

**HOPKINS CITY COUNCIL
WORK SESSION
AGENDA**

Tuesday, November 26, 2019

6:30 pm

Hopkins City Hall – Raspberry Room

6:30 pm. Beacon Interfaith Housing Apartment Building (Vista 44); Lindahl

Other

Adjournment



MEMO

To: Honorable Mayor and City Council

From: Jason Lindahl, City Planner

Date: November 26, 2019 Work Session

Subject: Beacon Interfaith Housing Apartment Building (Vista 44)

Proposed Action

No action required - review and discuss project with applicant and provide direction to staff. Based on feedback from this meeting, staff anticipates bringing this item back to the City Council on December 3, 2019 for further action.

Overview

The City Council reviewed this item during the November 4, 2019 regular meeting and ultimately decided to table it and directed staff to bring it back to a future work session for further review and discussion.

Since the November 4 meeting, the City Council asked staff to provide additional information on the definitions and classifications for affordable housing. That information was provided to the City Council during the November 12 work session. The Council also asked the applicant to provide more information on site design options, how their project fits into Hopkins' existing supply of legally binding affordable housing and what additional resources this project can bring to the community. Beacon will address these questions during the work session. As a reference, staff has attached the original City Council Report on this item, which provides a detailed review of this proposal.

Attachments

- City Council Report 2019-112

BACKGROUND

Development Proposal. Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative is proposing a 4-story 50-unit multifamily apartment building on a 1 acre portion of the parking lot for St. Joseph church and Chesterton Academy. The proposed development would be located on the green space portion of the parking lot and not reduce the amount of parking available to the church or school. Based on the applicant's plans, the following approvals are necessary for this project:

- Rezoning from R-5, High Density Residential to Mixed Use with a Planned Unit Development (PUD).
- Execution of a Planned Unit Development Agreement.
- Site Plan Review
- Administrative Subdivision and easement vacation.
- Approvals from the Nile Mile Creek Watershed District.

According to the applicant, the Vista 44 development will provide rental housing to families earning 50% or less of the area median income (AMI) and will be financed by federal low-income housing tax credits allocated by the State or Minnesota along with various loans and grants from other national, state, local public and private philanthropic sources. There are no City funds supporting this project. Although Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative is a non-profit 501(c)3 tax exempt organization, the development will not be exempt from property taxes. In addition to property taxes that will accrue to the state, City of Hopkins and the school district (estimated to be about \$50,000 annually); the development will also pay permitting and utility fees estimated to be over \$300,000.

Concept Plan Review. The Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council reviewed a concept plan for this project during their respective July 23 and August 20 meetings. During the concept plan review, Beacon offered tours of their Edina development to the City Council, Planning & Zoning Commission and Hopkins residents. After holding a public hearing at the Planning & Zoning Commission and hearing additional public comments both in support and opposition to the project, the City stated general support for the project and rezoning to the Mixed Use zoning district with a planned unit development. Deviations from the zoning standards could be accommodated through a planned unit development process and the applicant should state what additional features they intend to provide with their development in exchange for the PUD. The applicant should use feedback from the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council to prepare their formal application.

Neighborhood Meeting. The City's public engagement process for this development goes above and beyond the typical statutory requirements for a public hearing and review by the Planning & Zoning Commission and approval by the City Council. It also requires the applicant to host a neighborhood meeting before the public hearing to explain the project, answer questions and take any comments. This meeting took place on October 10, 2019 at St. Joseph's Church. The sign in sheet and a summary of the comments from the meeting are attached for your reference. Twelve people (including Beacon staff) attended the meeting and raised concerns about the building's height, setbacks and pedestrian cut-through traffic across the townhome property to the east.

Written Comments. To date, the City has received eleven separate comments about the Beacon proposal (6 in support and 5 against). These comments are from the following individuals or groups:

1. Kyle Bresin – supports proposal
2. CitiGables Condominiums – petition opposing the proposal.
3. CitiGables Townhomes – petition opposing the proposal.

4. Faith Leaders – letter supporting the proposal.
5. Sarah Granger – supports proposal.
6. Maureen Golden – supports proposal.
7. Judy Saumweber – supports proposal.
8. Jim and Michelle Smith – opposes proposal.
9. Pat and Bob Stacken – opposes proposal.
10. Jerry and Marie Trafas – opposes proposal.
11. Cheryl Youakim – supports proposal.

Planning & Zoning Commission Action. The Planning & Zoning Commission held a public hearing to review this item (Planning Application 2019-17-SP RZ & PUD) during its regular meeting on October 22, 2019. During that meeting, the Commission heard a summary presentation from staff and comments from both the applicant and the public.

