

MINUTES FOR THE VILLAGE OF SHOREWOOD HILLS
PLAN COMMISSION

The Tuesday, March 15, 2016 meeting of the Plan Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mark Sundquist. On call of the roll members present were: David Benforado, Earl Munson, Karl Wellensiek, Jim Etmanczyk, Debra Remington and Brauna Hartzell. Also present was Karl Frantz, Village Administrator.

Public Hearing on conditional use permit application for an addition to the Shorewood School

Opened public hearing at 7:01 pm

Mike Hearinging, Chief of Operation at Madison Metropolitan School District (MMSD), gave a brief background on the proposed project, along with Steve Kiekhaffer, Architect for the project and Chad Weise, Executive Director of Service.

There was a \$41 million dollar referendum passed with an 81% yes vote to improve the Madison Metropolitan School District Facilities. Currently there are 16 projects underway and four of them near completion with eight getting ready to go to bid. The projects are mostly centered on floor area and remodeling, some technology and infrastructure as well as accessibility. The Shorewood School project is focused on accessibility.

The two concerns to some Village residents are the location of the elevator shafts and the loss of green space. There were several different locations addressed for placement of the elevator. Steve Kiekhaffer, architect, explained the need to provide accessibility at the main entrance of the building on Shorewood Blvd., with a handicap ramp installed and the elevator located on the west wing of the building. This would also involve improvement to the driveway entrance with widening components. There are two diagrams to show the different concepts of accessibility. Currently, the upper and lower levels are not accessible from the inside of the building.

Bill Thomas, 3230 Tally Ho Lane, asked if there would be a net loss of classroom space with cutting through one of the rooms.

Peggy Scallon, 1022 Shorewood Blvd, asked about the proposed elevator location at the south west side of the west wing.

Steve stated that location was chosen based on easy access to what currently exists for accessibility. Had they not chosen this location, the others would cut into a classroom on both the upper and lower levels. With the location of the stairwell, it would have been impossible not to disturb the current classroom space.

Fred Wade, 1121 Wellesley Road, stated the concern is a current basketball court being affected and is there a reason it couldn't go to the northern corridor.

Steve Kiekhaffer stated that would affect a larger internal space including classrooms and bathrooms.

The elevator addition is 11 feet 4 inches long by 27 feet 4 inches wide. The four square courts will need to be relocated but the basketball court will stay where it currently is located. The elevator will be surrounded by sidewalk and hard surface.

Mrs. Remington asked if the school district will re-grade the space next to the basketball courts where it drops off to install the new four square courts.

Steve stated that is part of the cost of the project to clean up that area and re-install those courts. John Voegeli, 1004 Yale Road, asked why the elevator couldn't be located near the stairway by the Principals office to avoid, loss of green space, tearing out the four square courts and the huge addition sticking out the south side of the building.

Steve stated that would close off the current exit at that location as well as the access to the upper and lower levels by the existing stairway being taken out for the elevator to be installed.

Mike stated the reason that stairway remained intact was after the voluntary meeting with school staff who indicated that would negatively impact the traffic flow inside the school and were against that stairway being removed.

Peggy Scallon, 1022 Shorewood Blvd, asked how much additional paved space will there be with this project and the widening of the entrance to the staff parking lot.

Steve indicated the additional paved space will be doubled to 20 feet wide compared to the approximately 11 feet wide that currently exists.

Mike stated the green space falls right in the middle of the 32 elementary schools in the Madison school district and that is a concern. The basketball court is approximately 8,000 square feet of hard surface. The Madison School District is concerned that there is adequate green space for the kids to play on at Shorewood Elementary.

Mr. Frantz stated that due to this projects size it will likely trigger the village's stormwater ordinance and regulations based on land disturbance and therefore additional landscape will likely be needed.

John Voegeli, 1004 Yale Road asked if the widening of the road was code or if it was just what was wanted by the fire department.

