



Memorandum

To: Charles Witherington-Perkins, Director of Planning and Community Development
CC: Randy Recklaus, Village Manager
From: Sam Hubbard, Development Planner
Date: 11/30/2017
Re: Early Review – CA Ventures Sigwalt Street Apartments, 45 N. Chestnut Avenue

Please find attached information regarding revisions to a proposed rental apartment development by CA Ventures. Included is a formal request from Michael Porto of CA Ventures, dated November 21, 2017, requesting Early Review by the Village Board. Also included are aerials of the subject property, a site plan, elevations, floor plans, and renderings of the proposed development.

The Early Review Process, instituted by the Village Board in March 2001, allows developers, under certain circumstances consistent with the stated Guidelines of Early Review, to present projects to the Board in order to gauge the acceptability of development proposals. It should be understood that the results of the Village Board Early Review do not commit the Village to approving or denying a development proposal if and when the proposal moves through the review process. It is simply an opportunity for a developer to obtain a degree of preliminary feedback from the Board.

Project Background:

The subject property is located along Sigwalt Street between Highland Avenue and Chestnut Avenue, and is currently vacant. The property is within the R-3, One-Family Dwelling District and the developer has proposed rezoning the property into the R-7, Multiple-Family Dwelling District. Additionally, the developer is seeking Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval and Plat of Subdivision approval to consolidate the property into one lot to accommodate a multi-family development. The proposed use of the property is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, which designates the site as High Density Multi-Family. One of the Board's 2017 Strategic Priorities is to facilitate development of this block.

A previous version of this project appeared before the Village Board for approval on October 16, 2017, which resulted in a vote of denial. Concerns at that time related to parking, density, loading and deliveries, the mass, height, and setbacks of the structure, and the extent of the variations required for the proposed development. Since this meeting, the petitioner has revised their proposal to address some of the concerns raised by the Village Board and surrounding community.

The revised plans propose a five-story residential apartment building with a recessed fifth floor. The building has been shifted slightly to the east to increase the separation between the building and the single-family residential areas to the west. The number of units has been reduced from 88 to 80, and the proposed bedroom mix has been altered. The number of on-site parking spaces has increased from 110 to 120 spaces, which now complies with the parking regulations within the R-7 District. Additionally, the Sigwalt Street building setback has been increased to comply with code requirements. Finally, the overall

number of required variations has decreased. A summary of the key modifications to the plans is shown below, and a list of the overall required variations is included within **Exhibit I** located at the end of this memorandum.

Key Development Attributes

	Previous Proposal	Revised Proposal	Code Requirement
Total Number of Units	88	80	53 (per proposed bedroom mix)
1-Bdrm	38	35	-
2-Bdrm	50	39	-
3-Bdrm	-	6	-
Overall Number of Bedrooms	138	131	-
Dwelling Units Per Acre	97	88	-
Required Minimum Lot Size (density)	67,800 sq. ft.	61,500 sq. ft.	-
Proposed Minimum Lot Size (density)	39,587 sq. ft.	39,587 sq. ft.	-
Setbacks			
North (side)	5'	5'	37'
South (exterior side)	18.3'	20'	20'
East (front)	10.5'	6.7'	47'
West (front)	16.3'	20'	47'
F.A.R.	253%	242%	200%
Building Lot Coverage	72%	72%	45%
Height	62.5'	62'	60'
Number of Parking Spaces	110	120	-
Parking Spaces Per Unit	1.25	1.5	1.5
Loading Space	On Highland Ave.	On Sigwalt St.	On-site
Number of On-Street Parking Spaces	1 (loss of 4 existing spaces)	11	-

The developer is still proposing a per unit affordable housing contribution of \$25,000 for every affordable unit required but not provided. The affordable housing contribution is calculated as a percentage of the total number of units, and since the number of units has decreased by eight; one less affordable unit is required per the Multi-Family Affordable Housing Policy. Specifically, 13 affordable units were required in conjunction with the proposed 88-unit development, and the revised 80-unit development requires only 12 affordable units. As the developers proposed fee in lieu-of providing these affordable units remains at \$25,000 per unit not provided, the overall contribution amount would be reduced from \$325,000 to \$300,000.

Process Outline:

Should the petitioner elect to proceed forward with the proposed development, a new Plan Commission and Design Commission application will be required. Upon completion of the Early Review, the developer

will be required to submit the necessary Plan Commission and Design Commission applications, as well as host another neighborhood meeting with surrounding property owners to present the revised plans and receive preliminary feedback from the neighborhood. Once the neighborhood meeting has been held, the petitioner can then proceed to the Conceptual Plan Review Committee, then to the Design Commission, and finally to the Plan Commission for public hearing. Once this process is complete, the project would appear before the Village Board for final consideration.

Building Mass and Setbacks:

As indicated above, the location of the building on the subject property has been shifted slightly to the east in an effort to increase the separation between the structure and the single-family residential neighborhood to the west. This shift has decreased the east setback from the previously proposed distance of 10.5 feet to a distance of 6.7 feet. This east setback is now more consistent with the downtown environment located on the east side of the site, which allows buildings with no residential units to be built up to the property line with no required setback. By shifting the building to the east, it has allowed the western setback to increase from 16.3 feet to 20 feet (after 8-foot Right-of-way dedication), providing more separation between the structure and single-family homes along Chestnut Avenue.