The first group to speak during the public hearing were members of the Beacon development team. Kevin Walker of Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative provided a summary presentation. Anna Petersmeyer, COO of Volunteers of America, shared information on Volunteers of America and the services that would be available to residents of Vista 44. Bart Nelson of Urban Works Architecture discussed the floor to area ratio, parking requirements and design standards for the development.

Commissioner Hanneman questioned if there would be a preference for Hopkins. Mr. Walker provided information on the coordinated entry application system administered by Hennepin County and confirmed previous history with a community does not give an advantage. Commissioner Daly asked for more information on the green space for the development. Mr. Nelson shared that there are plans for a playground area, rain garden and will retain as much of the surrounding green space as possible.

Following Beacon's presentation, 23 individuals (12 in support and 11 against) came forward to address the Commission.

1. Rev. Zoe Kaester of Mizpah United Church of Christ in Hopkins spoke in support of the development.
2. Judy Johnson, 32 11th Avenue South, spoke in support of the development.
3. Alan Johnson, 32 11th Avenue South, spoke in support of the development.
4. Rabbi Jill Crimmings of Bet Shalom Congregation in Minnetonka, spoke in support of the development.
5. Tom Hudock, 325 13th Avenue North, spoke in support of the development.
6. Michael Semsch, president of National Handicap Housing, spoke in support of the development.
7. Charlie Flynn, 374 Althea Lane, spoke in support of the development.
8. Tim Buckley, 18 12th Avenue North, is not opposed to the development, but commented on current road conditions on 12th Avenue North and questioned if there would be street improvements with the project. Mr. Lindahl replied that no street improvements are included in the proposal, but the City does have a Street Improvement Plan that designates sections of the community for improvements each year. Mr. Lindahl said he would reach out to the City Engineer for a timeline.
9. Charles Claud, 32 11th Avenue South #109, shared concerns regarding the potential for unexpected expenses related to civil engineering, including parking, street conditions, and sewage and stormwater management.

10. Gary McGlennen, 32 11th Avenue South #111, spoke in opposition of the development. Mr. McGlennen questioned the applicant paying for the traffic study. Mr. Lindahl clarified the process for traffic studies and that the City chooses the consultant, not the applicant. Noting a last minute change to the plans, Mr. McGlennen suggested the Planning Commission choose to continue for more information.
11. Jim Shurley, 32 11th Avenue South, spoke in opposition of the development with concern for the change in zoning.
12. Rep. Cheryl Youakim, 129 7th Avenue North, spoke in support of the development.
13. Pastor Scott Searl of Shepard of the Hills in Edina, spoke in support of the development.
14. Marie Trafas, 402 14th Avenue North, spoke in opposition of the development, instead preferring senior-owned condominiums.
15. Jay Hornbacher, 10 7th Avenue North, spoke in support of the development.
16. Terrie Winegar, 106 12th Avenue South, spoke in opposition of the development.
17. Greg Zoidis, 201 Homedale Road and Beacon Interfaith board member, spoke in support of the development.
18. Mark Muenchow, 1117 1st Street South, spoke in opposition of the development.
19. Elaine Schweitzer, 1101 1st Street South, spoke in opposition of the development, citing concern with neighborhood safety, background checks and application requirements for tenants. Mr. Lindahl replied that City policy requires rental property owners to administer background checks on all future tenants and to have that information on file.
20. William, a Hopkins resident, is supportive of the development, but had questions about illegal drug use or excessive use of alcohol by residents of the development and if there will be support systems in place for those dealing specifically with addiction issues and the long-term plan for continuing all supportive services.
21. Joan Schwartzbauer, 32 11th Avenue South, spoke in opposition of the development.
22. Michelle Poirier, 102 Wayside Road W, discussed value in ownership vs rental as well as lack of parking in the area.
23. Judy Slayton, 1005 1st Street South, asked the Commission to envision long term.

After the public hearing, the following questions were addressed:

- Unexpected expenses related to civil engineering including street conditions, parking, and sewage and stormwater management. Mr. Lindahl replied that the traffic study showed that the development would not create a need for improvements to the surrounding streets. The City Engineer reviewed the plans and did not identify the current water and sewer capacity as an issue. With regard to stormwater management, there is a condition of approval from the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District.
- Mr. Lindahl presented clarification on staff recommendations provided in the reports and the legal authority of the City in reviewing proposals.
- Commissioner Daly questioned the density change that would occur with the zoning change from R-5 to Mixed Use. Mr. Lindahl did not have exact numbers at the time, but replied that they would be similar.
- Commissioner Hanneman asked about the contract for the development as supportive housing and the possibility for it to change in the future. Chris Dettling of Beacon Interfaith replied that a requirement by one of the financing sources (Minnesota Housing Finance Agency) is that supportive services be provided to the residents of the building for the duration of the loan agreement, typically 30-45 years.

