

**Plan Commission Summary Minutes
Virtual Web Conference Meeting**

April 11, 2022 - 5:30 pm

Plan Commission minutes are transcribed in a summarized manner. Video footage is available for viewing in the (CATS) Department of the Monroe County Public Library, 303 E Kirkwood Avenue. Phone number: 812-349-3111 or via e-mail at the following address: moneill@monroe.lib.in.us.

The City of Bloomington Plan Commission (PC) met on April 11, 2022 at 5:30 p.m., a hybrid meeting was held both in the Council Chambers, located in Room 115, at 401 N. Morton Street, City Hall Bloomington, IN 47404 and remotely via Zoom. Members present: Tim Ballard, Flavia Burrell, Andrew Cibor, Chris Cockerham, Trohn Enright-Randolph, Jillian Kinzie, Ron Smith, Karin St. John and Brad Wisler. Absent was Israel Herrera.

ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 14, 2022

March 14, 2022

****Kinzie moved to approve the March 14, 2022 minutes, with no changes. Burrell seconded the motion. Motion carried by voice vote 8:0- Approved.**

REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Kinzie reported she read in the Bloomington Beacon is asking Commissioners and Members of Council to offer reports about other meetings they attend to inform the public and to help amend and enhance the reporting that might not be available in our local papers. So she reported on her representation at the Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning organization, she attended the Meeting on April 8. She said there were two items on the agenda that consumed most of their time at that meeting, the first was the coordinated transportation plan update, that is supported by INDOT, regarding new information about rural transit and services for people with disabilities and the fund that were available for enhancing services.

PETITIONS CONTINUED TO: May 16, 2022

PUD/DP-24-21 Robert V Shaw

N Prow Road: 3500 block of N Hackberry Street
Request: Petitioner requests Final Plan and Preliminary Plat amendment for Ridgefield PUD and Subdivision Section V.
Case Manager: Jackie Scanlan

SP-05-22 MHG Apartments

1210, 1220, 1320, 1404, 1414 W. Arlington Rd.
Request: Major site plan approval to allow the construction of a multifamily Residential building with 211 dwelling units in the Residential Multifamily (RM) zoning district.
Case Manager: Eric Greulich

DP-08-22 Walnut Pike Development LLC

3111 S Walnut Street Pike
Request: Primary plot approval of a 37 lot subdivision of 15.56 acres in the Residential

Medium lot (R2) zoning district. Also requested a waiver of required 2nd hearing and vacation of Phase I of the Ivy Chase Plat.

Case Manager: Eric Greulich

SP-06-22 Strauser Construction Co., Inc.

3000 & 3070 S Walnut St.

Request: Major site plan approval to construct a 9 building self service Storage facility with 10 new vehicle parking spaces.

Case Manager: Karina Pazos

CONSENT AGENDA:

SP-14-22 LoftonEastThird, LLC

2611 E 3rd Street

Request: Major site plan approval to allow the reuse of a building for 11,000 sq. ft. of commercial space and 30 dwelling units in the Mixed-Use Corridor (MC) zoning district.

Case Manager: Eric Greulich

Wisler asked if any commissioners would like to have a full hearing the consent agenda item. No comments from commissioners. He then asked if there are any public comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Greg Alexander says the site has a severe pedestrian access deficit, its only access is by sidewalk on 3rd Street and that has been recognized as out of code, but that is not the problem, the problem is 3rd Street. The drivers come in and out of that particular driveway at speed, traffic along that sidewalk are going 40 to 50 miles per hour. It needs to be a pedestrian environment and when new things are going in, the question should be is there a bare minimum of pedestrian access and you have to acknowledge that this is no. He believes the solution to this is to add access to Edwards Row, by adding in a sidewalk to connect access to Edwards Row would elevate the need for everyone to use 3rd Street for pedestrian traffic. Greulich says that connection was discussed in 2005 when the Sahara Mart went in and there were mixed reactions from the neighborhood association about having access between these sites. Also, there is property between this property and Edwards Row that is not owned by the petitioners. The petitioners are not putting anything in that area that would prevent any future access to Edwards Row, should the adjacent property owners and the neighborhood association agree to that access. Jackie Scanlan, Development Services Manager, said they do want pedestrian connections, whether or not those who live on public roads want other people to be able to use those public facilities isn't the primary concern here, like Mr. Greulich said there are other private property owners between this property and Edwards Row and there is nothing we can do to compel the property owner to let us put a path across their property.

