



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-51-17-6

INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting	March 6, 2018
Request From	R1-6 (2.00 acres)
Request To	PUD (2.00 acres)
Proposed Use	Planned Unit Development to allow multifamily residential
Location	Approximately 125 feet north of the northwest corner of 52nd Street and Virginia Avenue

VPC DISCUSSION:

1 speaker card was submitted, expressing no position.

Paul Gilbert, applicant with Beus Gilbert PLLC, provided an overview of the request including aerial photographs, zoning maps, and conceptual plans. He stated that he had conducted extensive public outreach and revised plans to address neighborhood concerns including limiting the quantity of west-facing units, enhanced landscape setbacks, redesigned parking areas, enhanced building elevations, and other features. He displayed conceptual floor plans. He stated that the request is consistent with the existing General Plan Land Use Map designation.

Barry Paceley asked why the applicant is proposing a Planned Unit Development (PUD) rather than utilizing traditional zoning. **Mr. Gilbert** stated that the PUD includes unique building setbacks, increased height, and enhanced landscape setbacks that require the use of a PUD. **Mr. Paceley** noted that the proposed density was possible under the R-3 zoning district and expressed concern regarding the use of a PUD. He stated that PUDs allow developers too much latitude.

Karen Beckvar expressed concern regarding the proposed height and asked to clarify if the height included parapets and screen walls. **Mr. Gilbert** stated that the proposed height would be the tallest part of the structure and include all rooftop equipment and screening. **Ms. Beckvar** asked what would be done about an adjacent alley. **Mr. Gilbert** stated that this alley has problems with vagrants and would be closed off at certain points. **Ms. Beckvar** expressed concern regarding increasing the density of the site. She noted that the existing zoning of the site is R1-6 and not R-3. She expressed concern regarding lack of clarity in the PUD on landscape requirements, including tree size.

Wally Graham, a member of the public expressing no position, stated that he had met with the applicant and residents in the surrounding community. He noted that the applicant had revised conceptual plans to address neighbors' concerns.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-51-17-6

Date of VPC Meeting	March 6, 2018 (Information) November 13, 2018 (Recommendation)
Request From	R1-6 (1.98 acres)
Request To	PUD (1.98 acres)
Proposed Use	Planned Unit Development to allow multifamily residential
Location	Approximately 125 feet north of the northwest corner of 52nd Street and Virginia Avenue
VPC Recommendation	Approval
VPC Vote	11-4

VPC DISCUSSION

7 speaker cards were submitted in opposition to the request.

Adam Stranieri provided an overview of the request including aerial photographs, zoning maps, and General Plan Land Use maps. He discussed proposed land uses noting that primary uses are limited to multifamily residential and that no deviations from Ordinance standards are proposed for accessory or temporary uses. He displayed the proposed site plan and highlighted the project entry, circulation, guest parking, and central open space. He provided an overview of development standards including building and landscape setbacks, height, density, lot coverage, and open space. He noted which proposed standards exceed conventional zoning standards in the reference zoning district of R-3. He discussed proposed design guidelines including amenities, pedestrian pathway materials, private vestibule design, balconies, building materials, and others. He outlined recommended staff stipulations.

Karen Beckvar stated that the adjacent property to the north had been rezoned to R-3 and indicated that this case was originally stipulated to single-story height. She expressed concern that the proposed building height of 32 feet is not consistent with development in the surrounding area or with the adjacent rezoning approval for the property to the north. She expressed concern that refuse container locations may negatively impact adjacent neighbors. She asked if the adjacent alley to the west is included in the request. **Mr. Stranieri** stated that the adjacent alley is not part of the subject property and due to the width, would be deeded to the property owners to the west if abandoned.

Paul Gilbert, applicant with Beus Gilbert, PLLC, provided an overview of the request including aerial photographs and zoning maps that identified multifamily residential

projects and zoning designations in the surrounding area. He displayed a conceptual site plan and provided a comparative analysis of proposed building setbacks with the R-3 zoning district. He displayed a conceptual landscape plan and discussed how planting standards were designed to mitigate the impacts of building massing and height on adjacent properties. He displayed conceptual elevations and discussed proposed architectural features. He provided an overview of public outreach efforts and neighborhood meetings and noted revisions that had been made in response to community concerns, including the location of refuse containers.

Jay Swart asked for clarification regarding the refuse container locations depicted on the conceptual site plan. **Mr. Gilbert** stated that the conceptual site plan depicted revised locations based on collaboration with neighbors in the surrounding community.

