential development for this site. That general recommendation includes densities up to 15 du/ac (dwelling units per acre). With a calculated density of 16.7 du/ac this proposal is slightly in excess of this measure, though the plan states that areas of slightly higher density may exist based on a specific recommendation in an adopted plan. This proposal is consistent with the more detailed Sprecher Neighborhood Development Plan that recommends medium density residential for the subject site. Further, the number of units is consistent with the site's existing General Development Plan zoning that allows up to 86 units.

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

**Public Utilities and Services:** This property is served by a full range of urban services, though City transit is not available at this location.

**Zoning Summary:** The site is now zoned Planned Unit Development-Specific Implementation Plan. As such, there are no predetermined bulk requirements. Zoning staff has reviewed it based on the criteria for the R5 District, based on the surrounding land uses.

Bulk Requirements	Required	Proposed
Lot Area	97,400 sq. ft.	224,286 sq. ft.
Lot width	50'	Adequate
Usable open space	19,840 sq. ft.	8,169 sq. ft. *
Front yard	20'	25'
Side yards	Min. 8', total 20'	Adequate
Rear yard	30'	Adequate
Building height	3 stories	2 & 3 stories
Site Design	Required	Proposed
Number parking stalls	117	104 garage 38 surface 142 total *
Accessible stalls	3 surface 2 garage each Bldg. 9 total	3 surface 1 garage each bldg 6 total See Comment # (18)
Loading	1 (10' x 35')	
Number bike parking stalls	86	86
Landscaping	as shown	Yes See Comment # (19)
Lighting	Yes	Yes See Comment # (20)
<b>Other Critical Zoning Items</b>	Urban Design, Barrier free (ILHR 69); Shoreland Zoning	

*Table Prepared by Pat Anderson, Assistant Zoning Administrator*

## Project Review

---

The applicant is requesting approval of a zoning map amendment to the PUD-GDP-SIP district (Planned Unit Development-General Development Plan- Specific Implementation Plan) to allow construction of 86 apartment units in three buildings on a 5.15-acre site located in the Reston Heights Planned Unit Development. This project is subject to the zoning map amendment and planned unit development approval standards.

The undeveloped subject site is located at the northeastern corner of the East Hill Parkway and Stockbridge Drive intersection. The subject site includes Lot 262 and the adjoining Outlot 29, both owned by the applicant. This site is one of four sites identified in the Reston Heights PUD for multi-family development. The General Development plan was approved in November 1998. To date, development on the four multi-family sites has included a 48-unit project located on Lot 198, directly west of the subject site and a five building, 158 unit development on Lot 263, north of the subject site on the opposite side of the adjoining drainage corridor. Lot 254, approved for approximately 61 dwelling units is undeveloped at this time. Single-family development is immediately to the south and east.

The subject site slopes downward from the corner of East Hill Parkway and Stockbridge Drive towards a City-owned drainage way, which houses an intermittent stream that bisects the four multi-family parcels and forms the northern edge of the subject site. A more dramatic grade change marks the eastern side of the property.

The overall Reston Heights development, which comprises 210 acres generally located south of Milwaukee Street and east of Sprecher Road, was approved with a total of 978 residential units. In addition to the 384 multi-family units, the unit mix in Reston Heights also includes 190 single-family units generally to the south of the multi-family parcels and 322 residential units in a neighborhood mixed-use area located along the south side of Milwaukee Street, north of the subject site.

### Specific Implementation Plan

The proposal includes the development of three multi-unit buildings. Building One is a three-story, 38-unit structure at the rear of the property, closest to the drainage way. Buildings Two and Three are identical two-story, 24-unit buildings. The buildings have the following mix of bedroom units:

	Building 1	Building 2	Building 3	Total Units	Total Bedrooms
Studio Units	6	4	4	14	14
One-Bedroom Units	18	8	8	34	34
Two-Bedroom Units	14	12	12	38	76
<b>TOTAL UNITS</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>TOTAL BEDROOMS</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>124</b>

The street facing facades have a townhouse-style appearance created with varied roof lines, setback variations and the inclusion of building and patio entrances facing the street. However, the building is of a more conventional apartment-style design, with the individual units accessed from common internal hallways. The units themselves are all on one level, unlike a traditional townhouse that typically features two or three story units.