Mary Hrovat is in total agreement with everything that Greg Alexander said, access via 3rd Street versus access via Edwards Row. It would mean a lot to her to be able to get to the business that may be there and for people to have access to 7th Street bike lane.

Kinzie has reservations about the pedestrian access, she doesn't see a way that it's possible to do anything on this proposal at this stage, given the surrounding properties are owned by others.

****Kinzie motioned to approve consent petition SP-14-22. Smith seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 8:0—Approved.**

PETITIONS: April 11, 2022

DP-08-22 Walnut Pike Development LLC

3111 S Walnut Street Pike

Request: Primary plot approval of a 37 lot subdivision of 15.56 acres in the Residential Medium lot (R2) zoning district. Also requested a waiver of required 2nd hearing and vacation of Phase I of the Ivy Chase Plat.

Case Manager: Eric Greulich

Eric Greulich presented this petition and it is a request from Walnut Pike Development for property at 3111 South Walnut Street Pike, the property is currently single family residential. The petitioners are proposing to subdivide the property into 37 lots and that would consist of a series of single family homes for sale, as well as for common area lots. This property is on the far south side of town on Walnut Street Pike. This site has a long history within the Planning Department for subdivision approvals, however, it continues to still sit empty and undeveloped. There are some single family residences on the existing lots, all will be removed to allow for the overall subdivision of the site. Petitioner is requesting primary plat approval to allow for a 37 lot subdivision of 15.56 acres in the Residential Medium Lot (R2) zoning district. Also requested is a waiver of the required second hearing and delegation of secondary plat approval to staff. The petitioner is also requesting to vacate the recorded plat of Phase 1 of the Ivy Chase plat.

Greulich wanted to point out some things that is going to come into play with this petition. The existing developments surrounding this site, to the north and east you can see various phases of the Sherwood Oaks subdivision that were all platted and developed. There were no stub roads to this property that were constructed or required with that development. Likewise, to the south is a multifamily development that was approved with no stub roads, so the majority of the surrounding developed property was built without connection opportunities to this site. Petitioners are requesting to vacate this plat for everything east of Walnut Street Pike to allow for the site to be redeveloped.

The site has a mix of environmental features, there are sinkholes that are scattered around the site, as well as in the northern third of the property has a very dense mature tree canopy coverage, so there are some environmental aspects of the UDO that come into play here with preservation, as well as Karst Conservation. That all requires space to be set aside on the proposed plat, they are enacting the conservation subdivision within the UDO which requires a great deal of preservation to be set aside. The site plan they are proposing does have one entrance on Walnut Street Pike that does result in a cul-de-sac being created on the eastern half of the property, the cul-de-sac is a result of the lack of connection opportunities that were presented on the adjacent properties. The property to the north has one single family home that is likely to be redeveloped at some point in the coming decades. In order to promote connectivity and fix some of the errors that have happened in the past with surrounding developments, and allow for future connection the petitioner is proposing a stub road on the property to the north, in order to allow for that connectivity to continue through that property and connect out to Walnut Street Pike.

The proposed subdivision would have two roads internally, these would both be public dedicated with 61 feet right-of-way, and the petitioner is proposing to have on street parking on the south side of the internal road. The petitioner is setting aside a great deal of property in the common area. The UDO requires common areas for karst features over a half acre are to be set aside in common area, as well as tree preservation areas are required to be set aside in common area one they get over a certain size. Lots nine and 10 would be planted with a conservation easement for the area of tree

preservation with Karst Conservancy easements for all the karst features on those lots, lot 26 on the south side would be a large common area lot, lot 37 would be another common area lot that would primarily serve as detention, but also has a karst feature as well.