Steve indicated it was what the fire department wanted. This is slightly less than what the code is.

Closed public hearing at 7:35 pm

Mr. Etmanczyk asked if the school district had seen the letter from Vierbicher with regards to the basketball court and four square courts.

Dan Lindstrom, Vierbicher consultant, summarized his letter of recommendations.

Mark Redsten, 1022 Shorewood Blvd, stated the concern about moving the basketball court and it being degraded. He stated the four square courts are proposed in the only green space available for kids to play football. It's a highly used green space.

Mr. Sundquist stated the current plan in front of them indicates that only two four square courts are being moved and the other two are staying where they are. Vierbicher's letter suggests putting them all on the east side of the building instead.

John Voegeli, 1004 Yale Road, is not as concerned regarding parking spaces as he is about the elevator addition. If they put it in the parking lot, the village doesn't lose the green space, four square courts, and basketball court. The village strives off our unique ambiance and it will slowly be taken away if we allow the school to put their plans in place.

Peggy Scallon, 1022 Shorewood Blvd, MMSD standard for what is appropriate for green space doesn't have to be the same for what Shorewood Hills' standards are.

Mr. Benforado, inquired on if the entire school and basketball court will be closed during construction due to asbestos. The basketball court is heavily used throughout the summer and the village would like to be reassured that this project doesn't fall to the wayside and be put on hold.

Steve stated the project would start Friday, June 10 2016 and would be done by enrollment day making it a tight timeline. If this project were to be approved tonight, the elevator would be ordered as they take a long time to get one.

Mr. Benforado moved and Mr. Etmanczyk seconded a motion to recommend approval of the conditional use permit for an addition to the Shorewood School with attached findings and compliance with Vierbicher's memo dated 3/15/16.

Voted: 7-0

Passed unanimously

Public Hearing on rezoning of property located at 2801-2725 Marshall Court from C-3 to Planned Unit Development General Development Plan

Opened public hearing at 8:34 pm

Rich Arneson, Stone House Development, gave a brief presentation of the 95 unit apartment building with 10,000 square feet of commercial space for the medical office of Psychiatric Services. This would be done in two phases. The first phase would be 36 units on top of the 10,000 square feet of commercial space. After that is finished the second phase would start about 10-12 months after. There are two levels of underground parking under each building. There would be a dedication of land to the village for street use as well as a portion to complete the bike path. Stone House is requesting the zoning be approved for a four story building instead of the three stories currently approved in the neighborhood plan.

Kevin Burro, Knothe and Bruce Architects, explained the building height in comparison to Shkelton Square Condominiums. Shkelton Square's ridge height is 930 feet above sea level and Stone House is proposing a height of 48 foot or ridge elevation of 929 feet above sea level, asking for an exception of two feet. Kevin explained the shadow study that has been completed. Mr. Benforado asked about vacancies and if he was expecting 5%.

Rich stated he was close to 0% at Arbor Crossing and doesn't expect this new development to be any different.

William Thomas, 3230 Tally Ho Lane, inquired about the affordable housing planned for this development.

Rich Arneson stated the intent is to have up to twelve units at 60% median income. It's the same as it was in the first phase of this project at Arbor Crossing. There will be as many as seven three bedroom units balanced out by some one bedroom, but that has not been determined yet. Michael Stiennon, 2814 Marshall Court, was disappointed with the financial report. He stated the developer's financials are unverifiable. He shared his concern with the traffic report and how the street is too narrow to have such high density traffic and will create more parking issues for residents.

Robert Stephen, 2280 Marshall Court Unit #3, has concern with the amount of green space that will be left on Marshall Court after this development is done. He also has concern about the infrastructure for water and sewer on Marshall Court and how saturated it becomes when there is a heavy downpour. Mr. Stephen stated that when there is a fire alarm at Shkelton Square everything on Marshall Court stops for the fire trucks, but when people continue to enter, it proceeds to jam the street with traffic. He asked how many renters there are compared to homeowners and how that might affect our political votes.

