

5. Redevelopment Goals and Objectives

As clearly articulated in the 2009 Village Comprehensive Plan and Pyare Neighborhood Plan, it has been a long-standing goal of the community to maintain the Garden Homes Neighborhood as an in-tact, detached single family neighborhood. Although small in size and somewhat physically separated from most of the Village, the Neighborhood has fulfilled a unique role in providing affordable ownership and rental housing opportunities while providing a comfortable setting and strong sense of community among its residents and between the Neighborhood and the rest of the Village. In the face of increasing market pressures to redevelop the area with more intensive uses, area residents and the Village have remained steadfast in their desire to preserve the Neighborhood's unique character and role.

Unfortunately, the flash flood of August 20, 2018, and the heavy rains that followed over the next several weeks forever altered the physical character of the Neighborhood. While flash floods had plagued the area throughout its history, the extent of damage from this most recent event were unlike any experienced in the past and ultimately led to the removal (or planned removal) of 24 of the 41 homes in existence prior to the flood. As a result, area residents and the Village have found themselves in the unforeseen position of having to reconsider the Neighborhood's future both in terms of its physical character and larger role in the community. The realities of escalating property values and record high construction costs coupled with the fact that one individual owns a majority of the lots dictate that significant change is inevitable and that a return to the past is all but impossible.

Redevelopment Goals

Confronted with these uncomfortable yet inescapable circumstances, the Village Board and Plan Commission spent over a year engaging with the community to plan the future of the Neighborhood, together. The process was emotional and extremely challenging for all involved in trying to balance several individual and community goals with prevailing economic and environmental realities understanding that the outcome will forever alter the Neighborhood, the lives of its residents, and the Village as a whole. While everyone was given multiple, unfettered opportunities to express their opinions and desires, the competing nature of the diverse goals required compromise and meant, unfortunately, that not everyone would be fully satisfied. However, using a thoughtful and inclusive process, the Plan Commission identified the following goals as representing a strong majority of opinion within the community as to the future of the Neighborhood:

- Support and protect remaining residents
- Mitigate potential for future flood damage
- Facilitate an orderly transition to infill development
- Maintain a cohesive neighborhood feel
- Incorporate common open space
- Seek affordability and diversity of housing
- Improve area infrastructure

Redevelopment Objectives

To realize the Redevelopment Goals, the Plan Commission developed a series of Objectives. The following Redevelopment Objectives are recommendations to guide property owners, developers, Village officials, and the public for preparing and evaluating redevelopment proposals within the Garden Homes Neighborhood. These Objectives reflect the most important themes and issues consistently raised during the extensive neighborhood and community input sessions conducted throughout 2019 as summarized previously in Chapter 6 of this Plan.

Consistent with the recommendations contained in Chapter 7 of this Plan, the Village does not intend to proactively change the zoning in the Neighborhood with the potential exception of adopting design standards. Otherwise, the Village's first preference is to retain the historic, detached single family form of development for the area. At the same time, the Plan Commission is open to considering alternative forms of development provided applicants can demonstrate consistency with the Goals and Objectives of this Plan. In crafting alternative development proposals, applicants are encouraged to carefully study this entire Plan and thoughtfully and creatively prepare their plans. Further, applicants should expect to work in a highly-collaborative and respectful manner with both Village officials and community residents.

For its part, the Village readily acknowledges that the Redevelopment Objectives are aspirational in nature in an attempt to maintain and describe a true sense of neighborhood cohesiveness. No one Objective is intended to take precedent over any other Objective, nor should any one Objective be viewed and interpreted in isolation of all other Objectives. Further, it is quite possible that a rigid interpretation and application of individual Objectives may, in fact, create direct conflicts with other Objectives. At the same time, the qualitative and visionary nature of the Objectives affords both applicants and the Village a high degree of flexibility in ultimately determining what form of redevelopment may be most appropriate in the Neighborhood. As described further in the Implementation section, it is recommended this Neighborhood Plan be adopted as an appendix to the Village Comprehensive Plan and that these Objectives serve as a guide for the Plan Commission and Village Board in their evaluation of individual development proposals for Planned Unit Developments or Planned Overlay Districts. The Objectives address both qualitative and quantitative aspects of development; however, in keeping with the intent of this Neighborhood Plan and the Village Comprehensive Plan that such plans are strictly *policy* documents and not *regulatory* documents, these Objectives are simply *guidelines* intended to inform future implementation actions to be taken by the Village. Accordingly, no one Objective is intended to take precedent over any other Objective, nor should any one Objective be viewed and interpreted in isolation of all other Objectives. Indeed, it is quite possible that a rigid interpretation and application of individual Objectives may, in fact, create direct conflicts with other Objectives. As a result, the Village Plan Commission and Village Board shall have great discretion and latitude in determining how best to implement these Objectives either through Village-initiated activities (such as a creating new zoning standards for the neighborhood) or acting upon development proposals.