So the Conservation subdivision that is being proposed here really is the most appropriate given the environmental constraints on the site which make a traditional subdivision, where you would see alley loaded lots in a different internal connection road layout is just not possible. The location of Karst features really create a lot of difficulty with arranging lots with alleys and having any kind of internal access loop that would allow for the cul-de-sac to not be incorporated with this site, because of the lack of connection opportunities on the properties that surround this site really necessitates the cul-de-sac. The UDO does not allow for cul-de-sacs so the petitioner is requesting a waiver to allow for the cul-de-sac with this department for the reasons that have were mentioned.

The petitioner is requesting a series of waivers, they are requesting that the required second hearing be waived, the petitioners has supplied a full set of the site, grading and utility plans, as well as a primary plan that meets all the UDO requirements. With the exception of the waiver being requested for the cul-de-sac this petition is very well planned out in terms of design, so the waiver of the second hearing seems appropriate since the information presented to us is enough to analyze the site plan. The petitioner is also requesting to delegate secondary plan approval to staff, what the petitioner has provided will give a great idea of what will be involved with the plat so we are not expecting any changes with the secondary plat versus the primary plat, do not have any issues with delegating the secondary plan to staff for approval. The petitioner is requesting a waiver for vacating the previous plat approval east of Walnut Street Pike.

Recommending approval and recommend to the Plan Commission to adopt the proposed findings with the six conditions that were listed in the status report, plus the seventh condition that has been added.

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS:

Bill Riggert from Bledsoe, Rigger, Cooper, James introduced himself as representing the Walnut Pike Development on the Ivy Chase Subdivision.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

Cockerham thought he heard "future development" on lots nine and 10, asked Greulich to explain if there is going to be future development on those two lots. Greulich said lots nine and 10 are set aside as common area, they would specifically be labeled on the secondary plat as non-buildable lots. All common lots would not be buildable.

Enright-Randolph noted that on the county side a sinkhole did open during construction, so wanted staff to know they could reach out to MS Coordinator, they have put provisions in place to deal with sinkholes that develop during construction.

Smith asked why the stub road between lots nine and 10 was there, if not there then the karst topography and the tree canopy would be preserved. And members of the public who owns the property to the north are concerned about the safety aspects of having a dead end road at the back of their property. Greulich said this site is the victim of previous planning decisions that resulted in a lack of stub roads that give connection opportunities, so our transportation plan has many sections that deal with promoting connectivity between properties, both for vehicles and pedestrians. We know this

lack of connectivity is what results in a cul-de-sac being created on this site, trying to fix a lot of the mistakes that have happened in the past by not requiring those connections. Having more than one opportunity and connection into and out of a property is advantageous for a lot of reasons. It takes traffic burden off of the major roads, gives emergency services additional ways to get into and of sites. Allows for people located within the development to visit other people that are on the adjacent property without having to go on Walnut Street Pike. Requiring the stub road to the north gives better connection opportunities for this property, as well as the property to the north, when that is redeveloped. The stub road has been located away from the karst features. The stub road is in the most appropriate location, given the environmental constraints in the topography as well as the possible lot arrangements for the lot to the north. Smith asked if there was any karst topography under the stub road. Greulich said no, nothing has been identified. There is a karst feature just to the west of the stub road, east of lot eight so it is away from the karst feature. Smith asked if the property to the north is never developed is a middle ground that can be proposed. Greulich said with a subdivision they are required to dedicate right of way and then build all public improvements within the right of way, so they would be required to build that road to the north property line so when the property to the north develops they can connect to that easily. Smith understands but doesn't feel he can support the proposal, without some kind of condition on the stub road. Doesn't understand what the stub road has to be there right now. Greulich said there is not really a way for us to come back and retroactively acquire that right of way. The petitioners owns all the site now and once all the lots are sold to individuals we can't go back and acquire right of way from private property owners and expect them to build the road. Smith ask about ownership of the stub road because it appears looks like it is not plated for a home. Greulich noted that only lot 11 could be using that stub road at this time, but should it be connected to the north it would be used for vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles. If we don't get these connections now then we are going to be living with those same mistakes made in the surrounding areas. Scanlan noted this is a code requirement, has been a code requirement for decades and it is this plat because it is required and it is good policy to get connections that aren't just major roads. Cul-de-sacs have long term maintenance issues for the City, so putting them all over town is something we have decided, as a community, to stop doing and so one way to do that is to allow connectivity. That is what code says now so if this is something this body and any member of this body, or other bodies wants to propose UDO changes to address this, that is possible. But for now it is a requirement and they is why it has been included.