Dan Levin, works at 2737 Marshall Court at Psychiatric Services, is very excited about this project and the quality of the proposed project. Psychiatric Services has been on Marshall Court for over 50 years and they are excited to have the opportunity to be a part of this new project that will also meet their needs.

Alan Himble, Middleton resident, part of ownership in 2727 Marshall Court, stated they are in support of the project.

Closed public hearing at 9:32 pm.

Mr. Sundquist asked the developers to address some of Michael Stiennon's concerns.

Scott Harrington, Vandewalle, cost and revenues submitted by Stone House is very comparable to other projects in the village especially Pyare. Rents will be on the top end of what is seen on Marshall Court based on \$1.75 per square foot. Vandewalle reached the same results in regards to the economics on the three stories versus four stories building as what Stone House presented

from Vierbicher. The four stories are at or above the benchmarks for two of the benchmarks and the three stories are at or below the benchmarks on all four measurements.

Mr. Munson asked a series of questions regarding the analysis and development of the Marshall Court area by Vandewalle. There was an extensive conversation on development of this area and apartment dwellings versus single family homes in the village.

Mr. Arneson stated the Arbor Crossing II buildings would be stepped back on the fourth floor to avoid the canyon feel.

Mr. Benforado suggests that rumble strips be installed where the bike path meet up with Marshall Court. He also states he would like to explore an overpass.

Jeff Held, Strand Associates, gave a brief summary of the traffic study and the update from the 2008 study. The results indicate they are directly where they anticipated being with traffic studies after the 800 University Bay Drive and Arbor Crossing I were complete. The afternoon shows there are fewer cars than anticipated. Expecting 15-25 % more cars after the Arbor Crossing II is complete. There doesn't seem to be a concern with speed or crashes on Marshall Court. The peak hours for traffic on Marshall Court are 7:15-8:15 am and 4-5 pm.

The Plan Commission decided to recess this topic until the future April 12, 2016 Plan Commission meeting.

Approve previous meeting minutes

Minutes deferred until the next meeting.

The meeting was then adjourned at 11:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Karla Endres
Deputy Clerk

Plan Commission Conditional Use Permit Review

The Plan Commission will forward its written advisory recommendation to the Village Board within ninety (90) days after receipt of the application from the Zoning Administrator. The Plan Commission shall recommend approval, approval subject to specified conditions, or denial. A recommendation for denial shall include the reasons, including which standards contained in the Plan Commission review are found not to be met.

The Plan Commission shall review the application according to the standards below. No application shall be recommended for approval by the Plan Commission unless it finds that the following conditions are met:

1. That the establishment, maintenance or operation of the conditional use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare.

Finding: Yes. The addition of elevation and ramp to make the entire school ADA accessible is a welcome and needed capital improvement.

2. That the uses, values and enjoyment of other property in the neighborhood for purposes already permitted shall be in no foreseeable manner substantially impaired or diminished by the establishment, maintenance or operation of the conditional use and the proposed use is compatible with the use of adjacent land.

Finding: Yes.

3. That the establishment of the conditional use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district, and will not be contrary to an adopted comprehensive plan of the Village.

Finding: Yes. The Village Comprehensive Plan recognizes Shorewood Elementary School as an integral part of our community, and this is a welcome improvement.

4. That adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and other necessary site improvements have been, are being or will be provided.

Finding: Yes.

5. That the establishment, maintenance or operation of the conditional use is unlikely to increase the level of traffic congestion or reduce the level of safety at any point on the public streets.

Finding: Yes.

6. That the conditional use shall conform to all applicable regulations of the district in which it is located.

Finding: Yes.

7. That the conditional use does not violate flood plain regulations governing the site.

Finding: Yes.

8. That, when applying the above standards to any new construction of a building, or an addition to an existing building, the Plan Commission and Board shall bear in mind the statement of purpose for the zoning district such that the proposed building or addition at its location does not defeat the purposes and objectives of the zoning district.

