



Memo

To: Plan Commission
From: Casey Griffiths, Zoning and Planning Administrator/Assistant to the Village Manager
Date: February 26, 2016
Re: Reinders Development- 13400 Watertown Plank Road

The Village has received an application for a redevelopment project for the Reinders property located at 13400- 13430 Watertown Plank Road. Wangard Partners Inc. and R&R Investments of Wisconsin, LLC are proposing to redevelop the north portion of the property to multiple family residential. The proposal includes four apartment buildings and one building with townhomes. The development is a mix-used development as a portion of the existing Mill Place Shop's property will be considered part of the development.

Units

The proposal includes a mix of type of multi-family housing including apartments and townhomes. The four apartment buildings are proposed to have a mix of different styles of apartments including:

- Studio: 560 sq. ft.
- 1 Bedroom Traditional: 642 sq. ft.
- 1 Bedroom Standard: 747 sq. ft.
- 1 Bedroom Deluxe: 838 sq. ft.
- 1 Bedroom + Den: 978 sq. ft.
- 2 Bedroom Corner 1: 1,217 sq. ft.
- 2 Bedroom Corner 2: 1,132 sq. ft.
- 2 Bedroom Corner Deluxe: 1,258 sq. ft.
- 2 Bedroom + Den: 1,372 sq. ft.

There are two styles of town homes proposed:

- 2 Bedroom: 2,076 sq. ft.
- 3 Bedroom: 2,306 sq. ft.

Demolition

To facilitate the development the existing warehouse/office building on the rear of the property is to be removed, the Quonset hut and a warehouse building located directly to the north of the Mill Place shops is proposed to be removed.

Zoning

The existing parcels are currently zoned as M-1 Limited Manufacturing District (Reinders) and B-1 Local Business District (Mill Place Shops). The applicants are requesting a rezoning of 13400 Watertown Plank Road to Rm-1 Multiple Family Residential District and an overlay rezoning for both parcels to a Planned Development Overlay (PDO) District. As this is one development, it would be a mixed compatible use PDO. Under §335-30 of the Village Code, an applicant may petition for the redevelopment of a site utilizing a PDO, which may encompass one or more individual lots, with allowed compatible uses. Allowed uses under the PDO include those uses expressly provided for as permitted, conditional and/or accessory. The Rm-1 district's permitted uses include multiple-family dwellings.

Per Village ordinance, the intent of the PDO overlay district is to allow for development and redevelopment of a property through the use of coordinated site planning and diversification of location of structures and types and the mixing of allowable compatible uses. The PDO district is to allow for design flexibility, while at the same time maintaining use requirements in the underlying zoning district.

The proposed development will require a rezoning of the property from M-1 Limited manufacturing to Rm-1 Multiple Family Residential District and to a Planned Development Overlay District.

Density

The proposed density the applicants are requesting for the development is 182 units. The overall development parcel size is 8.28 acres. A mixed compatible use PDO District's minimum acreage is 1.5 acres, provided that it is within the Village's Downtown Design Overlay District (defined under §335-12). The primary parcel was removed from the Downtown Design Overlay in 2003, and would need to be placed back into it to allow for this development to meet the PDO acreage requirements. Under the Rm-1 District, the minimum density requirements are 8 units per net acre. Under the PDO overlay, the density may be increased to a maximum density of 12 units through a conditional use. The developer is seeking an enhanced density of 22 units per net acre. This density is also possible under §335-30F(3) provided that the Plan Commission determine that the proposed project uniformly contains exterior and interior materials, design details, workmanship and features of an exceptionally high quality. The factors that allow for an enhanced density to be granted are as follows:

- [1] Whether the project will provide better utilization of the land and better preservation of natural resources than would otherwise be realized if the site were developed either in conformity with the density requirements of the underlying district or as a PDO District without the enhanced density.*
- [2] Whether the project makes adequate provision such that an increase in residential density will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on neighboring properties, existing and/or proposed public rights-of-way and/or municipal and other public services as a result of the type, intensity and frequency of the use(s) associated with the proposed project;*
- [3] Whether the structures proposed for the project are harmonious with existing surrounding structures and land uses.*
- [4] Whether building materials have been selected and are proposed to be utilized in a manner that is harmonious with the natural environment and the general character of other buildings and structures in the vicinity of the proposed development.*
- [5] Whether the proposed project will result in the construction or upgrading of specific public infrastructure improvements that will benefit the public without cost to the Village.*

[6] Whether the proposed project will enhance an existing structure that is deemed beneficial to the character of the neighborhood where it is situated.

Under 335-30F(4), the applicants were required to complete a residential density calculation as required for a mixed compatible use PDO. This calculation takes into account the amount of nonresidential use in the proposed project. The applicants have provided the Village with a calculation regarding the density, factoring in the total interior square footage for all residential units and all nonresidential units, the number of anticipated residential units and the total land area. The calculation is provided in the application materials. It was determined that the density calculation would be greater than the density allowed under an enhanced density, which per code means that the maximum allowable density goes back to the 22 units per acre.