The building has been narrowed on the southern side to provide a 20-foot setback along Sigwalt Street, which now complies with the code required 20-foot setback along this elevation and eliminates the need for a setback variation. Additionally, the density of the building has been reduced from 88 units to 80 units; code allows a maximum of 53 units based on the proposed unit mix. The F.A.R. has also been reduced slightly from the originally proposed 253% F.A.R. to a revised F.A.R. of 242%. Finally, in response to concerns over the height and bulk of the structure, the developer has proposed a recessed fifth floor, which will help to soften the mass of the building when viewed from the street and will help to disguise the height of the building. On the Sigwalt Street side, the fifth floor has been recessed approximately 13 feet from the southern face of the building. On the Highland and Chestnut Avenue sides, the fifth floor has been recessed approximately 10 feet. On the north side, portions of the fifth floor have been recessed approximately 10 feet from the northern edge of the building.

As was required during the Design Commission review of the original proposal, the developer has recessed additional balconies on the north elevation of the building.

Parking and Loading:

The revised proposal includes 80 apartment units and the regulations of the R-7 District require 1.5 off-street parking spaces per dwelling unit. As such, the developer has proposed 120 parking spaces, which complies with the 1.5 spaces per unit ratio and eliminates the need for a parking variation. In addition, the developer has proposed seven new on-street parking spaces along Sigwalt Street, as well as one loading space directly in front of the building entrance. This loading space has been repositioned from the previously proposed location along Highland Avenue in order to address concerns relative to deliveries and drop-off/pick-up activities. Currently, there are five street parking spaces on Highland Avenue and none on along Sigwalt Street. The garage entrance into the proposed building would eliminate one street parking space along Highland, which results in a net increase of six on-street parking spaces when considering the seven spaces proposed along Sigwalt Street.

A total of 120 parking spaces are proposed within the basement and first floor garage levels. Of these spaces, 32 are tandem and 88 are standard parking spaces. The length of the parking spaces has been extended to provide the full 18-foot depth as required by code, which eliminates the need for one of the previously requested variations. Due to the constrained nature of interior parking garages, a variation is still required to allow a drive aisle width of 20 feet where code requires a 24-foot wide drive aisle.

Specific Direction/Questions for Board Consideration

The following are some questions for Board consideration in order to provide direction regarding this project.

1. Is the reduction in density acceptable? If not, how many units would the Board support?
2. If rezoned to R-7, there is only a slight height variation needed (2 feet) and the development fits within the Downtown Master Plan calling for high density residential at 4 to 6 stories. Does the Board concur with the building massing and 5 stories with upper story setbacks?
3. Parking meets code at 1.5 spaces per unit. A number of spaces are tandem. Is the proposed parking acceptable to the Board?
4. Pick up/drop off and loading is proposed on-street similar to other developments by widening Sigwalt Street. Does the Board agree with this approach?
5. Does the Board like the proposed building architecture?
6. Is shifting the building east to provide a larger setback along Chestnut Avenue an acceptable approach?

Conclusion

It is recommended that the Village Board evaluate the plans and preliminary information available at this time and provide preliminary feedback regarding the proposed development. If the developer decides to move forward with the modified proposal, it is recommended that a neighborhood meeting be required prior to commencing the public hearing process.

Exhibit I – Required Variations

Black Text = Variations still required with no change due to plan revisions

Green Bolded Text = Variations still required but reduced in extent due to plan revisions

Red Text = Variations still required and have increased in extent due to plan revisions

~~Red Strikethrough Text~~ = Variations no longer required due to plan revisions

1. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.3, Minimum Area for Zoning District, to allow the R-7 District to be approx. 1.39 acres where code requires a minimum of 2 acres for the R-7 District.
2. **Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.4, Minimum Lot Size, to allow a 39,587 sq. ft. lot where code requires a minimum of 61,500 sq. ft. ~~67,800 sq. ft.~~ in lot size.**
3. ~~Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6, Required Front Yard, to allow a front yard setback (east side) of 6.7' ~~10.5'~~ where code requires a 47' setback.~~
4. **Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6, Required Front Yard, to allow a front yard setback (west side) of 20' ~~16.3'~~ where code requires a 47' setback.**
5. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6, Required Side Yard, to allow a side yard setback of 5' where code requires a 37' setback.
6. ~~Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6, Required Exterior Side Yard, to allow a exterior side yard setback of 18.3' where code requires a 20' setback.~~
7. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.7, Maximum Building Lot Coverage, to allow 72% building lot coverage where code allows a maximum 45% building lot coverage.
8. **A variation to the maximum allowable building height to increase the maximum allowable building height from 60' to 62' ~~62.5'~~.**
9. **Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.13, Maximum Floor Area Ratio, to allow 242% ~~253%~~ F.A.R. where code limits maximum F.A.R. to 200%.**
10. Chapter 28, Section 11.7(a), Loading Requirements, to waive the requirement for one off-street loading space.
11. Chapter 28, Section 6.6-5.1, Permitted Obstructions, to allow certain balconies to project 5.3' into the required front, exterior side, and side yards.
12. Chapter 28, Section 6.6-5.1, Permitted Obstructions, to allow a transformer within the required front yard setback where code requires all transformers to be located outside of all setback areas.
13. ~~Chapter 28, Section 11.2-7, Size, to reduce the required depth of certain parking stalls from 18' to 16'.~~
14. Chapter 28, Section 11.2-8, to allow certain drive aisles to be no less than 20' wide where code requires a minimum drive aisle width of 24'.
15. ~~Chapter 28, Section 11.4-1, Residential Uses, to reduce the off-street parking requirement from 132 parking spaces (1.5 spaces per unit) to 110 parking spaces (1.25 spaces per unit).~~

This is a preliminary analysis and is subject to change upon review of a detailed submission.