Finding: Yes.

The Plan Commission shall also evaluate the effect of the proposed conditional use upon:

- The maintenance of safe and healthful conditions.

Finding: Yes. Safety improved with addition of elevators, ramp, and improved access road to inner staff parking lot.

The prevention and control of water pollution including sedimentation.

Finding: Yes (abide by village stormwater and erosion control ordinances).

- Existing topographic and drainage features and vegetative cover on the site.

Finding: Yes (do not alter or disturb landscaping elements to the south of the basketball court)

- The location of the site with respect to floodplains and floodways of rivers and streams.

Finding: N/A

- The erosion potential of the site based upon degree and direction of slope, soil type and vegetative cover.

Finding: Abide by village erosion control ordinance.

- The location of the site with respect to existing or future access roads.

Finding: This project will improve the access road from Columbia Road to the inner parking lot, particularly fire truck and ambulance access.

- The need of the proposed use for a shoreland location.

Finding: N/A.

- Its compatibility with uses on adjacent land.

Finding: Yes. The project minimally encroaches on the south paved asphalt recreation area, and replace three four square court that are eliminated with three just east of the existing basketball court.

- The amount of liquid wastes to be generated and the adequacy of the proposed disposal systems.

Finding: N/A.

Regarding the establishment, maintenance or operation of the conditional use applied for, the Plan Commission shall specify whatever reasonable conditions it deems necessary and appropriate to fulfill the intent of this Chapter. The conditions may include requirements relating to any of the following:

- Landscaping conditions required: Madison Metropolitan School District (MMSD) to prepare landscaping plan for area between south of the school and basketball court.

- Type of construction conditions required: See “Other Requirements” at the end. See other requirements at end.

- Construction commencement and completion dates conditions required: N/A

- Surety conditions required: N/A

- Lighting conditions required: Any new lighting fixtures must comply with village dark sky ordinance. MMSD will consider retrofitting existing lighting fixtures in the area of construction to that standard as well.

- Fencing conditions required: MMSD will fence off asphalt basketball court to comply with condition that no vehicles park on or transit across the court, and that the basketball court not used as staging or storage area.

- Operational control conditions required: N/A

- Hours of operation conditions required: MMSD to comply with village noise ordinance, and make sure that contractors and their employees abide by it.

- Traffic magnitude or congestion conditions required: MMSD will implement off-street parking plan for all construction vehicles.

- Deed restrictions conditions required: N/A

- Access restrictions conditions required: N/A

- Setbacks and yards conditions required: N/A

- Planting screens conditions required: N/A

- Modifications in parking conditions required: N/A

- Architecture, exterior colors and exterior materials conditions required: N/A

- Increasing emphasis on, and effectiveness of, Transportation Demand Management alternatives conditions required: N/A

- Any other requirements necessary to fulfill the purpose and intent of the Zoning Code of the Village of Shorewood Hills conditions required:
 - 1.) Abide by village noise ordinance, and make sure the contractors and their employees understand and abide by it.
 - 2.) Abide by village dark sky ordinance for any new lighting, and consider retrofitting existing lighting to that standard as well.
 - 3.) Abide by village stormwater and erosion control ordinances.
 - 4.) MMSD to develop off-street parking plan for all construction employees (e.g. - use of inner staff parking lot).
 - 5.) Keep all vehicles and construction equipment OFF the asphalted basketball court south of the school (*unless the equipment is required to be there for immediate work (i.e. no parking, no crossing), and make sure contractors understand and abide.
 - 6.) Village asks MMSD to be aware that Shorewood Blvd and the “Village Green” (south of the school) will be used extensively for the Village’s July 4th festivities, and to plan accordingly.
 - 7.) The nine conditions in the Vierbicher letter dated 3/15/2016 (with item “D” modified to reflect relocation of three 4-square courts to the east of the basketball court using permeable paving).