Height

Under Rm-1 zoning the maximum allowable height for principal structures cannot exceed 36 feet. Principal structures that have exposed foundations on side or rear yards cannot exceed 46 feet. Per §335-30D(2), PDO districts may deviate from requirements of the underlying zoning district with respect to maximum building height. The Plan Commission will need to determine if the proposed height of the project's building is acceptable. The four apartment buildings will have exposed foundations on their rear and side elevations, thus there are two different heights shown below.

- Buildings A & B
 - 5 Story Side (exposed foundations): 66 ft. 6 in.
 - 4 Story Side (non-exposed foundations): 55 ft. 8 in.
- Buildings C & D
 - 4 Story Side (exposed foundations): 56 ft. 6 in.
 - 3 Story Side (non-exposed foundations): 45 ft. 6 in.
- Townhomes
 - 32 ft. 10 in.

Setbacks

The Rm-1 district requires a setbacks of 50 feet from the street right of way, 20 feet side yard setback and 25 feet rear yard. Per §335-30D(2), the PDO overlay allows for a development to deviate from the setback requirements of the underlying zoning district. The applicant has proposed the following setbacks:

- Building A: 51.9 ft. (rear); 11.3 ft. (side)
- Building B: 89.1 ft. (street); 43.9 ft. (rear)
- Building C: 36.2 ft. (street)
- Building D: 37.9 ft. (street); 82.1 ft. (rear)
- Townhomes: 30 ft. (street); 45 ft. (rear)

Building Footprint & Impervious Surface

The Rm-1 district places the maximum allowable building footprint at 30% of the lot area and maximum impervious surface at 65% of the lot area. The proposed site plan for the residential development shows the proposed lot area and impervious surface for the development. Specific information was not given about proposed building footprints, however staff has been able to estimate footprint based upon the floor plan information given. This does not take into account any common space area. Additional information will need to be obtained from the developer regarding the footprint of the residential buildings. Information will also need to be submitted regarding the proposed area calculations for the B-1 property (Mill Place).

- Lot Area: 300,999 sq. ft.
- Impervious Surface: 193,842 sq. ft. - 64% of lot area

- Estimated Building Footprints:
 - Building A: 11,000 sq. ft.
 - Building B: 21,000 sq. ft.
 - Building C: 16,000 sq. ft.
 - Building D: 16,000 sq. ft.
 - Townhomes: 7,000 sq. ft.
 - Total: 71,000 sq. ft. - 23.5% of lot area

Parking

§335-32 requires that multiple family dwellings provide 2 parking spaces per dwelling unit. The proposed development is 182 units, which requires a minimum of 364 spaces. The applicants have proposed a total of 402 parking spaces, which includes 238 enclosed and 164 surface parking spaces.

Ordinance requires that all driveways be at a minimum of 20 feet wide, a width measurement was not provided on the site plan for the driveway connecting to Elm Grove Road. The width of the driveway to Watertown Plank Road is 38 feet.

Currently side yard parking is being proposed to the south of Building A. Off street parking is not allowed in a side yard, per code however under §335-32B(3) the Plan Commission may determine that conditions are such that parking in side yards is reasonably necessary to provide adequate parking. A deviation may also be made under the PDO overlay district is provided in §335-30D(2).

Traffic movement in the parking lot was not provided, however it is assumed that the drive lanes are intended for two way traffic. Ordinance allows for two way traffic movement if the provided parking is at a 90 degree angle, which was provided. Curbed end islands are required to be at least 100 sq. ft. in area. Area measurements were not provided on the site plans for the curbed end islands.

Curbs and barriers are required to be a minimum of four feet from a property line. Currently parking show on the south driveway to Watertown Plank Road is a minimum of 2 ft. from the lot line. Again a deviation may be made under §335-30D(2).

Right of Way Vacation

The applicants will be requesting that the Village vacate 40 feet of the 100 feet of right of way along Elm Grove Road. This vacation would be split evenly between the east and west sides. This right of way vacation would allow for the development to have an additional 0.50 acre. The existing right of way along Elm Grove Road is 100 feet, which is relatively wide for a two lane road in the Village. Typical right of way widths for most Village roads is between 60 and 50 feet. The applicants still need to submit their request for a right of way vacation.

Emergency Service Comments

Fire Chief Bill Selzer has reviewed the proposed site plan and his comments are attached the application materials. Police Chief Jim Gage has reviewed the plans and does not have any comments at this time. We are currently waiting on EMS Director Dr. Jon Robinsons comments.

Engineer's Comments

Provided in your packet are preliminary conceptual review comments from Village Engineer Andy Petersen.

Traffic Impact Analysis

Included in your packet is the executive summary of the traffic impact analysis completed by Traffic Engineering Services, Inc.

Tax Incremental Financing

The applicants are requesting TIF financing. Currently we have not received any information from the applicants in terms of what they will be requesting.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.