

MEMO

TO: Tim Rhode, Village Administrator
 FROM: Ryan Amtmann, Village Engineer
 DATE: September 15, 2020
 SUBJECT: LCL Catalyst Multi-family – Rezone and PUD Petition

BASIC INFORMATION	
Project Name	Lake Country Lutheran Catalyst Multi-family
Applicant Name	Catalyst
Consulting Planner and/or Engineer	TRIO
Existing Zoning	Public/Institutional
Requested Zoning	Rm-1 PUD Multiple-Family Res
Address/Abbreviated Legal	Tax Key HAV0423981
Comprehensive Land Map Designation	High Density Res 8 to 18 u/a

ADJACENT LAND USE/ZONING MATRIX		
<i>Direction</i>	<i>Land Use</i>	<i>Zoning</i>
North	Single Family Res	Rs-5
South	Fallow	I - Institutional
East	Single Family Res	Rs-5
West	Public/Institutional	C-1

Updated Information

Based upon feedback presented at the August 17, 2020 Plan Commission meeting, the Catalyst Development team has provided additional information to advance the progress of their General Development Plan. In addition, Village staff has met twice with the Catalyst Development team.

The following items were submitted by Catalyst on September 4. These items are having been made available to Plan Commissioners and are available on the Village's website for public viewing.

△ Name	Modified
<input type="checkbox"/>  Catalyst PUD Request - PUD Petition Letter_UPDATED 09022020.docx 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  Concept Site Plan_LCL South_2020-09-03.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  Entrance Exhibit_2020-09-03.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  Ex A - Legal Description.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  Ex B - PRELIM CIVIL PLANS_HARTLAND APTS_2020-09-03.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  Ex C - REZONING EXH-090320.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  Ex D - Hartland East Apartments Landscape_2020-09-04.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  EX E - 20200904_HARTLAND LCL APTS_ARCH.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  Ex F - Joint Stormwater Maintenance Easement_2020-08-24.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  Ex F - PARADISE TRAILS_STORMWATER EASEMENT-EXHIBIT B_2020-07-31.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  Ex G - Soils CM20074 East 50 Acre report.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  Ex H - Heartland Tree Survey Memo_20200116.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  Ex I - 4k -Heartland Corridor Report_CampusDrive_20200303.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  Ex J - Exhibit F - SWMP-LCL_2020-07-02_1.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  Ex J - SWMP-LCL_2020-08-26.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  Ex K - 2582 Hartland Lake Cntry Luth East Lands TIA Update 9-3-2020.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  Ex L - SITE LIGHTING.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  Ex M - Hartland Parking Memo.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  Hartland Parking Memo.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  Lake County Lutheran CSM 9-04-20.pdf 	9 Sep 20
<input type="checkbox"/>  LSP1-1P_Hartland East Apartments.pdf 	9 Sep 20

Primary Staff Comments

1. Future Development of Southerly Lot 3
 - a. Developer has prepared a concept – which includes 15,000 square feet of general office commercial
 - i. Does LCL and/or Village foresee there ever being a gas station/restaurant type use on this lot? LCL INPUT IS NEEDED.
 - ii. What is the impact of this type of use in the traffic study?
 - iii. If the multi-family is approved with the traffic assumptions of 15,000 sq. ft general office commercial, the approval should be made with LCL understanding that they are limiting the potential for a higher density development on the southern lot, without performing additional traffic study and perhaps encumbering the future development of the lot with additional roadway/intersection expansion costs.
 - b. Village suggests a driveway easement be provided to allow for a future connection of lot 3 to the multi-family entrance.
 - i. Developer does not want a driveway connecting to the residential development.
 - ii. If in the future, if a convenience store type use located on Lot 3, then the multi-family property may desire to have a drive connection. A drive connection would reduce the number of left turns onto Campus Drive to access the commercial