Objectives Terminology

In keeping with the intent of this Neighborhood Plan and the Village Comprehensive Plan that such plans are *policy* documents and not *regulatory* documents and that these Objectives are to be used as aspirational guidelines, the following terms should be interpreted to have the following meanings and applications in the context of the Redevelopment Objectives.

The terms “should,” “should not,” “may,” “may not,” “preferred,” and “avoided” are intentionally used to reinforce the discretionary nature of the Objectives as opposed to them being prescriptive standards.

The term “remaining homes” ~~as used in the Redevelopment Objectives~~ includes all of those houses in the Garden Homes Neighborhood that were in place as of December 31, 2019, and for which demolition permits had not been applied for as of that date.

The term “existing home(s)” ~~as used in the Redevelopment Objectives~~ includes all single family homes within the Garden Home Neighborhood that may be in existence at the time a redevelopment project of any type is proposed.

For planning purposes, two subareas for the Neighborhood have been identified. The “South” subarea consists of those parcels that front University Avenue and one to three parcels to the north of those, and the “North” subarea consists of the remainder of the Neighborhood (see map at the end of this section). The boundary between the two subareas is intended to be flexible depending on what parcels are available at the time a ~~project is proposed for redevelopment~~ project is proposed and the nature and location of the project type(s) of redevelopment that may be proposed within either subarea.

North Subarea

A. Assist Support and Protect Remaining Homeowners

Although a vast majority of houses in Garden Homes experienced water intrusion from the August 2018 flood event, some did not, and a few experienced only minor damage. Further, some of those who experienced more significant damage were able to make repairs and have expressed a desire to remain in the Neighborhood indefinitely.

As noted previously in this Plan, the Garden Homes Neighborhood serves a unique role in the Village by providing affordable rental and owner-occupied housing. Toward that end, the Village seeks to encourage and assist all remaining owners and occupants wishing to remain in the Neighborhood as long as possible. While the demolition of nearly half the homes in existence prior to the August 2018 flood has given rise to the preparation of this Neighborhood Plan and these Redevelopment Objectives for their replacement, the Village also affirms its goal to retain the remaining homes to the extent possible.

- a. Assist existing homeowners in evaluating options to mitigate future damage from floods
- b. Seek funding sources to assist homeowners with flood repairs and flood mitigation
- c. Maintain or improve existing infrastructure as needed to serve the remaining homes
- d. Consider funding programs that would help to ensure the affordability of the remaining homes for future owners
- e. Apply the other Redevelopment Objectives in a manner that, to the extent practical, protects the peaceful quality of life experienced by homeowners prior to the August 2018 flood, while also allowing for the option to add uses other than detached single family homes

B. Mitigate Potential for Future Flood Damage

As detailed previously in this Plan, the Garden Homes Neighborhood has suffered significant flooding in nearly every decade since its initial development in the 1930s, but the August 2018 flood event was the most severe to date. Nearly every home in the Neighborhood suffered some form of damage, and 16 homes were damaged beyond repair and had to be removed shortly thereafter. While the Village and City of Madison are actively investigating potential solutions to mitigate future flooding, basin-wide improvements to solve this problem (if available at all) appear to be several years away from being implemented (if available at all). As a result, elevating new structures above the flood level experienced in 2018 appears to be the best practical solution to avoiding the potential for future damage.

1. Elevate Living Areas and Floodproof Supporting Equipment
 - a. All habitable area should be elevated at or above 888', the 2018 flood elevation
 - b. Mechanical equipment should be elevated at or above 888' or be floodproofed
 - c. Basements should be avoided or engineered to withstand the hydrostatic pressures from super-saturated soils
 - d. The method of elevation on a parcel should not increase the extent or duration of flooding on any other parcel in Garden Homes that is not under the same ownership
2. Incorporate Stormwater Management Best Practices
 - a. Impervious areas should be limited to 40% or less of the lot area, or stormwater management improvements should be provided to achieve an equivalent condition
 - b. All Village, county and state and county stormwater requirements should be met or exceeded
 - c. Green infrastructure and sustainable stormwater features should be used such as green roofs, rain barrels/cisterns, rain gardens, permeable paving, etc.
 - d. Stormwater detention/retention areas should be incorporated into larger, useable open spaces and serve as an amenity to the Neighborhood; ponds that require fencing should be avoided

C. Maintain a Cohesive Neighborhood Feel

A clear and consistent theme from the public input discussions was a desire to maintain a cohesive neighborhood feel throughout all of Garden Homes even if new residential buildings are something other than single-family houses. While buffering may be needed to mitigate potential impacts on existing homes, the layout of new development should seek a seamless integration with the existing homes to create a cohesive neighborhood feel rather than appearing to isolate them.