Kinzie would like to clarify that at this time the only way to access this development is from Walnut Street Pike. Greulich confirmed that the access is Walnut Street Pike due to lack of connectivity on adjacent properties. Kinzie also wanted to clarify that the current plat shown on the aerial photograph is what is to be vacated. Greulich wanted to point out there are several developments throughout Bloomington that have stub roads that connect to adjacent undeveloped properties, this is not uncommon. Kinzie asked if the point of condition seven was to vacate the previous plat to eliminate the cul-de-sacs, this was confirmed by Greulich. Scanlan added that condition seven specifically is addressing the right of way or the portion of the previous plat that dedicated right of way over Walnut Street Pike, from the center of Walnut Street Pike east roughly 40 feet we don't want to vacate that, we want that to remain so everything from the existing interface between the right of way line on this property, everything east all lots in the cul-de-sac from the previous plat is removed.

Cibor asked to clarify the previous secondary plat dedicated 40 feet of right of way along Walnut Street Pike that didn't previously exist, and what he is hearing is the intent of condition number seven is to maintain that right of way and vacate everything to the east of that. Greulich confirmed that was correct. Cibor asked the petitioner about timing, since the previous plat had been approved some time ago and then sat, curious as to when this project will begin. Mr. Riggert said Walnut Pike Development is anxious to get this project started and will start as soon as they can get permits. With

the intent to complete in one phase.

Smith asked what is to prevent a car from going into the property owner's back yard from the stub road. Greulich said there is a sign that is required to be posted at the end of the stub road saying the street will be extended in the future. There is also a stand of trees at the end of the stub road as well as the trees on the adjacent property.

Smith ask President Wisler if conditions could be added at this point, Wisler confirmed that it was within their purview to add conditions. Smith asked if there could be a condition that the stub road not be developed. Wisler said he believes that could be added as an additional waiver. Wisler doesn't see this as good idea to do on the fly, would recommend putting it in writing and have legal draft for us, he believes it would be a lot safer to put it in writing and make sure it is worded carefully. Wisler's recommendation is to have second hearing on this, have Legal draft something between now and the second hearing.

Burrell asked if it is a requirement and if the stub road is not built by this developer at this time, then who will build it in the future. Greulich said the UDO does have language for public improvement bonds that has a three year limit on them, after that time limit is up the bonds are called in and the city builds whatever public improvements are bonded for, so we are not continuing to hold on to a bond, a bond is obviously a letter of credit from the developer, and tying up their money in perpetuity that is why we have various specific time limit for these public improvement bonds. Scanlan noted there have been conversations internally as well, there are some concerns on stub roads, how they are maintained, and the questions Burrell raises are great questions and this is what got us as a city, and now staff, to point where the UDO is now. How do we compel developers later, or whoever they've sold it to in five years, to connect to the property to the north. If that is not done at this time by the developers then we as taxpayers will be paying for the connection.

Burrell believes this is more involved than just doing a waiver, needs more thought. Should not be taken lightly.

