

City of Verona
Minutes
Plan Commission
June 4, 2018

1. **Call to Order:** Luke Diaz called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.
2. **Roll Call:** Mike Bare, Luke Diaz, Sarah Gaskell, Scott Manley, and Beth Tucker Long were present. Also present: Adam Sayre, Director of Planning and Development; Katherine Holt, Community Development Specialist; Jeff Mikorski, City Administrator; and Jeff Montpas, AECOM. Pat Lytle is absent and excused. Steven Heinzen arrived at 6:41 p.m.
3. **Minutes:** Motion by Manley, seconded by Bare, to approve the May 7, 2018 Plan Commission Minutes. Motion carried 5-0.
4. **Public Hearing: Zoning map amendment to rezone 101 Prairie Heights Drive from Planned Unit Development (PUD) to Urban Residential (UR).**

Motion by Mr. Bare, seconded by Ms. Gaskell, to open the public hearing at 6:40 p.m.
Motion carried 5-0.

There were no public comments.

Motion by Ms. Gaskell, seconded by Mr. Bare, to close the public hearing at 6:41 p.m.
Motion carried 5-0.

Steven Heinzen has arrived.

- a. **Zoning map amendment to rezone 101 Prairie Heights Drive from Planned Unit Development (PUD) to Urban Residential (UR).**

Mr. Sayre presented the staff report. The Applicant is requesting a zoning map amendment to change the existing zoning of PUD to UR. The Applicant suggests that the property could be used as a multi-unit or mixed-used residential building.

Staff does not believe that growth patterns or rates have changed enough to constitute an amendment to the zoning map without a specific project showing a need for the request. Staff believes the property will support non-residential development, as it abuts Highway 18/151, making it better suited for non-residential use. In addition, the development already contains a sufficient number of residential units.

Staff recommends the Plan Commission recommend to the Common Council denial of the Zoning Map Amendment at 101 Prairie Heights Drive for the following reasons:

1. The application does not meet the zoning requirements as it conflicts with the previously approved GDP for Prairie Crest development
2. Any discussion regarding the rezoning of the property should be tied directly to a development project
3. The Applicant should list the property on commercial broker websites to see if there is an interest in the Property

Mr. Bare asked about the history of the property and wanted to know if the property was listed as commercial.

Mr. Richard Wesley from Madison stated that the property was created in 1998 and it just has not gone anywhere.

Marie Antoinette from Restaino & Associates Realtors stated that she has had the listing since 2017. There was an offer in 2014 that was contingent upon the property being rezoned. Today, she has two offers that are both contingent upon rezoning.

Ms. Gaskell asked what options the City has in the process such as approve, denial, or postpone. She is supportive of the multifamily, as it is a good location.

Mr. Heinzen asked what the assessed value versus the appraised value is.

Ms. Antoinette stated that the assessed value is \$524,000 and is listed at \$525,000, but is unsure if it is assessed as a commercial use.

Mr. Diaz asked if this obligates us to do something. What happens if apartments go there?

Mr. Sayre replied that a multi-family use would require a conditional use permit and must meet the density and setback requirements as well as other requirements in the ordinance. If everything is met, it could be approved for 24-25 units, but still must meet the parking and storm water management requirements. If the density is increased, the Applicant would go through the Planned Unit Development (PUD) process.

Mr. Manley stated that this application is difficult to review without knowing what could be developed, such as a restaurant. It is unclear why this has not developed as commercial. If it becomes multi-family, where would people gather in the area?

Ms. Antoinette asked if it would help the decision process if a couple of options were presented.

Mr. Sayre explained that the City typically has an initial review of a development that is attached to a rezoning application. This gives the Plan Commission a better understanding of what could happen, while giving the Applicant feedback.

Ms. Tucker Long is concerned about multi-family by the highway. This area does not have a park within walking distance. Ms. Tucker Long asked if the Commission could postpone voting on this.