Access to the development will be provided by a full-access driveway on Stockbridge Drive and one right-in/right-out driveway on East Hill Parkway. In the latest plans, a total of 142 parking stalls are

provided with 104 stalls beneath the three buildings and 38 stalls on the surface. Plans show that 86 bicycle parking stalls will be located throughout the development, both in the basement parking garages (72 stalls) and on the surface (14 stalls) at locations throughout the project site.

The three buildings are similar in character and feature facades composed of a mix of brick veneer and horizontal vinyl siding. The apartment buildings will be topped by gabled roofs that include sections of varied height. Small amounts of shake-style siding are included beneath the projecting gables. A combination of patios, porches, and balconies are provided for each dwelling unit.

The submitted landscape plan calls for the preservation of most of the existing mature vegetation along the north side of the property though two existing trees along East Hill Parkway will be removed. Foundation plantings are proposed along all sides of the buildings and other planted beds are proposed within the buildings' front yards. A dense planting area including a mix of flowering ornamental and evergreen trees is located opposite Bailey Drive. That planting will screen the surface parking from the south and provides a landscaped terminal view from Bailey Drive.

As a clarification, the original submitted plans included a club house near the northwest corner of the site. The applicant is no longer seeking approval of that feature and it is not shown on the revised plans now before the Plan Commission.

## **Analysis and Conclusion**

---

Staff believes that the specific implementation plan for the 86-unit apartment project complies with the underlying general development plan's use, density, bulk, and massing requirements. The underlying zoning allows for up to 86 units. The applicant indicates that approximately 2,608 square feet of lot area is provided for each dwelling unit, well in excess of the 700-1,300 square foot lot area required for various dwelling unit types in the General Development Plan text. There will be 51,426 square feet provided of useable open space, exceeding the 13,760 square feet required by the General Development Plan. The front yard building setbacks are between 20 and 25 feet, consistent with the approved General Development Plan. Staff note that portions of the street facades are further recessed up to 35 feet, providing a bit larger front yard. None of the buildings will exceed the 3.5-story and 50 foot maximum height limitation. Finally, the proposed building coverage and setbacks appear to conform to the shoreland zoning requirements. Other considerations are summarized below.

### Conformance with Adopted Plans

The underlying General Development Plan for this property was approved in 1998, establishing the underlying zoning and basic right of use for the subject site, approving up to 86 apartment units.

The Comprehensive Plan, adopted in 2006, generally recommends low density residential development for this site and much of the larger surrounding area. That recommendation includes densities up to 15 du/ac (dwelling units per acre). With a calculated density of 16.7 du/ac, this proposal is slightly in excess of that measure. And while large apartment buildings are typically not included within areas recommended for low density residential development, the plan states that areas of slightly higher density may exist based on a specific recommendation in an adopted plan. In this case, the more detailed Sprecher Neighborhood Development Plan recommends medium density residential for the subject site and this proposal is consistent with that recommendation.

### Design and Character Considerations

The proposal appears to be consistent with the design standards in the underlying GDP zoning. While the proposed apartment buildings are significantly larger than the nearby single-family homes, the applicant has used façade articulation and the inclusion of setback recesses and projections to help break down the mass of the building. In terms of building placement, the smaller two-story buildings are placed closer to the street while the larger three-story building is setback deep on the site, minimizing its visual street presence.

This project received initial approval from the Urban Design Commission at its October 5, 2011 meeting. That report is attached. Among the issues discussed was the roof shape. There was a strong preference raised by nearby residents to maintain a gabled roof form to better reflect the surrounding residential character. During their review of the project, some members of the UDC indicated a preference for a flat roof design. Staff do not object to maintaining a gabled roof form noting that such a form would be largely consistent with the surrounding single and multi-family development. The UDC did recommend that if a gabled roof is ultimately approved, attention should be given to reducing the height and mass of the roof. Such details will need to be approved as part of the plans submitted to the UDC for final approval.

In regards to the site plan, there have also been concerns raised by nearby neighbors regarding the proposed Stockbridge Drive driveway. Staff understands the concerns primarily relate to increasing the amount of automobile traffic into the neighborhood. Because of the limited site access available from East Hill Parkway, Traffic Engineering and the Fire Department have both indicated a second driveway onto Stockbridge Drive is necessary to adequately serve a development of this size. The location of the driveway on the plans before the Commission has been moved westward from those in earlier concepts to help discourage apartment traffic from utilizing Bailey Drive and having to travel further into the neighborhood.