Wisler asked staff if the Commission has ever added a waiver that wasn't requested by the petitioner, is there any precedent for this. Scanlan stated this is the only situation in which the Commission can do waivers is at this point.

Cockerham would like to hear from the developer on the stub road, what is the developer's point of view. Riggert said when they first presented this petition to City Planning they did not have the stub road in because they were wanting to keep it simple. Greulich pointed out all the problems in the past about connectivity with the adjacent properties, and it is in the UDO, and it was added into the development. They would have asked for a waiver if it was something that they felt the staff would have supported. Matthew Crouch, petitioner representative, he agrees with everything Riggert said, it's not something they wanted to do but they realized they would not get the support of the planning staff.

Enright-Randolph also added there is one other component that hasn't really been brought up and that's the safety component, to have two points of ingress and egress is very beneficial especially if there was a situation if there is a need for first responders, believes safety standpoint is very important. Enright-Randolph also asked about connecting into other cul-de-sacs. Greulich said that it would be stepping into common areas that isn't developable.

Wisler noted that if this development could connect to Souder Square or Jennifer Drive there would be

connections all the way to Winslow or Sherwood Oaks Park without having to touch Walnut Street Pike. Greulich said that would have been ideal, another example of mistakes made in the past. Wisler said it sounds like there is some discretion, though not black and white, that every one of these properties has to stub to the next, asked Greulich to give more context as what triggers the requirement. Greulich said the transportation plan calls for new roads to be constructed with new developments with future connections. A good example of this is the Huntington farm on the east side of town, it is a large property that is currently undeveloped but as new developments were constructed adjacent to this property stub roads were put in to allow for connectivity when and if this property develops. Best management practices should include stub roads for undeveloped areas, so if it developed in the future connectivity will not be an issue. This is way it is very important to have this connection with this petition and have that constructed now.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ben Ramsden and his partner are co-owners of the property just north of this development, they have lived there for almost 13 years. They strongly object to the inclusion of the stub road to the north and this stub would terminate directly on their property. Does not believe the stub road is necessary. Objects to planning documents stating their property is undeveloped, feels that is a false statement, the property has been developed for over a 100 years. There is a house, built in 1921, that has been extensively renovated, including a high quality addition and customization landscaping. House is in excellent shape and certainly not needing to demolished or abandoned. He expects the house will remain intact given the value and its historic value. Said he and his neighbors were not notified of the informational meeting in February, if they had been they would have attended. Another procedural problem was, notification of this hearing being sent to the wrong address. Not against new development. Believes that even if a connecting road could ever be completed it seems highly unlikely that it would not improve any community connectivity for pedestrian or vehicles. He is concerned that the stub road would adversely impact appraisals and sale of his property.

Greg Alexander is glad to see that the Plan Commission and city staff are concerned about connectivity, it is a defining problem, believes this body dropped the ball for 50 consecutive years. While he was growing up everyone he knew lived in Forest Park and to get from where he lived, Westbrook Downs, to Forest Park is about 100 feet but to drive it was about a mile on a highway. It defined his life as a child and it will define the lives of the children who will live in this development without the connectivity.

Matt Louis lives on the adjacent property. What wasn't mentioned was that there was several attempts to develop this property that was denied by Plan Commission for multifamily resident due to safety concerns because these is only one method of egress from this property. Second, there were concerns about people driving into the neighbor's property from the stub road, the same can happen at the end of the cul-de-sac, as well as cars being parked 20 ft. from his back yard, which is where the children will be playing. Also concerned about the stub road, seems like it will be highly unlike that the property to the north will be developed.

Mary Ellen McCain is in support of what Mr. Ramsden said about the statement in the staff report saying there were no particular issues, the people in Peppergrass have been involved in shared concerns. Asked petitioners what will be done in terms of potential run off, not just ongoing but also during construction, will there be any kind of buffer zone and if so what manner.

