



VILLAGE ACTION REPORT

PROJECT: Authentix Cottage Grove Precise Implementation Plan

APPLICANT: Eric Thom – Continental Properties

PROJECT LOCATION: SE Corner of Highways N and BB (parcels #0711-091-9310-1, #0711-094-8501-0, and #0711-094-8100-4)

REPORT DATE: MAY 13, 2021

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The applicant, Continental Properties, is seeking approval of a Precise Implementation Plan (PIP) for their Authentix Cottage Grove project, a 288-unit multi-family development on 28.6 acres with approximately 11 acres dedicated for public park land. The proposed project includes 288 units in twelve two-story 24-unit buildings. The project will include 32 studio units, 112 one-bedroom units, 112 two-bedroom units, and 32 three-bedroom units.

PLAN COMMISSION MEETING: MAY 12, 2021

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

MOTION: by Ratcliff (1st), Schulze (2nd)

The Precise Implementation Plan was **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**, with the conditions as follows:

Planning

1. Sign permits are granted via a separate process. Signage must comply with 3' setback and must be clear of vision triangle at driveways.
2. The Village agrees to the following variations to the requirements of the most comparable zoning district (MR-12) via the Planned Unit Development process:
 - a. The residential zoning district with the highest permitted density is MR-12, Multi-Family Residential, which allows 12 units per acre. The proposed project has 18.9 units per acre excluding park land and stormwater facilities (or approximately 10 units per acre including the entire property).
 - b. MR-12 zoning permits a maximum of 8 units per building as a conditional use. The proposed project includes twelve 24-unit buildings.
 - c. The minimum landscape surface ratio in MR-12 is 50% as opposed to 40% for the proposed project (excluding the park land and stormwater facilities).

- d. The minimum paved area setback for MR-12 is 10'. The proposed project uses a 5' paved area setback on the street sides.
 - e. The maximum height for an accessory structure in MR-12 is 18'. The height of the accessory garage structures in the proposed project is 25'. It should be noted that the Village Ordinance measures the building height to the midpoint of a sloped roof so this exception may not be required.
 - f. The project provides a total of 531 parking spaces, while 576 would be required per the ordinance. The total of 531 spaces represents approximately 1.84 spaces per unit.
 - g. The applicant has provided a signage concept that is more suitable for a project of this scale that would otherwise be allowed under MR-12 zoning.
3. The applicant has proposed to construct the dog park as shown and dedicate the finished product to the Village as opposed to paying fees toward the Village's construction of the park. This approach makes sense given the site work that needs to be coordinated between the project and the park. The applicant shall verify actual construction costs to demonstrate they fully offset the required fees. Furthermore, the applicant shall continue to work with the Parks Department on final details, including ADA accessibility requirements, and the park plan shall be incorporated into the developer agreement.
 4. The applicant has proposed that the park shall open in 2023. A deadline shall be established and incorporated into the developer agreement.
 5. If additional lighting is provided in the dog park parking lot a photometric and cutsheet(s) shall be provided for staff review.
 6. The applicant shall provide an amended record copy of the PIP submittal document that incorporates the revised site plan, elevations, parking information and any other changes resulting from any PIP approval planning, engineering, or committee conditions.

Engineering – Site Comments and Requirements

1. A CSM of the property will be needed to dedicate the park area.
2. Developer will be responsible for MMSD fees based on the developable areas and areas dedicated to the Village shall be designated as environmental corridors.
3. On the Layout and Paving Plans the Heavy Duty HMA Pavement and the Regular HMA Pavement are noted as the same thickness. The asphalt notation of the E-0.3 should be updated to the current WisDOT nomenclature.
4. Verify the site layout and sidewalk widths. Minimum ADA requirements for sidewalk width is 4' wide.
5. ADA stalls are not shown in the dog park parking area.

6. Areas of reject curb should be noted on the plan as currently it appears areas of the parking areas collect water.
7. The monument signs will require a separate permit per the Village ordinances. The location of the signs will be reviewed with the final plans to not impede visibility for the safe pedestrian and/or vehicular movements.
8. Provide the structural design of the retaining walls to verify that the associated tie backs as necessary for the wall design will remain on the property along the easterly side of the property.
9. Areas of riprap should be replaced with scour stop for Village maintenance.
10. The noted secondary construction access should not be used during peak school hours.

Engineering – Traffic Comments and Requirements

The traffic study and its recommendations for the Authentix development were reviewed. In general the procedures and processes outlined in the study follow closely to the WisDOT Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines which are considered as best practices throughout the state. There are a few minor discrepancies and procedures that could have been improved on, but these items would have little impact to the results of the study's operational analysis and would likely not change the recommendation included in this study.

The results of the report show that operations at the studied intersections are acceptable when the development opens and is at full capacity. In addition, the locations of the access points do not appear to have impacts to the operations of the signal at Cottage Grove Road and Main Street. The study did not include any future year analysis, which is not uncommon for developments of this size, if following WisDOT TIA guidelines. A future year analysis would provide a sensitivity analysis at the studied intersection but may not impact the recommended improvements included in the report.

The recommended improvements in the report do not recommend turn lane installation at either entrance to the development based on the following reasons:

- The anticipated delay and queueing with development traffic are within acceptable levels.
- Both left turn lane and right turn lane warranting criteria utilized by the industry, and specifically the state, was reviewed and only met for one minor condition for the SB left turn on Main Street.
- It would be out of character for this corridor for a left turn lane to be installed at this location.