- development. Village has an interested in limiting unnecessary left turns on Campus Drive.
- iii. LCL should know now, that as a condition of approving a denser commercial/retail development on the southern lot, the Village may require a drive connection to the multi-family drive entrance. What leverage would LCL have in the future to compel the multi-family to provide a driveway easement?? LCL INPUT IS NEEDED.
 - iv. At a minimum, the PUD agreement should provide for the Village to have the ability to secure an easement from the multi-family property to connect an access driveway to the future southerly development. This access driveway WOULD ONLY BENEFIT the multi-family residents.
2. Traffic Study
- a. 193 students used for school. What is the planned student count in 5/10 years? LCL INPUT IS NEEDED.
 - b. Commercial/general office – is the lowest traffic generating use for the southerly lot.
 - c. What does the traffic study results look like with a higher LCL student count and a “worse” case traffic generating use on the southerly lot?
 - d. LCL should know that their future development of Lot 3 will need to undergo a traffic study update. There future development will be subject paying for any roadway upgrades that may be needed along Campus Drive.
 - e. The school traffic flows for the 3 entrances are consolidated.
 - i. Suggest using the future build population of the school (300???)
 - ii. Ball park what percentage are using northerly driveway opposite the multi-family.
 - iii. Evaluate the “intersection performance” at the multi-family entrance under proposed conditions and worse case conditions.
 1. Is the intersection configuration for multi-family adequate?
3. Parking
- a. Village code requires 2.25 parking stalls/unit = which results in 337 stalls being required.
 - b. Developer is proposing 319 parking stalls; thus, they are 18 stalls short.
 - c. Developer submitted a parking analysis that suggests that 2.13 stalls will be adequate.
 - d. Staff suggests that the Developer identify where/how an additional 18 parking stalls could be located on their site. The PUD could provide for the Developer to construct the additional 18 stalls if the Village determines that parking on the site is not adequate.
4. Scenic Road Cul-de-sac
- a. Developer/staff reviewed alternatives for a bulb in the cul-de-sac to promote directional travel in a counterclockwise direction where the condo and multi-family driveways connect to the east site of the cul-de-sac.
 - b. The feasible alternative is to keep the cul-de-sac to the current radius and to add a raised colored concrete bulb in the middle of the cul-de-sac. This would accommodate the ability of fire truck/snowplows to be able to navigate turn around and plowing operations.
 - c. Raised traffic bulb shall have 24-inch mountable/reject concrete curb/gutter and have colored concrete for the internal part of the bulb – Cayenne – Heavy (4 bags/1 yard).
5. Multi-family intersection
- a. Does the drive width/lane/length accommodate needs for multi-family traffic to exit campus drive, under the “worse-case” traffic assumptions identified above?
 - b. Traffic study should show how the multi-family intersection operates during proposed and worse case scenarios.

6. Campus Drive Cross Walk
 - a. A prominent cross walk shall be provided on Campus Drive.
 - b. Kids/students will likely take the path of least length to get from the east to the school.
 - c. There are two existing cross walks on campus drive. The northerly cross walk leads to nowhere; the southerly cross walk leads to the front of the school
 - d. LCL INPUT IS NEEDED – regrading what the walking patterns are now and what they are anticipated to be after the development is completed.
 - e. Optimal location is likely on the north side of the multi-family entrance (to avoid what will be $\frac{3}{4}$ of traffic turning left to go south bound).
 - i. There is not any sidewalk on the west side of Campus Drive, rather parking lot.
 - ii. Will the school parking lot be expanded to the north in the future?
 - iii. LCL should have an interested in seeing a sidewalk installed from the primary Campus Drive cross walk to the school. Who/when will this be installed? LCL INPUT IS NEEDED.
7. Landscaping
 - a. Landscape plan appears to meet goal of screened headlight pollution.
 - b. Southwesterly condo unit near cul-de-sac will need landscape screening on their site due to headlight pollution.
 - i. Provide landscape plan to NEUMANN for comment.
 - ii. Provide landscape plan to LCL for comment regarding southerly lot line landscape.
8. Trail Materials
 - a. To be consistent with the Paradise Trails trail a natural, grass trail should be utilized for the public path.
 - b. The public path shall be paved asphalt for the westerly 175-feet near the multi-family entrance to Campus Drive.
 - c. Winter snow clearing is only required for the paved portions.
9. Plan Comments
 - a. C1.1 – Detailed plans shall include existing/proposed lane widths, pavement marking, cross walk for Campus Drive and the multi-family entrance.
 - b. C1.4 – see attached mark ups on drawing.
 - i. See suggested valve locations.
 - ii. All inlet structures shall be catch basins.
 - iii. Meter pit should be located up by amenity area on a flat/accessible location.
 - iv. Is there any chance at all that the wet pond could be “dry” and accomplish project requirements?
 - v. Where are the water services?
 - vi. Have you confirmed the water flow usage for domestic/fire suppression – to be able to confirm that water service and meter size?
 - vii. Provide storm sewer/inlet calcs during final design – it appears that additional inlets will be required.
 - c. Landscape
 - i. There are several existing trees within the development that are planned to “remain” – there should be a tree protection/fencing plan provided with the detailed plans.

RTA:rta