

Community Development Department

222 Lewis Street
River Falls, WI 54022
715.425.0900
www.rfcity.org



MINUTES
PLAN COMMISSION
JANURARY 7, 2020 at 6:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers

Members Present: Lisa Moody, Susan Reese, Dan Toland, Hal Watson, Bill Stuessel, Craig Hinzman, Michael Woolsey
Members Absent: None
Staff Present: Amy Peterson, Sam Wessel, Crystal Raleigh, Brandy Howe
Others Present: Trevor Bohland, Chippewa Valley Holdings, LLC, Scot Simpson

CALL TO ORDER

Meeting convened at 6:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

M/Moody, S/Reese – motion carried 7-0

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

CURRENT ITEMS

1. Consideration of a resolution to approve a SIP for 1300 S. Main Street

Howe presented the specific implementation plan (SIP) for 1300 S. Main Street submitted by Gerrard Development, LLC. The proposal is a 50-unit affordable housing project to be developed by Gerrard Corporation and owned and managed by the West Central Wisconsin Community Action Agency, Inc. (WestCAP). The building includes first-floor walkout units, underground parking (86 spaces), surface parking (11 spaces), and a sandbox play area. The unit mix will include 20 1-bedrooms, 19 2-bedrooms, and 11 3-bedrooms, with 8 units reserved for disabled veterans. A bump-out on S. Main Street and a covered transit stop is included in the site plan which will provide a pick-up location for the shared taxi service. The SIP is the final design phase where detailed engineering specifications are provided to ensure the civil, stormwater, and architectural standards meet city code. In the review of the SIP against the GDP, staff identified the following:

- A 20-foot utility easement was added to the site plan where requested and was approved by the Electric Superintendent.
- A playground on the southeast corner of the site is now proposed as a sand play area. No equipment will be installed that would conflict with buried utilities in the area. The Electric Superintendent reviewed the proposed layout and has approved this change.

- A full stormwater plan was provided. Engineering staff have reviewed the plan and confirmed it meets the municipal code standards.
- A total of 12 bicycle parking spaces are included in the underbuilding garage and four have been added to the courtyard area. Parking for 41 bikes is required per the multifamily design guidelines in the zoning ordinance. This is an area of flexibility for which the PUD is being requested.
- A landscaping plan was provided that depicts the placement of new street trees and shrubs on the site. The City Forester has reviewed and approved the landscape plan.
- The sidewalk on the north side of the site does not extend all the way to the east side of the property line. An existing utility pole does not allow for the sidewalk to be installed in this area at this time. The City intends to remove the pole in the future and construct a sidewalk from this development along Johnson and Sycamore Streets to Wells Park. Given the city requirement for sidewalk, the City asked the developer to escrow \$2,500 for sidewalk construction.

Watson made a motion to recommend approval of the SIP for 1300 S. Main Street.

M/Watson, S/Stuessel – motion carried 7-0.

2. Consideration of a resolution to approve a SIP for Peregrine Terrace

Howe presented the specific implementation plan (SIP) for Peregrine Terrace submitted by Chippewa Valley Holdings, LLC. The name has been changed from Wildcat Terrace to Peregrine Terrace to eliminate confusion with the Wildcat Court apartments off of S. Wasson Lane. The project is a 92-unit, 9-building market-rate apartment complex on an 8.4-acre site. The building/unit mix is four 8-unit buildings and five 12-unit buildings. Mix of 1, 2, and 3-bedroom units. The 8-unit buildings will be along 6th Street and Cemetery Road and the 12-unit buildings will be in the middle of the parcel. Individual buildings contain attached garages served by individual parking lots for each side of the building. Ample parking will be provided. The SIP is the final design phase where detailed engineering specifications are provided to ensure the civil, stormwater, and architectural standards meet city code. In the review of the SIP against the GDP, staff identified the following:

- At the time of GDP submittal, a 40'x40' recreation area for residents was planned but not shown on the site plan. This was later determined to be infeasible to make room for the onsite stormwater facilities.
- A full stormwater plan was provided and approved by engineering staff.
- An electrical plan and utility easement locations was provided and approved by utility staff.
- A landscaping plan was provided that depicts the placement of new street trees and shrubs on the site. The City Forester has reviewed and approved the landscape plan.
- Details for a secondary, emergency access at the southeast corner of the lot were provided at the Fire Department's request. The access will be limited to emergency vehicles, maintained year-round, and plowed as a fire lane. The Fire Department has reviewed and approved the plan.
- Details for bicycle parking and dimensions for parking stalls were provided per staff's request. The revised site plan depicting these items was reviewed and approved by staff.

Reese asked about the removal of the recreation area to make room for the stormwater ponds, and whether there is truly no other area on the site plan to add outdoor seating or a play area. Peterson noted that the Plan Commission could include a recommendation in the resolution that staff work with the developer to come up with a solution for the lack of green space. Watson noted that the University's vacant land to the north of the site would likely become an informal playfield for residents, which may result in a future issue with the University. After a discussion between the Plan Commission and Trevor Bohland, developer, it was suggested that there not be a condition of approval related to this; however, the Mayor urged the developer to work with staff to identify a solution.

Watson made a motion to recommend approval of the SIP for Peregrine Terrace.

M/Woolsey, S/Stuessel – motion carried 7-0.