1. Maintain Primarily Residential Uses

- a. All forms of residential development consistent with these Objectives may be considered
- b. Institutional uses already permitted in the R-2 Single Family District (such as churches and schools) may be considered provided they follow all of the applicable Redevelopment Objectives
- c. Live-work units (such as artist lofts) may be considered provided they generate little additional traffic, have few external impacts (such as noise and hours of operation), and maintain a residential appearance
- d. Opportunities for individual, condominium, co-housing, or cooperative ownership are preferred as is senior housing (owner or rental)

2. Building Size and Mass

- ~~a. Building footprints should be limited to 6,000 square feet or less~~
- ~~b. Building length along streets and public spaces should be limited to no more than 160 feet~~
- ~~c. Building height should be limited to two stories of living area but buildings that incorporate garages may extend to three stories; one additional story may be considered if additional open space is provided and the upper level is stepped back away from existing homes~~
- ~~d. The elevations of larger buildings should be broken into smaller components (25-40 feet wide) by incorporating architectural features that also differentiate the individual dwelling units within the building~~
- ~~e. Each dwelling unit should have a separate/private entry from outside the building~~
- ~~f. Buildings on the same lot should have no less than 20 feet of separation~~
- a. The mass and scale of buildings should be consistent with maintaining a cohesive feel across the entire Garden Homes Neighborhood and comfortably fit among the existing homes; multiple smaller buildings are preferred over fewer, larger buildings
- b. Buildings should use rectilinear footprints and simple building forms; overly complex geometry should be avoided
- c. Elevations of buildings with multiple units should be broken into smaller components by incorporating architectural features that also should differentiate the individual dwelling units within each building
- d. Each dwelling unit should have a separate/private entry from outside the building; entries should be oriented to streets and common open spaces and away from existing homes
- e. Individual units should include some form of private outdoor space such as yards, porches, stoops, decks, and balconies; buildings with front porches are preferred and may have reduced front yard setbacks
- f. Building height should be consistent with the R-2 zoning district; buildings that incorporate garages within the primary building footprint and projects that provide additional common open space may extend beyond the R-2 height limits provided that portions of buildings that are above the R-2 limits are stepped back away from existing homes

3. Utilize Traditional Residential Building Designs

- ~~a. Buildings should reflect the historic residential character of the area by incorporating sloped roofs and a predominance of clapboard siding, brick or stone; use of stucco, EIFS, faux~~

- ~~materials, metal and materials not typically found in single-family residential architecture should be avoided~~
- ~~b. Individual units should include some form of private outdoor space such as yards, porches, stoops, decks, and balconies; buildings with front porches are preferred and may have reduced front yard setbacks~~
- ~~c. Buildings should use rectilinear footprints and simple building forms; overly complex geometry should be avoided~~
- ~~d. Building designs and materials should be consistent across all four sides~~
- ~~e. Window and door openings should be articulated and sized similar to single-family homes~~
- ~~f. Buildings and entries should be oriented to streets and common open spaces and away from existing homes~~
- ~~g. Large areas of blank walls should be avoided~~
- ~~h. Projects with multiple buildings should use multiple building elevation designs~~
- a. Buildings should reflect the historic residential character of the area by incorporating sloped roofs and a predominance of clapboard siding, brick or stone; use of stucco, EFIS, faux materials, metal and materials not found in traditional single-family residential architecture should be avoided
- b. Projects with multiple buildings should use multiple, yet compatible, building elevation designs and colors
- c. Building designs and materials should be consistent across all four sides of the structure
- d. Large areas of blank/unarticulated walls should be avoided
- e. Window and door openings should be articulated and sized similar to single-family homes