Rosie Stedman lives in Peppergrass is also concerned about run off. During the neighborhood meeting Mr. Rigger stated that Bloomington doesn't require an acceleration/deceleration zone like

Peppergrass has, she believe it will be needed there.

ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

Kinzie would like for the staff or petitioner to address the few questions that were raised by the public. Would like for someone to address Matt Lewis' question about the cul-de-sac and its location up against the developments to the east. The second question was about the run off and expectations for addressing the run off during construction and the third question is about road safety on Walnut Street Pike. Greulich will address those three questions. In terms of the safety issue at the end of the cul-de-sac, it will have a standing curb, as well as the sidewalk and tree plot along there. Staff can work with the petitioner and Engineering staff to place any other physical impediments that might be necessary. There is a utility easement that runs to the end of the cul-de-sac that we have to be careful of, with this petition they would be installing the road in the center of the site that would have curb inlets to capture the storm water and divert that to the West, a majority of the current storm water would be captured by the street and then transition to the west. The issue with acceleration/deceleration lanes, this is a practice that we are no longer in favor of and are actually working to remove those in several locations around the city. They create dangerous obstacles for pedestrians. That is a change in general engineering policy.

Mr. Riggert wanted to address the questions from the public, he wanted to add to Mr. Greulich's comments regarding storm water management on the south property line is they have graded in a berm to help divert the storm water to the west that comes to the south. They are obligated to implement best management practices for erosion control and that would include silt fence or filter socks, as well as the berm in diverting the storm water around, so there are measures that are part of the erosion control plan or storm water pollution prevention plan that CB would be reviewing.

Smith asked for clarification of the motion to send it to a second hearing with clarification from staff, which motion might that be, he would advocate for that motion. Wisler said he could move to continue this to a second hearing. Smith would like to move that it be moved to a second hearing with further clarifications regarding the stub road. There were no seconds.

Cibor asked for staff to explain the rationale for a second hearing. Scanlan explained that two hearings are prescribed for the larger petitions, when you look at the surrounding subdivisions to this one, which typically are much larger and contain more detail or questions, as well as rezones and beginning PUD's. Those by rule are required to have two hearings which is the default for all types of petitions. In the Rules of Procedures site plans can go with one hearing or primary plats that don't have waivers and but since they are requesting a waiver for the cul-de-sac they should technically have two hearings.

Wisler ask if Mr. Greulich could explain why do we do not need a stub road to the east if we need one to the north. Greulich explained we absolutely would love to have a sub road to the east but there is not a location or an opportunity to connect to. Wisler said is that the point, that you know stub roads are not required now, they are never necessary as future development or redevelopment occurs. How would you respond to the argument that the parcel to the north is developed, just like the parcels to the south are developed? Greulich said the parcel to the north is about eight acres in size and it has one single family residence on that parcel and the owners have stated and they plan to be there for a while. As he mentioned, we are planning for the long term future, so getting that stub road into the north makes sense now, because this is the opportunity we have now, may not get another opportunity to in the future. Scanlan added they are looking for potential future development, the property to the north is four and half acres a little smaller than Greulich said, and it does have a

beautiful home on it, but for us it is more likely this property would develop within the horizon, for example our long range plan in the next 30 years. It is unlikely that five properties to the east would all sell so that a connection could be put in. We feel the property to the north is more likely to develop in a way that could facilitate a connection than the property to the east. Wisler asked isn't it true that they are all equally likely to eventually be redevelop. Scanlan said it is possible, but an educated professional guess would be that the vacant land will develop rather than the areas that are already developed.

Ballard wanted to make sure he is understanding clearly, basically the developers has gone by the letter of the law, the UDO required of them and they are willing to help us in the long term planning that is great. To him that is a much clearer picture and a much clearer path than being reactive after the fact.

Cockerham asked if the home north of the site has historical designation, Mr. Ramsden said it is not on the historical register but it could be. Cockerham believes there needs to be additional entrance into this development for safety reason, but the thought of this stub going unused for 50 years bothers him. Homeowner asked for a compromise, make an easement.

