



VILLAGE ACTION REPORT

PROJECT: Glen Grove Apartments General Development Plan

APPLICANT: Megan Schuetz – Movin' Out

PROJECT LOCATION: Parcels #0711-043-0006-6, #0711-043-0017-3, and #0711-043-0028-0

REPORT DATE: September 16, 2020

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The applicant is seeking approval of a Planned Unit Development for a 131,000 sq. ft., 100 unit apartment building to be owned and operated by Movin' Out. Movin' Out is a "state-wide nonprofit housing organization whose mission is to provide affordable housing options to households that include a family member with a permanent disability and military veterans." Units in the proposed project will be set aside in support of that mission. The proposed project includes 15 one-bedroom units, 40 two-bedroom units, and 45 three-bedroom units.

PLAN COMMISSION MEETING: September 15, 2020

STAFF REPORT PROVIDED BY: X Planner, X Engineer, ___ Public Works

MOTION #1: by Ratcliff (1st), Williams (2nd)

The motion to recommend approval of the General Development Plan with conditions, with the conditions below, FAILED.

Planning

1. The planned unit development shall include the following variations from MR-12 district regulations:
 - a. The building height may exceed 35' per the submitted building elevations.
 - b. The landscape surface ratio may be less than 50% as shown on the submitted site plan.
 - c. The floor area ratio may exceed 0.275 as shown on the submitted site plan and building plans.
 - d. The building coverage may exceed 30% as shown on the submitted site plan.
 - e. The number of parking spaces shall not be less than 197 as shown on the submitted plans.
2. All signage will require a sign permit prior to installation. Final signage shall be substantially similar in size and location to that shown on the submitted plans.

Engineering

1. Sidewalk should be along and within the public ROW on CTH N to match the future sidewalk when extended from the intersection of CTH N and School Road.

2. A 6" watermain connection is planned along the north property line from the existing Village 16" main. Existing services are 2" that are stubbed to the lots.
3. A clean out or manhole should be located within the property where the connection to the 8" sanitary service stub and 6" sanitary lateral to the building is shown.
4. The signs provided appear to exceed Village ordinances. The sign locations should be shown on the plans. The signs are labeled as east and west entrances and a smaller one at the Main entrance and I am unclear where these will be located.
5. Stormwater appears to be planned for underground storage and a bioretention basin which seems appropriate for the planned site.

VOTE: 2 Aye (Williams, Ratcliff), 4 Nay (Brinkmeier, Broom, Jushchyshyn, Sale), 0 Abstain

MOTION #2: by Broom (1st), Sale (2nd)

The motion to recommend denial of the General Development Plan was APPROVED.

VOTE: 4 Aye (Brinkmeier, Broom, Jushchyshyn, Sale), 2 Nay (Williams, Ratcliff), 0 Abstain

APPLICANT COMMENTS:

- (Megan Schuetz – Movin' Out) – introduced staff from JLA Architects and mentioned contractor McGahn and ACC management. Provided an overview of Movin' Out's mission and experience including 18 multifamily buildings with over 1,000 units and 250 designated for families with a disabled member. Described the mix of apartment sizes and amenities.
- (Dan Zutter – architect, JLA) – provided an overview of the site and building plans. Noted there is a 16' grade change from north to south resulting in a retaining wall on portions of the north side and a mix of walkouts and balconies. Described green space amenities including playground, seating, and garden beds. Described exterior strategy to break up the building mass with varied massing and colors.

PLAN COMMISSION COMMENTS:

- (Sale) – asked about staffing at the on-site leasing office. Schuetz explained it would be staffed during regular business hours and likely extended hours or weekends during the initial leasing period.
- (Broom) – asked about the width of the underground parking. Zutter explained there is a two-way drive aisle that is 20' wide.
- (Brinkmeier) – asked about the type of masonry. Zutter described it as utility brick with a slight texture. Brinkmeier stated he would prefer more muted colors and he thought the other Movin' Out projects shown had more dimension to break up the massing.
- (Brinkmeier) – asked about property taxes. Jushchyshyn also wanted to know when the implications of the tax structure would be discussed. Giese explained this would be part of Village Board's developer agreement negotiations.