4. Provide Adequate Buffering to Existing Homes

- a. Building setbacks from existing homes should be similar in depth to the rear yards of existing homes or provide other buffering (such as upper level setbacks, enhanced landscaping, a reduction in building openings, etc.) that afford a similar level of privacy and mitigation of noise and visual impacts to the existing homes
- b. Intermittent and varied landscaping should be provided adjacent to existing homes; continuous tall hedges, fences and walls should be avoided
- c. Buffers should be used as passive extensions of common area open space (such as walking paths)
- d. ~~At e~~Entries, lighting should utilize downlighting under porch roofs or residential-scaled wall-mounted cutoff light fixtures ~~should be used~~
- e. ~~For a~~Area lighting; post lights should be limited to no more than 12 feet pedestrian-scaled in height using cutoff fixtures that minimize light spillage onto adjoining properties
- f. Lighted facades, wall packs, flood lights, and similar high intensity or commercial-scale lighting should be avoided unless required for emergencies
- g. Mechanical equipment should be screened and located on building sides that do not adjoin existing homes; rooftop mechanical equipment should be completely screened

D. Incorporate Common Open Space

An important component of maintaining a cohesive neighborhood feel is providing common area open space that is available to all residents of the Garden Homes Neighborhood. While private yards exclusive to individual units are not discouraged, new developments should seek to incorporate common open areas, whether publicly or privately owned. Such areas can help tie a project together internally as well with the surrounding area, understanding that larger open spaces will likely result in larger buildings and/or more dwelling units in order to make projects financially feasible.

- a. Common open areas should be used as a central feature around which to orient buildings and entries
- b. Larger open spaces should be incorporated that can accommodate a variety of informal recreational activities for neighborhood residents (such as ball sports, frisbee, kids games, etc.)
- c. If residential units are intended to attract families, one or more small play areas should be incorporated with amenities such as swings, climbing structures, and other play equipment designed for children
- d. Active recreation areas should be located away from existing homes and/or buffered with landscaping
- e. Smaller common open spaces should be incorporated that can accommodate passive activities such as walking, sitting and picnics
- f. Stormwater management features should be integrated into common open areas
- g. Perimeter buffering should be tied into common open spaces

E. Minimize Vehicular Impacts

Due to the low density of development and lack of through streets in the Garden Homes Neighborhood, traffic has been minimal adding to the area's appeal. Redevelopment also should seek to minimize traffic impacts and place a high emphasis on creating a safe and comfortable pedestrian environment. Alternate access points and circulation systems may be considered, but it is imperative that unobstructed and convenient access continue to be provided to all existing homes. Further, given the many alternative forms of transportation available to the area, development should consider methods to reduce dependence on individual automobiles by providing ~~direction~~ connections to transit stops and the bike path, incorporating shared car and bicycle services, installing electric charging stations, and reducing the supply of parking spaces.

- a. Continuous and convenient access should be provided to all existing homes
- b. Primary access points and vehicular drives should be located away from existing homes
- c. Land area used for parking should be minimized by locating stalls within buildings; individual surface parking lots should be ~~limited to no more than 12 cars~~ broken into small pods with each serving only a limited number of units
- d. Parking lots should incorporate perimeter screening
- e. Garages should be located within the main building footprint or ~~be attached~~ to the side or rear of the main building;
- ~~e.f. Garages should not dominate the front elevations and should that extend not protrude beyond in the front wall of the primary living areas should be avoided~~
- ~~f.g. Garage doors that face existing homes should be avoided~~
- ~~g.h. Garages for each unit should be separated from one another or limited to pairs where possible. Adjoining garages should be limited to no more than six stalls~~
- ~~h.i. Walkways and paths should be provided that separate pedestrians and bikes from vehicles~~
- ~~i.j. A continuous public pedestrian and bicycle connection from Locust Drive to University Avenue should be provided~~

F. Seek Affordability and Diversity of Housing

One of the key defining features of the Garden Homes Neighborhood has been the relative affordability of the houses for both owners and renters, providing an opportunity for individuals and families to be a part of the Shorewood Hills community who otherwise may have had to locate outside of the Village. Unfortunately, the acquisition costs of property in the Neighborhood, lost value and income from damaged and demolished homes, costs of demolition, cost of new construction and the requirement to elevate/fill, and potential need to replace existing infrastructure make the provision of "affordable" housing under any definition of the term extremely challenging without some form of assistance. This could include the Village creating some type of

affordable housing fund and/or purchasing lots and homes for resale with deed restrictions to maintain affordability. Potential sources of funding may include extending the life of existing Tax Increment Finance (TIF) districts as provided for under statutes to promote affordable housing and/or creating a new TIF district whereby the increase in property tax receipts from redevelopment in the Neighborhood could be used to fund various affordability strategies.

