



VILLAGE ACTION REPORT

PROJECT: Highland Village PIP & Final Plat

APPLICANT: Kevin Metcalfe

PROJECT LOCATION: Lots 1 – 4 of CSM #12454 bounded by Cork Crossing, Hwy BB, & Sandpiper Trail

REPORT DATE: January 19, 2021

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The applicant is seeking approval of a Final Plat and Precise Implementation Plan (PIP) to construct a multi-family residential development with 38 units in ten buildings including six 4-unit flats, two 4-unit townhomes, and two 3-unit townhomes. The townhomes are 2 ½ stories with porches and individual entries facing the street. The flats are cottage style buildings 1 to 2 stories in height with ground floor master suites. All units feature 2-car garages. The buildings employ a traditional residential style intended to compliment the adjacent existing neighborhood.

PLAN COMMISSION MEETING: January 13, 2021

STAFF REPORT PROVIDED BY: Planner, Engineer, Public Works

MOTION #1: by Brinkmeier (1st), Schulze (2nd)

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

Planning

1. The following exceptions to the zoning ordinance shall be granted through the PUD:
 - a. Max. density for the MR-12 district is 12 units per acre. The maximum density on individual lots in the proposed project is 16 units per acre. It should be noted the density for the project as a whole is 9 units per acre, so on a project-wide basis the density does not require an exception.
 - b. Min. landscape surface ratio (LSR) for MR-12 is 50%. The proposed project has an LSR as low as 35% on an individual lot and 45% over the whole project.
 - c. Max. building coverage ratio for MR-12 is 30%. The proposed project has a building coverage as high as 42% on an individual lot and 32% project-wide.
 - d. MR-12 zoning requires a minimum of 3,500 sq. ft. of lot area per unit. The proposed project has a ratio as low as 2,500 sq. ft. per unit on individual lots. It should be noted the project as whole meets the requirement.
 - e. MR-12 requires a minimum lot width of 80'. The proposed project has lot widths as low as 75'.
 - f. MR-12 zoning requires a 25' setback on the front or side street. The proposed project has a 12' setback on Cork Crossing and Sandpiper Trail. The setback on Highway BB complies with the ordinance.

- g. The applicant is requesting minor exceptions to particular sections of the landscaping ordinance related to the placement of street frontage landscaping and the points required for paved areas. The total landscaping points provided exceed the minimum requirement, so the exceptions relate to how the points are allocated.

Engineering – Site Plan Comments

1. The sanitary laterals should be connected to the main with a wye and not directly in the manholes. Lot 3 and Lot 8 can come straight out parallel to the water services. Lot 5 and Lot 6 may need the sanitary to be extended to the west a distance to allow the lateral connections outside of the manholes.
2. Review the northwest corner of the intersection of Highland Drive and Sandpiper Trail as an area of reject curb and gutter may be necessary to avoid a low point along the curb and gutter.
3. Please provide scourstop stabilizing mat instead of rip rap for ease of maintenance for the Village.

Engineering – Stormwater Comments

1. Large scale – For their November 9, 2020 submittal they indicated a 100-year peak runoff rate from the site of 23.05cfs across 3.14 acres. This results in a unit discharge rate of 7.3 cfs/acre – and is inclusive of some larger areas of turf (i.e. the impervious density is at a comparative lower point). The current submittal is looking at only storm sewer, which will be serving an area with a higher impervious density, but their flows are less.
 - a. West system (P100): Total area = 1.16 acres, Q100 = 5.5 cfs (4.7 cfs/acre)
 - b. East system (P109): Total area = 1.21 acres, Q100 = 5.7 cfs (4.7 cfs/acre)Much of this may be due to the fact that they've assigned an inlet time of concentration of 10 minutes which therefore results in a very low rainfall intensity. This appears very liberally low, I calculated time of concentration for the whole length of the street and found a value less than 5 minutes. Since 5 minutes (or perhaps 6) is the standard minimum, it would seem appropriate to use that value – this would increase their rainfall intensities from ~ 7.5 in/hr to 10.5 in/hr, which would be a 40% increase. This would move unit peak flow rates right up to what they had indicated in their November submittal.
2. Smaller scale – some of the routing may be incorrect.
 - a. It is indicated as subcatchment A draining to pipe 106, however, pipe 106 originates across the parking lot from that pipe.
 - b. Similarly, it is indicated that subcatchment B as draining to pipe 105, but that would logically be where subcatchment A should drain. (A and B are the same size so maybe this is a typo).
 - c. Subcatchment F is indicated as draining to pipe P100 – which is likely the ultimate discharge location; however, there is no actual connection shown to the roof comprising watershed F.
 - d. The same condition under 2.c. exists for really all the roof areas – what is the actual point of connection, and is there adequate capacity. Since any lack of capacity of these roof drain systems will result in overflow to the street, it is important to have an understanding of how this will function.