### Parking Considerations

The adequacy of on-site parking has also been raised by surrounding neighbors. Staff note that the plans before the Commission now include 142 total stalls. This includes 104 stalls beneath the buildings and 38 on the surface. Staff note that the amount of surface parking on this plan set has been increased from earlier proposed concepts. As currently proposed, there are 1.65 off-street parking stalls per dwelling unit and 1.15 stalls per bedroom. This is in excess of the minimum amount of parking that would be required in either the R4 or R5 zoning districts for a comparable development, which would require 132 and 117 stalls, respectively.

### Proof of Financing Requirement

Applicants of Planned Unit Developments are required by ordinance to provide proof of financing capability as part of the information reviewed for the approval of Specific Implementation Plans (Sec 28.07(6)(g)(3)(a)(x)) unless otherwise waived. Staff recommends that the applicant provide 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.

## Conclusion

Planning Division staff believe the project can likely meet the applicable approval standards for planned unit developments and zoning map amendments. The project is consistent with the underlying general development plan (GDP) zoning that allows up to 86 multi-family units on this site. The Comprehensive Plan, adopted in 2006, generally recommends low density residential development for this site and much of the larger surrounding area. And while large apartment buildings are typically not included within areas recommended for low density residential development, the plan states that areas of slightly higher density may exist based on a specific recommendation in an adopted plan. In this case, the more detailed Sprecher Neighborhood Development Plan recommends medium density residential for the subject site and this proposal is consistent with that recommendation. Further, staff note the General Development Plan approval predates the Comprehensive Plan. At the time of report writing, staff is aware that there have been neighborhood concerns regarding scale, design, and traffic impacts. In response, the applicant has made several design revisions to the plans based on neighborhood feedback as well as comments from staff and the Urban Design Commission.

## **Recommendation and Proposed Conditions of Approval**

---

Major/Non-Standard Conditions are Shaded
--

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

The Planning Division recommends that the Plan Commission find that the standards for zoning map amendments and planned unit developments are met and forward Zoning Map Amendment 3561, rezoning 6854 Stockbridge Drive from PUD-GDP (Planned Unit Development Plan-General Development Plan) to PUD-GDP-SIP (Planned Unit Development-General Development Plan-Specific Implementation Plan), to the Common Council with a recommendation of approval, subject to input at the public hearing and the conditions recommended by the Planning Division and other reviewing agencies.

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. That the zoning text be revised to eliminate references to the clubhouse and swimming pool, which have been removed from the current site plans. Should the applicant wish to add these at a future date, these shall be approved as an alteration to this Specific Implementation Plan.</li></ol> |
|---|
2. As required by the Zoning Code for Planned Unit Developments, the applicant shall provide 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.

***The following conditions have been submitted by reviewing agencies:***

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

3. In accordance with 10.34 MGO – STREET NUMBERS - Submit a PDF of all floor plans to Engineering Mapping Lori Zenchenko (Lzenchenko@cityofmadison.com ) for coordination and approval of an interior addressing plan. The current plan sheets do not show the location of the apartment entry doors. These will need to be shown on the plan set and PDF to determine apartment numbers. If there are any changes pertaining to the location of a unit, the deletion or addition of a unit, or to the location of the entrance into any unit, (before, during or after construction) the addresses may need to be changed. The interior address plan is subject to the review and approval of the Fire Marshal.
  4. Preliminary approved base addresses are as follows:  
Clubhouse – 301 East Hill Pkwy  
Bldg 1 – 327 East Hill Pkwy  
Bldg 2 – 6902 Stockbridge Dr  
Bldg 3 – 319 East Hill Pkwy
  5. “East” is part of the root street name for East Hill Pkwy and is not a directional prefix, therefore should be spelled out on all site plan pages and related documents.
  6. Provide storm sewer design stamped by a Professional Engineer showing no flooding of underground parking for a 100-year storm event.
- 
7. 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)
  8. All damage to the pavement on Stockbridge Dr., E. Hill Parkway 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)
  9. 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.
  10. Effective January 1, 2010, The Department of Commerce’s authority to permit commercial sites, with over one (1) acre of disturbance, for stormwater management and erosion control has been transferred to the Department of Natural Resources (WDNR). The WDNR does not have an authorized local program transferring this authority to the City of Madison. The City of Madison has been required by the WDNR to continue to review projects for compliance with NR216 and NR-151 but a separate permit submittal is now required to the WDNR for this work as well. The City of Madison cannot issue our permit until concurrence is obtained from the WDNR via their NOI or WRAPP permit process.