At the time of the traffic counts, the current school pattern was utilizing a hybrid model and was not at full capacity. The study did reflect anticipated pandemic adjustments that seemed appropriate. The AM peak hour analyzed in the study overlaps with what we would expect as the AM school traffic peak during hybrid operation. It should be noted that school traffic is difficult to model due to heavy fluctuations of traffic at drop off/pick up or in some cases

traffic controlled by crossing guards. However, standard procedures were followed in the study, and confirm that operations of the Main Street driveway will not be detrimental in the AM peak under the study conditions. The study does not include an afternoon peak that would correlate to school traffic. However, trips entering or exiting the development during that time would be well below what was assumed in the PM peak hour that was analyzed. It seems likely that the development alone would have little impact to the increase in the heavy short term traffic and lower operations that occur when school ends in the afternoon.

MSA will work with the Developer but may require some changes to the striping on Main Street as necessary to alter the painted median in front of the driveway entrance.

Engineering – Utility Comments and Requirements

1. Easements will be required to be provided for access and maintenance by the Village for any public water and sanitary sewer.
2. Sheet 1.1 notes the water should be a minimum of 5'-6" deep and should be a minimum of 6'-6" deep.
3. The water looped through the site should have at a minimum of one of the loops connecting to Cottage Grove Road and Main Street as an 8" main.
4. The plan shows a single service to each of the buildings anticipated to be paid by an association.
5. Verify utility crossings as it appears that some storm and sanitary crossings could conflict. (Near ST 1-38, ST 1-36, and ST 1-7 were noticed.)

Engineering – Stormwater Comments and Requirements: Storm Sewer Design

1. No storm sewer or inlet capacity design calculations have been provided so MSA is unable to review the design for capacity. Noting that nearly all of the pipes appear to be 12" diameter (there is a mismatch of pipe sized between ST1-3 and ST1-2; a pipe is shown as 12" on sheet 2 of the storm sewer plan, but is shown as 30" on adjoining sheet 4) suggests that the information is placeholder only at this time. MSA will need to be provided design calculations demonstrating that the proposed stormwater drainage system has sufficient capacity to collect and convey 100-year peak flow to the proposed stormwater management ponds so the ponds will provide 100-year peak flow control in accordance with Village ordinance standards.
2. The dog park parking area should have storm sewer to prevent the entire parking lot from draining directly into the roadway.

Engineering – Stormwater Comments and Requirements: Stormwater Management System

There are several issues associated with the development of stormwater management calculations which need to be addressed before MSA can complete a review of the site for compliance with Village ordinances.

1. Peak discharge rate control

- a. There are some (small) off-site watersheds to the south that flow onto the site which need to be factored into collection system and stormwater management system design.
- b. Times of concentration values for both existing and proposed conditions are well over the 100-foot maximum required by current NRCS guidance (and indicated on the provided calculation spreadsheets).
- c. Predeveloped runoff curve number values do not appear to be provided in the report or indicated in provided calculations. Review of data within the calculations suggests a uniform RCN value of 68 has been applied to the site; while this is appropriate, per Village ordinance for cropland on HSG B soils, the site contains some wooded area and some grassland/range area which needs to be factored into the calculations.

2. Water Quality Treatment

- a. Calculations have been provided which appear to indicate 80% TSS reduction for the 1-year 24-hour storm; however, no calculations have been provided demonstrating compliance with the 54% TP reduction standard. This really needs to be completed using the WinSLAMM computer model. This model will also be useful in development of the infiltration calculations.

3. Infiltration design

- a. Infiltration performance is based upon a RECARGA rain garden model of a large sand filter served by a drain tile.
 - i. The design ponding depth for the infiltration BMP is 30" which is well above design standards, depending on BMP classification:
 1. WDNR Biofilter guidance indicates a maximum ponding depth of 12 inches (possibly as much as 18 inches).
 2. WDNR Infiltration Basin guidelines indicate a maximum ponding depth of 24 inches.
- b. Infiltration rates assigned in the model have not been determined following the required guidance of CPS1002. The values used are much higher than allowable.

Engineering – Long Term Maintenance Agreement

We recommend that the proposed maintenance activities regarding the stormwater management system be replaced with information combined from the attached documents which are applicable to wet ponds and biofilters (infiltration ponds).

Engineering – Wetlands

The site plan indicates the boundary of a delineated wetland. This wetland report is reported to have a date of 2015 which is more than the WDNR standard 5-year applicability duration. WDNR has in certain instances allowed use of wetland boundary delineations more than r-

years old; but regardless, the developer should obtain specific concurrent that the wetland delineation is still valid.

VOTE: 5 Aye (Williams, Ratcliff, Broom, Jushchyshyn, Schulze), 1 Nay (Brinkmeier), 0 Abstain

APPLICANT COMMENTS:

- (Eric Thom – Continental Properties) – presented the project with a focus on changes since the April meeting. The layout is the same. Thom highlighted elements of the park design and noted they were not anticipating the parking lot would be lighted.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

- None

PLAN COMMISSION COMMENTS:

- (Jushchyshyn) – asked if the park would be maintained by the Village. Ruth confirmed that it would be the Village’s responsibility after it is turned over to the Village.
- (Jushchyshyn) – asked for confirmation that proposed sanitary system was appropriate. Lord confirmed that it was.
- (Schulze) – asked about signs. Thom confirmed there would be a monument sign at each entrance and wall signage on the clubhouse.
- (Ratcliff) – appreciated the additional information about the dog park. Noted that park gates will need to accommodate the park department’s mowers.
- (Ratcliff) – asked CGFD Chief Archibald if he had any concerns. Chief Archibald said their initial concern related to vehicle circulation, but that has been resolved. They had some minor concerns about overhanging trees obstructing equipment. Thom replied they can work with the Village on that.

STAFF COMMENTS:

- See staff reports and as noted above.