- e. Calculations for on-grade inlets indicate approximately 1.4 cfs capacity per inlet, which appears reasonable. However, considering questions about estimates for peak flow rates, it seems like there is a need for one additional inlet each at the street for the west system. There will be some bypass from the development off the east system, but that is probably unavoidable without some excessive and low cost-return changes to the system.
- 3. The 48" RCP intake to the west of Sandpiper Trail has an invert of 895.47. This means, when flowing full there'll be a headwater of 899.47 – this will become the tailwater on the proposed eastern storm system. The proposed top of curb casting elevations within Highland Drive are 899.39 – which is below the tailwater. Construction of this system as proposed will likely result in an 'outlet' of flows from the swale during a major event prior to the 48" pipe being full which would drain down the street.
- 4. It should be noted that the low floor elevation of the buildings in Lots 9 and 10 are 900.75. Any overflow from the 48" pipe at the northeast corner of the site will come through the parking area between Lots 9 and 10 that has a crest height of 900.55. Very minimal freeboard exists for the building and it's possible it may benefit to raise the floor elevations of the building for additional protection of a major storm overflow.

VOTE: 6 Aye (Williams, Ratcliff, Brinkmeier, Broom, Jushchyshyn, Schulze), 1 Nay (Sale), 0 Abstain

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

The Final Plat was APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS, with the conditions as follows:

Planning

- 1. The following exceptions to the Subdivision Ordinance shall be granted through the PUD:
 - a. 274-42(A) requires a 66' ROW width. Highland Drive shall be permitted to have a 60' width.
- 2. Per 274-32(C) a final plat must show the "exact location and description of street lighting and lighting utility easements." Treatment of these features on Highland Drive shall be added to the final plat.

Engineering – Preliminary Plat

- 1. Verify the overall lengths of lines and curves with the individual lots. Due to rounding some of the overalls do not add up to the individual lots by 0.01'
- 2. The note for the release of the storm sewer easement should refer to being completed by a separate document.
- 3. Please mask some of the bearings and distances beneath the no access hatch for readability.

VOTE: 6 Aye (Williams, Ratcliff, Brinkmeier, Broom, Jushchyshyn, Schulze) , 1 Nay (Sale), 0 Abstain

APPLICANT COMMENTS:

- (Kevin Metcalfe – developer) – provided an overview of the project including minor changes since GDP.
- (Duane Johnson – architect, Knothe & Bruce) – provided additional information regarding the plans.

PLAN COMMISSION COMMENTS:

- (Jushchyshyn) – confirmed mechanicals were being moved to a basement location. Had concerns about them in the garage.
- (Williams) – asked about the project timeline. Metcalfe replied they are starting the pre-sale for units soon. Hope to start construction in April or May and be complete within 12 months.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

- None

STAFF COMMENTS:

- See staff reports and as noted above.

VILLAGE BOARD MEETING: January 18, 2021

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

MOTION #1: by Valencia (1st), Lennberg (2nd)

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

Planning

1. The following exceptions to the zoning ordinance shall be granted through the PUD:
 - a. Max. density for the MR-12 district is 12 units per acre. The maximum density on individual lots in the proposed project is 16 units per acre. It should be noted the density for the project as a whole is 9 units per acre, so on a project-wide basis the density does not require an exception.
 - b. Min. landscape surface ratio (LSR) for MR-12 is 50%. The proposed project has an LSR as low as 35% on an individual lot and 45% over the whole project.
 - c. Max. building coverage ratio for MR-12 is 30%. The proposed project has a building coverage as high as 42% on an individual lot and 32% project-wide.
 - d. MR-12 zoning requires a minimum of 3,500 sq. ft. of lot area per unit. The proposed project has a ratio as low as 2,500 sq. ft. per unit on individual lots. It should be noted the project as whole meets the requirement.

- e. MR-12 requires a minimum lot width of 80'. The proposed project has lot widths as low as 75'.
- f. MR-12 zoning requires a 25' setback on the front or side street. The proposed project has a 12' setback on Cork Crossing and Sandpiper Trail. The setback on Highway BB complies with the ordinance.
- g. The applicant is requesting minor exceptions to particular sections of the landscaping ordinance related to the placement of street frontage landscaping and the points required for paved areas. The total landscaping points provided exceed the minimum requirement, so the exceptions relate to how the points are allocated.