Mr. Sayre stated the Plan Commission can postpone making a decision, or the Applicant can withdraw the application.

Motion by Mr. Bare to table the item and asked the Applicant to submit other options for the Plan Commission's review, seconded by Gaskell. Motion carried 6-0.

5. **Public Hearing: Precise implementation plan amendment for Sugar Creek Commons development located at the southwest corner of West Verona Avenue and Legion Street.**
 - a. **Precise implementation plan (PIP) amendment for the Sugar Creek Commons development located at the southwest corner of West Verona Avenue and Legion Street.**

The application was withdrawn by the Applicant.

6. **Planned Unit Development (PUD) concept plan review for a proposed 100-room hotel and a 10,000 square foot conference center to be located at 509 West Verona Avenue.**

Mr. Sayre presented the staff report. The Applicant is requesting a concept plan review for a 100-room hotel and a 10,000 square foot conference center to be located at 509 West Verona Avenue. Mr. Sayre pointed out the shortage of parking, the access points, and points of conflict

on the site. Staff believes that this will be a good site for a conference center and would make it more of a destination location. The Applicant is requesting feedback from the Plan Commission.

Mr. Manley asked about changes in the number of parking spaces for this project, and why the restaurant changed to a two-story conference center. Mr. Sayre stated that the parking requirements for a restaurant versus a conference center are based on the seating capacity for the restaurant.

Ms. Tucker Long asked what size parking could fit underground of the hotel.

Mr. Sayre stated that parking could fit underground outside of the building's footprint.

Mr. Kevin Yeska, JSD Professional Services, stated there are forty parking stalls within the hotel's footprint. The conference center would house about 250 to 275 guests, which would create a parking shortfall of about thirty to forty parking stalls. The Applicant is willing to look into a shared parking agreement with St. Vincent's de Paul, Sugar Creek Commons, and Sugar River United Methodist Church.

Ms. Tucker Long asked Mr. Yeska if he knew why the number of parking stalls changed so drastically.

Mr. Yeska replied that the entrance to the underground parking has not been added in and the building is no longer split into a separate restaurant and hotel.

Mr. Sayre stated that staff is more concerned with points of conflict between the hotel drop-off, Sugar Creek Commons road, and parking garage entrances. Staff would like to see the access point to the underground parking of Building B be moved to another location.

Mr. Yeska discussed the Applicant's concerns regarding the parking garage entrance for Building B. The parking garage entrance internal to the parking lot area had to be changed, as a sixteen percent slope is unacceptable. The Applicant changed the entrance to the hotel side of the building, as the slope is about six to eight percent.

Mr. Heinzen asked if it is possible to put the parking garage entrance for Building B on the south side of the building. Could the hotel entrance shift further south?

Mr. Yeska replied that it is not possible to move the parking garage entrance south and the hotel entrance cannot be moved without doing a complete interior remodel. The entrance also creates a focal point at the end of the road for Sugar Creek Commons and walkability from the hotel entrance to Sugar Creek Commons.

Mr. Manley asked if it is possible to place the hotel entrance to the west side of the building. This would create fewer opportunities for conflicts with Building B, parking vehicles, and pedestrians.

Ms. Tucker Long confirmed the idea of flipping the entrance of the hotel to the west and having a smaller back door for people to leave the hotel to go to Sugar Creek Commons.

Ms. Gaskell stated that the hotel access to Sugar Creek Commons fits well, even if there are known points of conflict.

Mr. Yeska stated that people leaving Building D-E-F would leave the fastest way possible, whether that is the western side of the hotel or the eastern side of the hotel. He agreed to review the hotel access point on the western side and add pavement markings denoting pedestrian crossings. Deliveries for the conference center would occur underground for smaller delivery trucks such as catering vehicles.

Ms. Gaskell stated that since there will be bigger vehicles around, flipping the underground access point would be a good idea.

Ms. Tucker Long stated that Building B could become blocked with people checking into the hotel and asked if this is the only underground access point for Building B.