- (Sale) – asked about Madison housing project managed by ACC that had been declared a nuisance. Schuetz explained ACC managed the project earlier and withdrew from the project. The nuisance declaration came later after ACC was no longer involved and Movin' Out had nothing to do with that project at any time. Scheutz noted that due to financing regulations for affordable tax credits, Movin' Out would be required to maintain ownership for a minimum 30 years so they aren't going anywhere and have an incentive to manage the project well.
- (Broom) – asked if Movin' Out provided transportation or owned vans for use by tenants that can't drive. Scheutz said Movin' Out doesn't provide that directly because tenants who need those services typically get them from their supportive service programs, and this type of transportation is commonly used. They ensure there is a safe drop off area and indoor waiting area to facilitate ridesharing and transportation.
- (Ratcliff) – has a neighbor that uses transportation social services so she agrees such services would be available to this project. Also knows a resident in an existing Movin' Out project and her mom lives in an affordable tax credit senior apartment and both love their homes and haven't had any problems. Doesn't think it's fair to assume affordable projects will bring problems. Glad to see the amount of parking is reduced as she agrees the full amount seems excessive for this project.
- (Jushchyshyn) – asked why there were back to back zoning changes after last month. Ruth explained the action at the previous meeting was a change to the comprehensive plan, which is a necessary precursor to a zoning change, but not a zoning change in itself.
- (Jushchyshyn) – doesn't see the need for the project in the Village. Feels the Village does not have enough services to support such a project, for example public transportation. Concerned about not getting full value for property taxes. Appreciates the innovations brought forward by Movin' Out but feels the Village is too small for such a project.
- (Ratcliff) – noted the vacant property doesn't generate full value in property tax now because it has gone undeveloped for decades and this project will only help. Doesn't believe there will be a negative impact. Stated the Village needs places for workers to live if it wants new businesses. Lower wage workers working in the Village now cannot afford to live here.
- (Brinkmeier) – agrees with Alex about lack of public transportation. Doesn't like the massing because the building feels too large. Doesn't like the colors and would've preferred multiple smaller buildings.
- (Broom) – noted that he asked the same questions about transportation when the day care was approved. Scheutz explained that transportation is often provided through social service programs tenants are served by and those services would be available here so public transportation is not a necessity. A tenant who required public transportation other than those provided by those services simply wouldn't choose to live in this building. Schuetz noted that the vacancy rate for apartments in the Village was 1% meaning there is virtually nothing available for prospective renters, and literally nothing available in the Village that could be deemed affordable to lower wage workers.
- (Sale) – asked if it was normal to have so many exceptions. Ruth explained that the Village is not being asked to permit something that is not allowed, but a project of this size and complexity is provided a different approval path by the ordinance through

the Planned Unit Development process. Ruth noted Cottage Grove Commons is similar in size and scope and it was also a PUD with a similar set of exceptions. Summit and the recent hotel projects were noted as other examples of PUD approvals.

- (Ratcliff) – believes the project is even more important in the current economy when unemployment is high and people who can no longer afford a single-family home would no longer be able to live in the Village.

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS:

- (Joe Bowers – property owner, 4600 CTH N) – attended neighborhood meeting and previous public hearing. Concerned about traffic and impact on intersection at School Road. Would like to know more about lighting relative to his property across the street.
- (Mike Faust – owns rental properties near project) – provided input via email and read by Williams. Against the project primarily due to size, density, impact on property values, and impact on his ability to attract renters.
- (Bill Weber – owns rental properties near project) – provided input via email and read by Williams. Against the project due primarily to size and density.

STAFF COMMENTS:

- See staff reports and as noted above.
- (Manthe – Village Attorney) – suggested second motion be voted on to clarify intent to recommend denial.