- Concern over safety and background check requirements. Mr. Walker of Beacon Interfaith commented that the application process is thorough and noted that those whom could adversely affect the well-being or pose a risk to the safety of the other tenants and the surrounding community will not be allowed to rent in the development.

After the public hearing and some general discussion, the Planning Commission recommended the City Council approve both (1) the rezoning to Mixed Use with a PUD and (2) the Site. Each vote was 4-2 with Commissioners Balan and Stiele voting against the motions citing a desire for more time to review the recently revised site plan.

REZONING & PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

The applicant is proposing to rezone the subject property from R-5, High Density Multiple Family to Mixed Use with a planned unit development (PUD). The Mixed Use district was selected because it more closely fit with the applicant's vision for the development and the City's Comprehensive Plan. Both districts have similar building height and density standards. However, the Mixed Use district offers additional façade (building appearance), setback, parking, building orientation and exterior materials standards that are more consistent with the general downtown development pattern and supportive of transit than the existing B-5 zoning.

Rezoning applications are considered quasi-judicial actions. In such cases, the City is acting as a judge to determine if the regulations within the Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Ordinance or Subdivision Ordinance are being followed. Generally, if this application meets the City's established requirements, it should be approved. The criteria to weigh when considering a rezoning application are detailed below. Based on these findings, staff recommends approval of the request to rezone the subject property from R-5, High Density Multiple Family to Mixed Use with a planned unit development (PUD), subject to conditions. It should be noted that State law requires a Super Majority vote of the City Council to approve any rezoning that changes from residential to commercial. In this case, the Mixed Use district allows commercial uses so the City Attorney finds a 4/5 vote of the City Council is necessary to approve this request.

Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. Staff finds rezoning the subject property from R-5, High Density Multiple Family to Mixed Use with a planned unit development (PUD) would be consistent with both the current 2030 Comprehensive Plan and Draft 2040 Comprehensive Plan – Cultivate Hopkins. Staff reviewed the application under both comprehensive plans to provide the City Council a boarder future planning context as we transition to the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. However, the 2030 plan stands as the City's official policy document until final approval of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

The Subject property is guided HDR – High Density Residential by the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. According to the narrative for this land use classification, it allows for high-density residential uses including multi-unit and multi-building developments. The high-density category accommodates more intense housing, such as apartments and condominium developments. The density range for this category establishes a minimum threshold of 17+ units per acre, ultimately resulting in multi-storied structures.

The Residential Land Use Pattern goal from the 2030 Comprehensive Plan states the City should work toward a balanced supply of housing, which is important to Hopkins' efforts to serve the needs of a broad range of residents. The land use plan identifies land use patterns that will support a variety of residential uses including medium to high density uses, such as condos, townhomes and

apartments. In addition, the Housing chapter of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan includes the goal - continue to strive for a mix of housing that accommodates a balance of all housing needs. Policies to support these goals include:

- Ensure that the infilling of vacant parcels and the rehabilitation of existing developed land will be in accordance with uses specified in the Comprehensive Plan.
- Work to assure strong and well-maintained neighborhoods.
- Work to enhance a variety of residential land uses in the City.
- Work to balance the supply of multiple family residential uses within the City.

By comparison, the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update – Cultivate Hopkins guides this property as Downtown Center. The City envisions this area as the central economic, social and civic district for Hopkins and the region. Development in this area should include moderate to high density mixed use development designed to complement and enhance the existing development pattern in these areas and support the public investment in transit. This area is expected to absorb a significant amount of anticipated future growth.

Maintaining downtown Hopkins' unique identity and sense of place must be a central consideration when planning for future growth in the Downtown Center. Mixed uses (vertical and horizontal) are encouraged. Overall, this land use category should include medium to larger scale neighborhood and regional uses. Densities in this area typically range from 20-100 units per acre, with 50-100 units per acre within ¼ mile of an LRT station platform. The estimated mix of uses throughout the land use category should be 40% commercial and 60% residential.

The 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update – Cultivate Hopkins organizes goals and policies by the four environments – Built, Natural, Social and Economic. Goals and policies that support this proposal are listed below by those environments.