Karen Beckvar stated that she would like to know whether the stipulations in the rezoning case for the adjacent property to the north had been modified by the Planning Hearing Officer. She stated that the predominant building height in the surrounding area is single-story. She stated that she likes that the units located along 52nd Street are oriented towards the public street. She stated that she does not like the proposed 5-foot setback for the unit at the northeast corner of the site and that this unit could be removed to comply with the proposed 30-foot setback along the remainder of the north property line.

Hayleigh Crawford asked what the anticipated price points for the proposed units are. **Jeff Hanrath**, property owner stated that prices may be in the \$380,000-\$400,000 range. He noted that the anticipated prices have increased due to proposed design upgrades.

Trish Kennedy, a member of the public speaking in opposition to the request, expressed the following concerns:

- The project would negatively impact existing neighborhoods both east and west of 52nd Street.
- Residents along Cambridge Avenue, east of 52nd Street, were neglected in public outreach efforts and did not have adequate information about the request.
- Existing R-3 zoning along 52nd Street should not be viewed as precedent for new rezoning requests.
- The development pattern in the surrounding area is predominantly single-family residential and the proposal is not consistent.

John Stefanac, a member of the public speaking in opposition to the request, stated that the development pattern in the surrounding area is predominantly single-family residential and the proposal is not consistent. He stated that multifamily residential in the surrounding area is concentrated closer to Thomas Road. He expressed concern that the proposed height and density would be out of place and that the project would create traffic problems.

Mary Thorman, a member of the public speaking in opposition to the request, expressed concern that the proposal would exacerbate existing traffic and parking problems along 52nd Street and Virginia Avenue. She also expressed concern that the proposed refuse container locations may create problems.

David Rice, a member of the public speaking in opposition to the request, expressed concerns regarding the proposed height and privacy for adjacent residents. He stated that he would prefer single-family residential uses on the property. He stated that while he appreciates the proposed enhanced setbacks, they are not adequate to mitigate impacts to view corridors.

Ludovic Simanovski, a member of the public speaking in opposition to the request, expressed concerns with the proposed height and density, impacts to traffic in the surrounding area, and parking availability. She stated that the proposal is not consistent with single-family residential on the east side of 52nd Street. She stated that the intensity of the project is not compatible with the neighborhood.

Jon “Tim” Cox, a member of the public speaking in opposition to the request, stated that neighbors do not support the project. He expressed concerns with increased traffic and compatibility with existing development in the surrounding area.

Mr. Gilbert stated that he would conduct additional outreach to the neighbors along Cambridge Avenue, east of 52nd Street. He stated that the project proposes for-sale condominiums, not apartments. He noted that the proposed guest parking exceeds minimum City standards and would mitigate potential problems with parking on adjacent public streets. He stated that the City has designed and planned 52nd Street for increased intensity and traffic and that there are similarly dense multifamily developments along 52nd Street.

Mr. Swart noted community concerns about increased pedestrian activity and asked if the community would be gated. **Mr. Gilbert** stated that it would be.

Mr. Stranieri responded to **Ms. Beckvar’s** request for the current stipulation regarding height in rezoning case no. Z-157-87-6, addressing the adjacent property to the north, and noted that stipulation no. 1 in PHO-2-05—Z-157-87-6 states: “That all units be limited to two-story or 30 feet in height, with an exception to the last two units to the west be limited to 24 feet in height.”

Ms. Beckvar asked if the applicant would continue to work with neighbors on the proposed refuse container locations. **Mr. Gilbert** stated that he would. **Mr. Swart** asked if the Development Narrative regulated refuse container locations. **Mr. Stranieri** stated that it does and noted proposed setbacks of 5 feet from the north and south property lines, 150 feet from the east property line, and 8 feet from the west property line. He noted that any proposed location on site would be required to comply with these setbacks.

MOTION

Ronda Beckerleg-Thraen made a motion to recommend approval of the request per the staff recommendation. **William Fischbach** seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION

Andrea Hardy asked if the proposed refuse container locations comply with the proposed development standards as identified by staff. **Mr. Stranieri** stated that they do comply.

Mr. Swart stated that he wants the applicant to follow up with all community members in attendance who indicated they did not receive notice of the request. He requested that the applicant follow up with these community members regarding all issues raised during public comment.

VOTE

11-4 Motion to recommend approval of the request per the staff recommendation passed; with members Bair, Beckerleg Thraen, Fischbach, Hardy, Langmade, Miller, Nye, Orndorff, Sharaby, Swart, and Trauscht in favor; and members Abbott, Beckvar, Crawford, and Scher opposed.

STAFF COMMENTS

None.