Kinzie asked if an easement could substitute for the stub road. Greulich said an easement doesn't solve the problem of the road connection being required to be built. When the north lot is redeveloped, maybe within the next 50 years, with an easement it would be a private road and we don't like to have a private road joining a public road. Makes maintenance more difficult, then we are making Homeowner Associations maintain the road in perpetuity. And it doesn't change the fact that the road still has to be constructed, having a public road means it will be built now and maintained by the City.

Cibor wanted to note that during this process the staff has had discussions with Engineering recognizing maintenance potential impact and through those discussions realizing the importance of connectivity. He will support the motion that is on the table.

Smith wishes they could get to a compromise and make an easement, he doesn't understand why we need the stub road at this time. He understands the issue of connectivity and safety, but it is important to respond to our citizens.

Wisler would like to echo Smith's thoughts. Agrees that we need to have these stub roads for future connectivity and he can see that we are paying the price now for not having these connections in the past. In the past compromises have been made in order to meet affordable housing requirements, some developers has been allowed to make a contribution to the Trust Fund rather than building specific units in the development. It would not be hard for the City to do something similar, dedicate an easement and make a contribution for future construction. If a cul-de-sac is going to be allowed then there should be some discretion for the stub road. He is not sure he agrees with the rationale for the discretion that has been applied in this case, he does agree that as a matter of principle we need to be requiring these kinds of stubs. This is a very difficult decision for him.

****Cockerham motioned to approve petition DP-08-22, including the six conditions outlined in the staff report and the seventh condition added during this meeting. Kinzie seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 6:2—Approved.**

SP-15-22

Walnut Star LLC

3391 S Walnut Street

Request: Major site plan approval to allow the construction of 103 multi-family dwelling units in the Mixed-Use Corridor (MC) zoning district.

Case Manager: Eric Greulich

Mr. Greulich reported this request is from Cedar View Management for property at 3391 S. Walnut Street, the property is in the Mixed-Use Corridor (MC) and the petitioners are requesting a major site plan approval to allow for the construction of a multifamily development with 103 dwelling units. To the east of this site there is multifamily zoning with a series of multifamily buildings, some duplex and apartment buildings, to the north is an office building and south is a dog training center, then to the west is various institutional uses. This site is undeveloped and would like to develop multifamily buildings with parking lots on the interior as well as a common building and pool area. There will be one access cut on Walnut Street, the location meets all of the setback requirements from adjacent drives so there's not an issue in that regard. This petition would have 103 dwelling units and 105 bedrooms so majority of the units are one bedroom apartments. Buildings would have three stories for most of them, there is a mix of some of the stories and footprints to help meet the diversity and anti-monotony standards. There is a buffer yard required along the north property line because this a multifamily zoning against commercial zoning, so they are required to be planted with appropriate trees spaced every 30 feet. The proposed site plan meets all of the landscaping requirement, they have incorporated rain gardens within the interior of the site to capture storm water runoff as well as islands within the parking area have appropriate curb cuts to allow for storm water to infiltrate each of those.

The petitioners are required to have the primary pedestrian entrance at the center of the building, all of the buildings have a series of modulation around the perimeter change in building height and have various materials shown within the building footprint, there is a masonry building with some fiber cement lap siding as well as board and baton siding, to help give vertical and horizontal elements within the buildings. There are patios shown on the exterior of the buildings to give residents an area to enjoy the outside. There are no issues with the architecture of the buildings. Building 4 in the back would have a covered bike area in an outside storage room on the west side of the site, it was noted in the staff report that the petitioner might need to increase in size in order to provide the three required long term bike storage area requirements. All the buildings would have covered bike parking in a central hallway corridor, so they would be covered and accessible to all residents. There would be some covered parking for vehicles which is an additional amenity.

The petition meets all of the requirements of the zoning code, there are no variances being requested, so we are recommending approval, with the six conditions that are listed in the status report.

