

Summary Report
TLNA Steering Committee Meeting for
Stone House Development Proposal for the 1000 N Block of E. Washington

November 29, 2015

This document presents the findings of the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Association's (TLNA) Steering Committee on the Phase I proposal by Stone House Development for 1002-1046 E. Washington Avenue. This report addresses only the proposed Phase I and does not include any analyses from the previous Stone House proposal for the same block.

NOTE: The TLNA Council is receiving this report for the first time as of the publication date above, hence has not accepted or considered the report, nor has it taken a position on the proposal.

Contents:

- 1. Purpose**
- 2. Committee Membership**
- 3. Committee Process**
- 4. TLNA Process**
- 5. Summary Findings**
- 6. Supplementary Materials and Findings**

1. Purpose:

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

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

2. Committee Membership:

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

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

Patrick Heck (TLNA Development Committee Chair), Patty Prime (TLNA President), Mark Bennett, Steve Maerz, Bob Shaw, Pat Kelly, John Belknap, Karla Handel, Marsha Cannon, Rebecca Cuningham, Richard Linster, Evan Wedell, Seth Nowak.

Additionally, District 2 Alder Ledell Zellers has attended. Heather Stouder, from the Planning Division of the Department of Planning and Community and Economic Development has acted

as an advisor and attended some meetings.

Note that many other neighbors have provided valuable input via email and other channels; their opinions are contained here, in meeting notes and/or separate links on the webpage.

The Committee formed as a result of the Sept. 3 neighborhood meeting called by Alder Zellers. At that meeting, Stone House presented their preliminary concept for the proposal and accepted neighborhood input. As is typical, attendees were given the opportunity to join the soon-to-form Steering Committee and other neighbors were invited via the TLNA listserv in all meeting announcements. Postcard invitations for the neighborhood meeting were sent by Alder Zellers to 945 Tenney-Lapham (T-L) residences and businesses nearest to the proposal site.

3. Committee Process:

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

The Committee met twice – on Oct. 1 and Oct. 28. Email communication supplemented the distribution of information.

Depending on the desires and actions of the TLNA Council, as well as the input of the City and Stone House, the Committee is prepared to hold additional meetings and provide additional feedback to the developer. These meetings can serve several purposes, including, but not limited to, supplements to or clarification of this report, follow-up design issues, consideration of a modified proposal or consideration of any new information from the developer.

4. TLNA Council Process:

Prior to TLNA Council Members forming a stance on the proposal, the Steering Committee encourages a careful consideration of this report and also recommends that they contact the Committee with any questions. The Steering Committee can be contacted via its Chair, Patrick Heck (pwheck@gmail.com), and if a Council Member so desires, she can be included in any issue-specific email dialogues with Committee Members.

5. Summary Findings:

The Steering Committee generally supports the proposal presented by Stone House and their desire to improve this blighted site. We appreciate the developer's willingness to meet with the neighborhood and the Steering Committee to listen to our concerns. Stone House also readily provided information, building renderings, shadowing studies and perspectives both without being prompted and when the Committee made a request.

The Committee recognizes that the proposal mostly conforms to city zoning regulations and generally follows the Urban Design District-8 standards, although several permitted conditional uses will be required, as well as a change to UDD-8 (*MGO 33.24(15)(e)(12)(b)ii*)

due to the inclusion of an extra floor. While the proposal does not entirely follow the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan, the Plan's recommendations for the Madison Dairy site were mostly related to the continuing presence of the Dairy. The Plan's recommendations for future redevelopment of the E. Washington half of the block does call for employment usages with no retail or consumer services and no residential component. The Committee finds that the inclusion of some retail space and possible consumer services, as well as the residential tower, are not in conflict with the overall Plan goals, particularly given Madison's current housing market.

The Committee is very supportive of the proposal's inclusion of an affordable housing component and hopes that the City and all funding agencies and will recognize the value of the affordable units. In particular, the proposed 3-bedroom units along E. Mifflin across from Lapham School that will require tenants to have no more than 30% of Dane County Median Income are seen as a great asset for Tenney-Lapham and the City. Stone House's collaboration with a social services agency, The Road Home, and their plan to include onsite agency staff to assist those tenants, is key to stabilizing those families, who prior to obtaining these apartments will be considered on the edge of homelessness or homeless. The additional 46 affordable units at 50% and 60% of DCMI are also strongly supported. Any families that live in these units should have a mutually beneficial relationship with Lapham School and the neighborhood.

The Committee takes no position on the appropriateness of the developer's request for TIF assistance from the City. The Committee, however, does recognize that the affordable housing component of the project, which is highly supported by the Committee and the neighborhood, may not be feasible without TIF assistance.