As this site is greater than one (1) acre, the applicant is required by State Statute to obtain a Water Resources Application for Project Permits (WRAPP) from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, prior to beginning construction. This permit was previously known as a Notice of Intent Permit (NOI). Contact Eric Rortvedt at 273-5612 of the WDNR to discuss this requirement. Information on this permit application is available on line

<http://dnr.wi.gov/Runoff/stormwater/constrformsinfo.htm> (NOTIFICATION)

11. Prior to approval, this project shall comply with Chapter 37 of the Madison General Ordinances regarding stormwater management. Specifically, this development is required to a) Control 80% TSS (5 micron particle) off of new paved surfaces; b) Provide infiltration in accordance with Chapter 37 of the Madison General Ordinances; c) Provide oil & grease control from the first 1/2" of runoff from parking areas; and d) 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.
12. The applicant shall submit, prior to plan sign-off, a digital CAD file (single file) to the Engineering Program Specialist in the Engineering Division (Lori Zenchenko). The digital CAD file shall be to scale and represent final construction. The single CAD file submittal can be either AutoCAD (dwg) Version 2001 or older, MicroStation (dgn) Version J or older, or Universal (dxf) format and contain 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))
13. The applicant shall submit, prior to plan sign-off, digital PDF files to the Engineering Division (Jeff Benedict or Tim Troester). The digital copies shall be to scale, and shall have a scale bar on the plan set. (POLICY and MGO 37.09(2)) PDF submittals shall contain the following information: a) building footprints, b) internal walkway areas, c) internal site parking areas, d) lot lines and right-of-way lines, e) street names, f) stormwater management facilities, g) detail drawings associated with stormwater management facilities (including if applicable planting plans).
14. The applicant shall submit prior to plan sign-off, electronic copies of any Stormwater Management File including: SLAMM DAT files; RECARGA files; TR-55/HYDROCAD/etc., and; sediment loading calculations. If calculations are done by hand or are not available electronically the hand copies or printed output shall be scanned to a PDF file and provided.
15. All proposed and existing utilities including gas, electric, phone, steam, chilled water, etc shall be shown on the plan. (POLICY)
16. The applicant's utility contractor shall obtain a connection permit and excavation permit prior to commencing the storm sewer construction. MGO 37.05(7) This permit application is available on line at <http://www.cityofmadison.com/engineering/permits.cfm>.



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

This agency submitted a report with no recommended conditions of approval.

**Fire Department** (Contact Bill Sullivan, 261-9843)

17. Provide fire apparatus access as required by IFC 503 2009 edition, MGO 34.503, as follows:

- a. Where there is a change in the direction of a fire lane, the minimum inside turning radius shall be at least 28-feet.

**Zoning Administrator** (Contact Pat Anderson, 266-5978)

18. Meet all applicable State accessible requirements, including but not limited to:

- a. Provide a minimum of one accessible surface stall and two accessible garage stalls striped per State requirements. The surface van accessible stall shall be a minimum of 8' wide with an 8' striped out area adjacent.

19. Parking lot plans with greater than twenty (20) stalls, landscape plans must be stamped by a registered landscape architect. Provide a landscape worksheet with the final plans that shows that the landscaping provided meets the point and required tree ordinances. In order to count toward required points, the landscaping shall be within 15' and 20' of the parking lot depending on the type of landscape element. All plant materials in islands shall be protected from vehicles by concrete curbs.

20. Lighting plans are required for this project. Provide a plan showing at least .25 footcandle on any surface of the lot and an average of .75 footcandles.

21. The applicant has not provided a designated loading area for this project, and asks for a waiver of said requirement with this request.

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

22. 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.

**Parks Division** (Contact Kay Rutledge 266-4717)

Comments were not received in time to be included in this report.

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

This agency did not submit a response to this request.