- a. Developers should consider using affordable housing financing programs to provide some affordable units
- b. The Village should seek funding for affordable housing in the Neighborhood, including consideration of creating a new TIF district
- c. Projects that provide more than 25% affordable units may be permitted to exceed some of the development density and intensity limitations in these Objectives
- d. Work with developers to provide housing for a diversity of households and lifestyles

South Subarea

While redevelopment of the North Subarea needs to be thoughtful in how it integrates with existing homes, it also needs to consider how it will relate to other potential future redevelopment within the Garden Homes Neighborhood. As noted previously, two general subareas have been established for planning purposes with the South ~~subarea~~ Subarea consisting of the nine lots that adjoin University Avenue and one to three lots behind those (see map at the end of this section). Of the original nine lots along University Avenue, only three were owner-occupied as of December 2019. Of the others, one was ~~currently~~ for sale, one was scheduled for demolition, one was vacant, one was rented, and two ~~others~~ served as an entry to the commercial development to the ~~W~~est. Further, of the four lots to the north that immediately adjoin those facing University Avenue, only one was owner-occupied while the remainder had been or were scheduled to be demolished.

As noted previously in this Plan, market pressures for redevelopment and intensification along the University Avenue corridor and the lack of a long-term solution to prevent future flooding will continue to put pressure on the assembly of parcels throughout Garden Homes and in the South Subarea in particular. The subarea presents a wide range of market-viable opportunities for commercial, multifamily, and mixed-use development. For example, the depth of the ~~subarea~~ Subarea is nearly equivalent to the lot area of the Boulevard Apartments recently developed further to the east in the Village. Likewise, one- or two-story commercial buildings with surface parking lots also could fit in this ~~subarea~~ Subarea. While the boundaries of the subareas shown on the map are not fixed, a key issue will be ensuring that enough lots have been assembled to make new uses viable, while also maintaining a cohesive neighborhood feel across the entire Neighborhood. Accordingly, significant redevelopment within the South Subarea is a possibility that must be considered both now with the planning for the North Area and in the future in terms of the types of redevelopment that would be appropriate within each of these subareas.

1. Potential Uses (in addition to those listed for the North Subarea)
 - a. Offices/professional services
 - b. Commercial/personal services
 - c. Hotels
 - d. Mixed-use buildings
2. Building Mass and Design
 - a. Building height should be consistent with the C-1 zoning district; buildings that incorporate parking within the primary building footprint and projects that provide additional buffer area to the north may extend beyond the C-1 height limits provided that portions of buildings that are above the C-1 limits are stepped back away from North Subarea Maximum building heights may

- ~~extend to no more than three stories, but buildings that incorporate garages may extend to four stories provided the upper level steps back away from the North Subarea~~
- ~~b. Buildings and entries should orient directly to University Avenue and encourage engagement with pedestrians on the sidewalk~~
 - ~~c. Extensive front setbacks should be avoided for buildings with non-residential ground floor uses unless accommodating activities such as entry plazas, outdoor dining, etc.~~
 - ~~d. Setbacks, stepbacks of upper floors, and landscaping should be used to buffer impacts on the North Subarea while also integrating the two subareas to maintain a cohesive feel across the entire Neighborhood~~
 - ~~e. Buildings should use rectilinear footprints and simple building forms; overly complex geometry should be avoided~~
 - ~~f. Elevations of buildings should be broken into smaller components by incorporating architectural features~~
 - ~~g. Building design should incorporate elements that are similar to and compatible ~~to~~with the residential character of the North Subarea Building Design Objectives~~
 - ~~b.h. Buffering along the North Subarea should incorporate elements that are similar to and compatible with the North Subarea Buffering Objectives~~
 - ~~e. Adequate setbacks and buffering should be provided adjacent to existing homes~~
 - ~~d.i. High quality designs and materials should be used similar to those used on recent developments in the Village along University Avenue and Doctor's Park~~
3. Access and Parking and Services
- ~~a. Enclosed parking is preferred with limited use of surface parking broken into smaller (50+/- spaces) distinct lots~~
 - ~~b. Parking Surface parking between in front of buildings (along University Avenue) or and behind them (adjacent to the North Subarea) buildings and University Avenue should be avoided; surface parking should be located to the side of buildings and away from the North Subarea~~
 - ~~b.c. Service entries, mechanical equipment, support facilities (such as dumpsters), and commercial outdoor activity areas (such as outdoor dining) should not located between buildings and the North Subarea or be sufficiently screened to mitigate visual, noise and odor impacts~~
 - ~~e.d. A single point of access should be used from University Avenue for the entire area with shared use of Maple Terrace/existing Lodge driveway preferred~~
 - ~~d.e. Projects that are predominately non-residential may need to separate vehicular access and circulation from residential development in the North Subarea, but pedestrian and bicycle connections ~~with those~~between the sub-areas should be maintained~~