The market rate apartments in the tower along E. Washington are generally supported, although there is some concern in the neighborhood about overbuilding in the market rate apartment market. The apartment tower includes 11th floor community and board rooms, which is one floor above the maximum allowed in this block of UDD-8. Otherwise, the tower appears to easily meet the City's criteria for 2 bonus floors, thereby permitting their floors 9 and 10. The Committee supports a change to UDD-8 to allow for the 11th floor, particularly since the Committee and neighborhood have not voiced opposition other than some concerns that for granting such requests, as has often been done in UDD-8, the neighborhood should be receiving some sort of public benefit, e.g., access to the community room. The Committee does appreciate that Stone House is open to allowing TLNA access to the community room and its companion boardroom on a reservation basis.

A majority of the Committee finds that the architecture of the tower building is still somewhat uninspired and blocky, but some improvements shown at the Oct. 28 Steering Committee meeting are appreciated. In particular, the inclusion of large glass walls/windows in the southwest corner facing the Capitol Building pleased all Committee members. There were suggestions that the majority of the tower resembled a hotel or campus dormitory and could benefit from a less monolithic design, e.g., making it appear as if it were two different structures. Similarly, some found the tower's exterior, regular banks of balconies, both inset and outset, as contributing to the exterior issues. Many thought the exterior tower cladding was too monochromatic and dominated by beige-like colors. Stone House and the architect agreed that there was room for improvement in those areas, but that some features and colors were placeholders. The addition of red-colored brick cladding to the façade of the commercial and retail spaces was well received, providing a welcome contrast with both the tower materials and the affordable housing building along N. Brearly. The Committee is more than willing to

consider future changes and options that address the concerns about the tower's form and exterior facades.

The potential inclusion of locally owned and operated CarX in the development is strongly supported by the Committee and neighbors. The ground floor retail spaces are seen as potentially adding to the neighborhood's retail potential and activation of East Washington Avenue sidewalks, hence are also fully supported. The commercial spaces along E. Washington on floors 2 and 3 of the tower are also seen as a benefit to Tenney-Lapham due to their bringing living-wage paying jobs to the neighborhood. Several employees of one prospective commercial tenant apparently are already homeowners or tenants in Tenney-Lapham, which adds to the commercial spaces' appeal. The Committee hopes that Stone House will focus on finding local entities for the commercial and retail spaces.

The contemporary design of the affordable housing building, as depicted in the renderings presented at the Oct. 28 Steering Committee, is generally supported by the Committee, although a few find it to be incongruous with the historic character of the neighborhood and Lapham School. Stone House has mentioned the possibility of façade changes for this building due to budgetary concerns, but most of the Committee encourages them to be bold when choosing from their options. There are a variety of opinions about the ground level sections of the façade along East Mifflin that cut in and out: some find them appealing while others are concerned about privacy for the tenants. A few prefer a façade that is closer in design to that of Stone House's City Row development, although Stone House indicated that today's funding environment makes that type of design difficult.

Several Committee members expressed a desire to give input on the proposal's landscaping plans, especially in the areas adjacent to the affordable housing building. The retention of street trees, inclusion of additional street lights and taking advantage of any opportunities for undergrounding of utilities were identified as priorities.

The 358-stall parking garage to be shared by the apartment, retail and commercial tenant were seen as sufficient for both autos and bicycles, although some expressed a desire that tenants living in the affordable units should have their parking spots deeply discounted. The Committee supports the inclusion of a lane that will allow parking garage traffic to enter/exit onto N. Ingersoll St, thereby keeping traffic off the E. Mifflin bicycle boulevard. The plans for raised bed gardens and community space on the parking garage rooftop were unanimously supported.

The Committee appreciates Stone House's desire to include a car sharing spot and electric car charging stations. The Committee encourages Stone House to include solar panels whenever possible for common areas or for apartment, retail or commercial spaces. Additional similar steps in this direction are also encouraged because these features increase the project's value to the neighborhood.

Some Committee members and neighbors want the City and Stone House to address the traffic situation around Lapham School, perhaps coordinating with TLNA to develop traffic calming features around the School. Even though the majority of the traffic generated by the development is expected to utilize E. Washington, there will be increases on N. Brearly, N. Ingersoll and E. Mifflin as cars seek E. Johnson and E. Gorham Streets and by those who attempt to use the bike boulevard as they drive to/from downtown.

Further analyses of the proposal with respect to city code, ordinances and planning documents is provided in *Supplementary Findings* below. If the TLNA Council eventually endorses a proposal for this site or if it should otherwise move forward, we have also included a list of additional conditions that the Committee feels should be considered.