3. Consideration of an ordinance to annex and rezone 1110 W. Maple Street

Howe presented the proposed annexation of 1110 W. Maple Street. Property owners, Travis and Abbey Marson, filed a petition to annex this 0.6-acre parcel on November 25, 2019. A single-family home is on the property that is serviced by a well and septic system that are both nearing replacement. The Marson's are seeking annexation to hook up to the City water and sewer systems. The existing use of the site is single-family residential – the petitioners intend to continue to occupy the home after annexation. Land to the north and west is zoned and developed as single-family. To the east of Apollo Road is the Habitat for Humanity EcoVillage which was developed as a PUD attached, single-family dwellings. To the south and adjacent to the east of the annexation area are two parcels in the Town of River Falls, each occupied by single-family dwellings in a rural setting. The future land use (FLU) designation for this site is residential, medium density, which is intended for 4-8 dwelling units per acre and includes single-family, duplexes, triplexes, apartments, and condominiums. Per Code, all territory annexed to the City shall be compatible with adjacent districts and the FLU. The R-2 Multifamily (Medium Density) is the most compatible zoning district with the existing and future uses. It permits single-family, two-family, and multifamily dwellings at maximum densities of 6-11 dwellings per acre. The existing SF home is a conforming use in this district.

Hinzman asked about access to the Marson's property on the north side and whether or not it is a city street and if it will be paved as a result of annexation. Howe responded that it is a private access drive that is owned by the land owner to the north; an access easement was placed on this property at the time of platting. It is essentially an existing non-conforming private driveway that will not be required to be paved.

Watson made a motion to recommend approval of the ordinance to annex and rezone land at 1110 W. Maple Street.

M/Woolsey, S/Woolsey – motion carried 7-0.

REPORTS/DIALOGUE

1. Campus Corridor

Wessel reviewed the campus corridor project/report and mentioned it was being brought back to Plan Commission to discuss their thoughts on the project's process and product, since this is

a unique project that was staff and consultant-led with no Plan Commission or public involvement. Wessel reminded Plan Commission that the project aligns with the City's goal of pursuing infill redevelopment and to explore private public partnerships between UWRF, CVTC, the City, and other business partners regarding redevelopment projects.

City Administrator Scot Simpson led a discussion following the presentation. He noted that this document is a marketing tool, rather than a policy document, that is intended to provide developers with a sense of the type of development that city leaders will likely support. It is for this reason that staff asks for acceptance rather than adoption of this document. Plan Commission provided the following feedback to staff:

- It's good that the CVTC and UWRF are working together to improve connectivity between the two campuses
- Concepts are useful but a city-wide plan containing subarea recommendations is ideal. Planning is complicated because the City is catching up with a reactive approach, such as small, scattered projects such as this one. The City should focus on updating its comprehensive plan.
- It's a good idea to build housing for young professionals working for the campuses rather than just student housing.
- Plan Commission feels the intensity of development near the South Fork west of South Main Street is too tall and dense. There is also a big difference between the 60 unit complex to the north of the South Fork and the 14 unit complex to the south of the South Fork.
- The concept is helpful like the South Main Study by providing a variety of ideas without locking the City into specific decisions.
- The concept is dependent on property sales and housing demand, as well as the number of housing units that will be built outside the corridor.
- There is an opportunity to redevelop the block southwest of the Main and Cascade intersection which could involve collaboration with Boy Scouts and preservation of green space.
- If a development proposal matches site plans contained in this concept, neighbors might be frustrated that their opinion was not considered when the concept was created. Although the concept specifically avoids many areas with single family homes and uses cautionary language to be sensitive towards neighbors.

Moody made a motion to accept the Campus Corridor Concept report.

M/Moody, S/Reese; motion carried 7-0

2. 641 S. Main Conceptual Review

Peterson introduced Gordon Awsumb, a developer with a contract to purchase 641 S. Main Street who is proposing market-rate rentals on the site with plans to utilize Opportunity Zone funding, which would require him to keep the property in his ownership for 7 years to receive the capital gains tax forgiveness. Awsumb presented several residential development concepts for 641 S. Main Street that featured a variety of layouts and a mix of townhomes and twin homes, some oriented parallel to the South Fork and some parallel to S. Main Street. Peterson mentioned that the site was included in the Campus Corridor concept and she asked that the

Plan Commission consider density and shoreland setbacks when providing feedback for Mr. Awsumb.

Plan Commission noted their preference for the lower profile (two story) and marketability towards young professionals and UWRF employees rather than more student housing. Members also preferred that the buildings front S. Main Street rather than the South Fork. There was a discussion about the setbacks possible under the current shoreland ordinance, and the ability to average with Planning Director approval; the setback shown in the concepts is 75 feet. There was some concern about the proposed 75 feet setback as revisions to the shoreland ordinance is still under review. Finally, it was also discussed that the site will have to accommodate a potentially wider bridge and bicycle-pedestrian pathway where S. Main Street crosses the South Fork.

3. Director's Report

Peterson reported that a Board of Appeals (BOA) meeting is set for January 22, 2020 to discuss a variance request. She reported that proposals are due January 10th for residential development on the city-owned property next to DeSanctis Park. Peterson mentioned that the Recreation Department shifted out of Community Development and now reports to the Assistant City Administrator. She also read the 2019 figures regarding building permits, describing that 2019 new construction value was \$60 million, nearly doubling the over \$30 million in new construction in 2018.

ADJOURNMENT

Watson made a motion to adjourn at 7:48 p.m.

M/Watson, S/Woolsey; motion carried 7-0

Respectfully submitted,



Brandy Howe, AICP, Sr. Planner



Sam Wessel, AICP, Planner