Mr. Yeska replied that it is the only underground access point for Building B.

Mr. Diaz wants good signage for the site, a shared parking agreement, and the driveway combined with St. Vincent de Paul along East Verona Avenue.

7. Initial site plan review for a proposed 3,687 square foot Summit Credit Union to be located at 407 and 409 West Verona Avenue.

Mr. Sayre presented the staff report. The Applicant is requesting a concept plan review for a 3,687 square foot Summit Credit Union located at 407 and 409 West Verona Avenue. Mr. Sayre pointed out the building design is similar to the Summit Credit Union in Monona and would complement the building design for Sugar Creek Commons.

Ms. Gaskell asked about City standards for pervious vs. impervious land on a lot. It looks like a lot of pavement.

Mr. Sayre replied that Staff will watch that closely as things progress.

Mr. Heinzen and Mr. Manley feel the proposed building looks nice and will be a great addition to the area.

Ms. Tucker Long echoed Ms. Gaskell's concern about the amount of pavement, and stated that she would like to see if there is a better way to route traffic.

8. Planned Unit Development (PUD) concept plan located at 102/104 Lincoln Street. Three (3) different development options will be discussed including office use, light industrial use, and 90 multi-family units.

The Applicant is requesting a concept plan review for feedback on redevelopment ideas for the property located at 102/104 Lincoln Street ("Property"). Option A includes a three (3) story, 47,000 square foot office building. Option B includes a one (1) story, 32,700 square foot addition to the existing building containing a light industrial use. Option C includes a three (3) story, 90 unit multi-family building. The proposed development requires a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for option C.

Mr. Sayre stated the most recent review of the plan for this site was in March of 2018. At that time, the proposal was for a three-story apartment building. The Plan Commission voted 5-0 to recommend to the Common Council for approval. The Council then voted 5-3 to deny the proposal for the apartments.

This property is currently zoned for Urban Industrial. Options A and B would require site plan approval. Option C would need a zoning exemption and approval from the Council for parking and setbacks. Staff believes parking looks good for all three options and access points are good.

Staff had a conversation with the City Traffic Engineer. Over all, none of the options raise any concerns with traffic flow. The office use would generate the most traffic. The second most traffic use would be the apartments. The third would be the light industrial.

Staff is requesting feedback from the Plan Commission and Council on these options.

Mr. Heinzen stated that he believes that options A and C look like reasonable options. He asked if the easement that is on that property prohibits parking on top of it. He would like to see the office building closer to Lincoln Street with the parking behind it.

Mr. Sayre responded saying that pavement is not an issue over the easement.

Mr. Manley is supportive of Option C as it is the least intrusive option to the neighbors to the west and would generate the most amount of value in taxes. Option A is a viable option. He wants the office to stay in the location shown on the concept with the parking in the front.

Mr. Bare is supportive of Option C. Are there stormwater management or compatibility concerns for this option? Mr. Sayre believes the stormwater concerns will be improved with the site being redeveloped.

Ms. Gaskell expressed support of option C and is not supportive of option B, light industrial.

Ms. Tucker Long is in favor of option C but is concerned about the parking for residence and visitors and would like to see a park.

Mr. Diaz stated that he is opposed to option C and likes the idea of option A as it has the least impact on the existing neighborhood.

9. Initial concept review for a proposed 160-acre residential development to be located at 7230 Pine Row Road in the City's Southwest Neighborhood adjacent to Valley Road.

On May 7, 2018, the Plan Commission reviewed the Application for a 160-acre residential development, which includes single family homes, age restricted homes, memory care and assisted living units. The Plan Commission directed Staff to determine if there is a better location within the City's growth boundary for this type of development, or a better location for the non-residential land use that may be removed from this location.

Staff looked into moving the proposed project to an existing residentially zoned area, and at converting some residential land to nonresidential land. There are a few potential spots in the City, but Staff does not feel that any of the options are a good choice.