All Committee Members hope that Stone House will continue their dialogue with the neighborhood and will continue to address the several concerns expressed in this report even though the Committee is generally supportive..

6. Supplementary Materials and Findings:

Further explanations and materials can be found at the TLNA Development Committee website.

-- Pertinent sections of city code, ordinances and planning documents related to height:

- Maximum Building Height is 3 stories on E. Mifflin and 8 on E. Washington, from *T-L Neighborhood Plan* and *UDD-8 Block 4a requirements* and *UDD-8 Block 4b requirements*. In *UDD-8 Sec. 33.24(15)(e)(12)b*, two bonus stories are allowed on block 4b if one or more of several elements are provided. For this proposal, one element of *UDD-8 Sec. 33.24(15)(e)(12)(c)i* applies that would allow the 2 bonus floors:
 - Inclusion of at least fifteen percent (15%) of dwelling units for families with incomes not greater than sixty (60%) Area Median Income (AMI) for rental units and/or an income not greater than eighty percent (80%) AMI for owner-occupied units.
- The Plan Commission and Common Council will be required to approve any change to *UDD-8 (MGO 33.24(15)(e)(12)(b)ii)* that would allow an 11th floor.
- *Madison CC-T Zoning, Sec. 28.084(3)*: Traditional Employment Districts. Dimensional Requirements, Permitted and Conditional Uses.
 - Maximum height 5 stories/68'.
- *Madison CC-T Zoning, Sec. 28.084(3)c*: Additional Height. Building heights exceeding the maximum height may be allowed with conditional use approval. (Cr. by ORD-13-00007, 1-15-13).

-- Pertinent sections of city code, ordinances and planning documents related to usage:

- *Madison CC-T Zoning, Sec. 28.082(1)*: Table 28F-1 lists permitted and conditional uses in Traditional Employment Districts, including the need for a Condition Use Permit for dwelling units in mixed-use buildings.
- *Madison CC-T Zoning, Sec. 28.082(1)*: Table 28F-1 lists permitted and conditional uses in Traditional Employment Districts, including the need for a Condition Use Permit for having general retail space.

- *Madison CC-T Zoning, Sec. 28.082(1)*: Table 28F-1 lists permitted and conditional uses in Traditional Employment Districts, including the need for a Condition Use Permit for having a restaurant or restaurant-tavern.
- Note that the Alcohol License Review Commission would be involved if an alcohol license were to be desired.

-- Pertinent issues related to any TIF request:

- Any TIF request will go to the Board of Estimates, the Common Council and the Joint Review Board. The Joint Review Board is made up of representatives from all taxing jurisdictions that would be deferring receipt of taxes they would have received.
- A new Tax Incremental District (TID) would have to be created or nearby TID 36 would have to be amended to include the property.

-- In addition to the points raised in the Summary Findings above, other points to be taken into consideration should a proposal move forward at this site:

- Retain as many street trees as possible.
- The Committee should have input on landscaping plans.
- Street parking on N. Ingersoll, N. Brearly and E. Mifflin by residents or business patrons should be discouraged by the developer, building management and the City whenever possible. Residents of the proposed apartments should not have access to residential parking permits should that program be established on nearby streets.
- Traffic calming or diversion tactics should be used to keep all additional traffic generated by tenants or patrons of the project off of the bike boulevard and around Lapham School.
- The developer should install electric car charging stations and consider a car-sharing spot.
- Indoor and outdoor bicycle parking should meet or exceed City requirements.
- Gardening and green space for tenants should be maximized on the rooftop of the parking garage.
- Commercial entities that locate in the project should appeal to neighbors and enhance the neighborhood.
- HVAC systems for the apartments and exhaust fans for the parking level should have minimal noise and should be located away from Lapham School and neighboring residential structures.
- There should be an onsite manager for the apartment tower and affordable housing units, as well as a social services agency located in the project that will provide services to the nine 3-bedroom units in the affordable housing building.
- If UDD-8 should be modified to permit a building taller than the current Block 4b

maximum building height on this proposal site, the increased height limit should apply only to the percentage of Block 4b covered by the section of the new building which exceeds the height limit.

- The impact of the demolition and construction, particularly pile driving, on Lapham School and its students should be minimized whenever possible. The Committee recommends that the developer and contractors meet with Lapham administrators to detail the construction schedule and impacts.
- Additional green features should be included whenever possible and bird-safe glass should be used in the residential tower if feasible.
- A station for the collection of dog waste should be included in the project so as to discourage dog waste from collecting on nearby streets.