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS:

Zack Bode, with Studio3Design, is representing the petitioner. He had nothing to add to Mr. Greulich's report, but would be happy to answer any questions.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

Burrell asked about electric car stations. Greulich said there are five spaces required and those will be indicated with the grading permit. Burrell asked about the ratio for residents per car stations.

Greulich said it is one for every 25 vehicles, Bode confirmed that was correct. Burrell asked if that meets the requirement, Greulich confirmed it does meet requirements.

Kinzie mentioned there was concern from the previous proposal for this site, regarding traffic for just having one entrance to the site. Asked if Greulich could discuss if those concerns apply for this development as well. Greulich said the previous concerns were with drop and pick up times and stacking spaces for the autism therapy school, which is much different than residential parking. There won't be people coming and leaving at the same time from the site. Kinzie is concerned that there will be staking as cars are entering and exiting the site. Greulich said the driveway into the site is about 100 feet long and there is lots of room for cars coming and leaving the site safely. Scanlan noted that the previous concerns were with pinch points in time, where here it would be more like the average trips a day that stretch across the day.

Enright-Randolph is concerned about storm water drainage from this site, he is assuming they are complying with everything but a little difficult to follow from the drawing. It looks like they are putting in a lot of impervious service areas in this proposal and this area does fall within the critical drainage with Monroe County. Was the calculation done for the added impervious surface with the release rate, the county is doing a review. In reviewing the previous plan and comparing them side by side comparison he does not see how all the same storm water area and storm sewer area are the same as the previous plat. Steve Brehob noted that Enright-Randolph was not seeing the proposed grading, said there is a big open area just to the north of the drive which is a large storm water retention area, should meet all of the drainage and detention requirement for this project. Greulich said this project is required to have a minimum of 40% landscape area, which it does meet.

St. John asked about condition number five, says the building adjacent to building number four needs to be bigger to accommodate three bikes, where is that building on the map. Greulich replied that building number four is the eastern building with the bike storage being in front center of the building. Code requires that there be three feet of clearance on both sides of racks and drawings submitted it was not clear if that can be obtained, this is why condition number 5 was added. St. John asked to confirm that it must be a size to accommodate the three bicycle spaces. Greulich said yes, long term bike parking require one fourth of the total amount of bicycle spaces required to be covered long term storage, so the minimum of three spaces is required of the 21 spaces. St. John questioned the number three, Greulich miss spoke should be four, St. John said one fourth would five plus. Mr. Bode said that it should actually be five and a half, believes they have the space for the required number of bikes, will work with staff to ensure there is the space needed. Also, wanted to clarify that this storage space is part of building number four, not a separate building. St. John suggested changing condition number five to six spaces. Scanlan clarified there will be three racks with six spaces.

Enright-Randolph ask about offsite improvements from previous site plans, does that still apply to this development. Greulich said for the previous plat they were required to install a compliance side path along Walnut Street frontage that was for the property to the south. That was addressed in the plat, they have to bond for that improvement, so that will happen within the three year period that we have for public improvement bonds or if the property to the south redeveloped within that three year time period.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

ADDITIONAL COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Cockerham was to thank the developer for the effort, when he first looked at this site he wouldn't have

thought of multifamily housing. But with location in relation to Crane, on the south side and the dire need for more housing in the community the more he likes the idea of multifamily housing. He will support this petition.

Wisler agrees with Cockerham, he would have never thought of this space for multifamily housing, he believes it can be, there are a lot of amenities nearby. If there can be connectivity between here and some of the amenities to the north and south which would require every resident to get in a car and drive on Walnut Street, this could be a great development. If we don't create that connectivity this could just add to the congestion on South Walnut. He is happy to support this petition, but it does create some more work for them to do.

****Kinzie motioned to approve petition SP-15-22, including the six conditions, with the correction to condition number 5, to accommodate the required bicycle spaces, outlined in the staff report. Cibor seconded the motion. Motion carried by roll call vote 8:0—Approved.**