Engineering – Site Plan Comments

1. The sanitary laterals should be connected to the main with a wye and not directly in the manholes. Lot 3 and Lot 8 can come straight out parallel to the water services. Lot 5 and Lot 6 may need the sanitary to be extended to the west a distance to allow the lateral connections outside of the manholes.
2. Review the northwest corner of the intersection of Highland Drive and Sandpiper Trail as an area of reject curb and gutter may be necessary to avoid a low point along the curb and gutter.
3. Please provide scourstop stabilizing mat instead of rip rap for ease of maintenance for the Village.

Engineering – Stormwater Comments

1. Large scale – For their November 9, 2020 submittal they indicated a 100-year peak runoff rate from the site of 23.05cfs across 3.14 acres. This results in a unit discharge rate of 7.3 cfs/acre – and is inclusive of some larger areas of turf (i.e. the impervious density is at a comparative lower point). The current submittal is looking at only storm sewer, which will be serving an area with a higher impervious density, but their flows are less.
 - a. West system (P100): Total area = 1.16 acres, Q100 = 5.5 cfs (4.7 cfs/acre)
 - b. East system (P109): Total area = 1.21 acres, Q100 = 5.7 cfs (4.7 cfs/acre)

Much of this may be due to the fact that they've assigned an inlet time of concentration of 10 minutes which therefore results in a very low rainfall intensity. This appears very liberally low, I calculated time of concentration for the whole length of the street and found a value less than 5 minutes. Since 5 minutes (or perhaps 6) is the standard minimum, it would seem appropriate to use that value – this would increase their rainfall intensities from ~ 7.5 in/hr to 10.5 in/hr, which would be a 40% increase. This would move unit peak flow rates right up to what they had indicated in their November submittal.
2. Smaller scale – some of the routing may be incorrect.
 - a. It is indicated as subcatchment A draining to pipe 106, however, pipe 106 originates across the parking lot from that pipe.
 - b. Similarly, it is indicated that subcatchment B as draining to pipe 105, but that would logically be where subcatchment A should drain. (A and B are the same size so maybe this is a typo).

- c. Subcatchment F is indicated as draining to pipe P100 – which is likely the ultimate discharge location; however, there is no actual connection shown to the roof comprising watershed F.
 - d. The same condition under 2.c. exists for really all the roof areas – what is the actual point of connection, and is there adequate capacity. Since any lack of capacity of these roof drain systems will result in overflow to the street, it is important to have an understanding of how this will function.
 - e. Calculations for on-grade inlets indicate approximately 1.4 cfs capacity per inlet, which appears reasonable. However, considering questions about estimates for peak flow rates, it seems like there is a need for one additional inlet each at the street for the west system. There will be some bypass from the development off the east system, but that is probably unavoidable without some excessive and low cost-return changes to the system.
3. The 48” RCP intake to the west of Sandpiper Trail has an invert of 895.47. This means, when flowing full there’ll be a headwater of 899.47 – this will become the tailwater on the proposed eastern storm system. The proposed top of curb casting elevations within Highland Drive are 899.39 – which is below the tailwater. Construction of this system as proposed will likely result in an ‘outlet’ of flows from the swale during a major event prior to the 48” pipe being full which would drain down the street.
 4. It should be noted that the low floor elevation of the buildings in Lots 9 and 10 are 900.75. Any overflow from the 48” pipe at the northeast corner of the site will come through the parking area between Lots 9 and 10 that has a crest height of 900.55. Very minimal freeboard exists for the building and it’s possible it may benefit to raise the floor elevations of the building for additional protection of a major storm overflow.

VOTE: 7 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain

MOTION #2: by Valencia (1st), Allen (2nd)

The Final Plat was APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS, with the conditions as follows:

Planning

1. The following exceptions to the Subdivision Ordinance shall be granted through the PUD:
 - a. 274-42(A) requires a 66’ ROW width. Highland Drive shall be permitted to have a 60’ width.
2. Per 274-32(C) a final plat must show the “exact location and description of street lighting and lighting utility easements.” Treatment of these features on Highland Drive shall be added to the final plat.

Engineering – Preliminary Plat

1. Verify the overall lengths of lines and curves with the individual lots. Due to rounding some of the overalls do not add up to the individual lots by 0.01’

2. The note for the release of the storm sewer easement should refer to being completed by a separate document.
3. Please mask some of the bearings and distances beneath the no access hatch for readability.

VOTE: 7 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain

APPLICANT COMMENTS:

- (Kevin Metcalfe – developer) – provided an overview of the project including minor changes since GDP.
- (Duane Johnson – architect, Knothe & Bruce) – provided additional information regarding the plans.

VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS:

- (Murphy) – does the narrower ROW on Highland Drive still allow for parking on both sides of the street? Johnson noted the ROW was the same as the next street to the north which has parking on both sides. Ruth confirmed and noted the pavement width is within the range required by the Subdivision Ordinance.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

- None

STAFF COMMENTS:

- See staff reports and as noted above.