Staff contacted the Verona Senior Center and Verona Area School District to see what impact this development would have on them. The Director of the Senior Center replied that there could be impact on staffing, costs, and eventually the need to expand the building. The school district did not respond to the request.

Matt Mauthe, CEO for Marquardt Village, stated that he provided the market study of the need for senior living in this area, as well as a conceptual site design plan. Mr. Mauthe explained that the memory care building would be the only building that would be seeking full property tax exemption. The remainder of the project area would be subject to property tax. He explained that most of the people would be in memory care or assisted living, and would not be going out or using the Senior Center facility. Those not in memory care or assisted living already live in the area in single-family homes.

Chad Wuebben, developer working with Mr. Mauthe, stated that they have a willing seller that will help keep the prices down on the homes. Mr. Wuebben asked the landowner to come and say a few words.

Ben Kahl, owner of property, shared that he and his family have had the land for sale since 2012 and have only received two offers from mining companies. The family has agreed that they do not want to sell to a mining company and really like the idea that Mr. Mauthe has brought forward. He would like the Plan Commission to approve this development.

Mr. Heinzen asked Mr. Sayre if they need to have 160 acres all together, or if the land can be separated into two eighty acre properties, if they would like to “swap” out the land. He also asked if there is still a good balance of residential verses non-residential land if they do not find other land to convert over to non-residential. How many units does Noel Manor have?

Mr. Sayre answered that he does not know of a good spot in the City to convert residential to non-residential. Noel Manor has about 111 units with 32 memory care units. This development would double those numbers.

Mr. Manley does not like any of the options for changing residential to non-residential. He would like to know a little bit more about how they would use the residential area and would like to see a variety of homes more than just starter homes. 260 units seem high. He is also concerned about part of this being tax exempt especially creating service demands on the City for the Senior Center and ambulance service. Existing buildings and uses in the City already pay taxes.

Mr. Bare likes the idea of something like this going in there versus a mining company. Mr. Bare suggests that the applicant and the Senior Center Director meet. Mr. Bare would like to see if there is a way to piece together close to the amount of non-residential land that we would be losing.

Ms. Tucker Long has concerns about losing the non-residential land. She does not want to get into a situation where there is so much residential, but nothing for people to do or go to work. She likes the idea of “swapping” land and is in favor of the property nearby. She is also concerned about part of it being tax exempt. The Herfel property would work well for this use as the southern portion could be zoned transitional with residential use near the existing homes.

Ms. Gaskell asked if this may not be a complete “swap” as far as the amount of land.

Mr. Sayre confirmed that this would not necessarily be an acre for acre “swap”.

Mr. Diaz says that he gives this a tentative yes, but without seeing a final plan he cannot commit to supporting it fully. He is supportive of more senior housing. He would also like to see 4 lots per acre.

Mr. Diaz asked why land that is zoned as non-residential continues to be converted over to residential. In other words, why are we not getting the commercial companies and is there anything that we could do to change that.

Mr. Sayre answered that it is all in the demand. There is a lot of office and light industrial competition in this area. It is more a function of market.

Ms. Tucker Long asked how much land has been converted from non-residential to residential in the last couple of years.

Mr. Sayre answered that in Liberty Park there were 15-20 acres that were converted, as well as some changes in the Sugar Creek Commons, West End area, and Locust Drive.

10. Reports and comments from the Planning Department

a. Update on development projects.

There were updates in the packet.

b. Update on future Zoning Ordinance Amendments.

Planning Staff have met to discuss potential zoning changes, which are listed in the memo in the packet. The first one is looking at building setbacks, density, minimum lot size

requirements and maximum density requirements, landscaping, parking, and architectural review.

11. Reports and comments from the Plan Commissioners

None

12. Adjournment

Motion by Mr. Manley, seconded by Ms. Tucker Long, to adjourn at 8:45 p.m.

Motion carried 6-0.