Built Environment - Land Use Goals

1. Welcome growth to the city by directing most of new housing and employment to the city's mixed use centers and employment districts, allowing for the continuation of the scale and character of Hopkins' existing neighborhoods.
 - Encourage the development of housing and employment in Neighborhoods, Centers, and Districts future land use categories, as defined and designated in the comprehensive plan.
 - Encourage transit-oriented development (development that emphasizes pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and a broader mix of uses at densities that support transit) in areas with high quality transit service, especially within a quarter mile of light rail stations or high frequency bus routes.
 - Plan for appropriate amenities, high quality design, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and open space in high growth areas, particularly in the Neighborhood Center, Activity Center, and Downtown Center future land use categories or other areas in close proximity to transit.
2. Create and develop mixed use centers and districts throughout the city, to support livability and community vitality.
 - Promote the development of high density transit oriented mixed use development around

planned Green Line Extension light rail stations

5. Reinforce Hopkins’ unique identity and sense of community through high quality urban design.
 - Reinforce the distinctive characteristics of Downtown and existing neighborhoods by encouraging developments that are compatible in design and supportive within their context.

7. Encourage all public and private developments to be well designed, durable, human-scaled, and pedestrian oriented.
 - Encourage all new projects to have a positive relationship to the street by orienting main entrances to the front of the property, connecting the front door to the sidewalk, and reducing parking between the building and the street as much as possible.
 - Encourage all development projects to be durable and environmentally responsible.
 - Encourage all developments to incorporate common spaces (interior or exterior) that help enhance the public realm and sense of community.

Built Environment - Housing Goals

1. Grow the supply of housing in Hopkins, particularly in targeted areas.
 - Support the development of moderate to high-density housing in appropriate locations, particularly near commercial nodes and activity centers.

2. Maintain an inventory of housing that is affordable to low and moderate-income households.
 - Support preservation, production, and protection of affordable housing units.
 - Support programs and initiatives that create long-term affordable units.
 - Strengthen partnerships with developers, nonprofits, banks, and others to create and preserve affordable units.

Economic Environment – Economic Competitiveness Goals

4. Promote economic equity in Hopkins, to benefit residents regardless of identity or background.
 - Encourage the development and maintenance of affordable housing and commercial space.

Compatibility with Present and Future Land Uses. Rezoning the subject property from R-5, High Density Multiple Family to Mixed Use with a planned unit development (PUD) would be consistent with surrounding present and future land uses. These uses are detailed in the table below.

Surrounding Existing and Future Land Uses Analysis			
Direction	Existing	2030 Future Land Use	2040 Future Land Use
North	Parking lot	Multiple Family Residential	Downtown Center
South	Multiple Family Residential	Multiple Family Residential	Downtown Center
East	Multiple Family Residential	Multiple Family Residential	Downtown Center
West	Park	Park	Open & Social Space

The existing land uses surrounding the subject property include a surface parking lot and commercial

to the north, multiple family housing to the south and east and Central Park to the west. Future land use designations for the 2030 Comprehensive Plan call for multiple family residential and park uses consistent with the existing land use pattern. The draft 2040 Comprehensive Plan – Cultivate Hopkins plans for the subject property and those to the north, south and east to all be guided as Downtown Center (see description in Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan section above). Central Park to the west is guided Open and Social Space, which calls for a wide range of public and private uses where the community may gather for education, social and recreation activities. Uses in this district may include community centers, conservation areas, colleges or universities, libraries, parks, public or private schools, regional trails or recreational facilities. These areas are intended to retain their existing boundaries and character but may improve to meet the changing educational, social and recreational needs of the community.

Conformance with New Zoning Standards. The zoning regulations for the Mixed Use district include both development and dimensional regulations and are reviewed in detail in the Site Plan Review section below. For the most part, the proposal meets the development standards for the Mixed Uses district with the exception for these items identified in the PUD section below. These deviation are acceptable to staff based on the planned unit development proposal from the applicant. This proposal and the necessary deviations from the Mixed Use district standards are detailed in the Planned Use Development section below.

Planned Unit Development. The purpose of a planned unit development is to allow flexibility from traditional development standards in return for a higher quality development. Typically, the City looks for a developer to exceed other zoning standards, building code requirements or meet other goals of the Comprehensive Plan. In this case, the applicant requests deviation from the maximum front (east) side setback from 5 to 7 feet, exterior building materials, floor to area ratio from 3.0 to 1.63, façade articulation and underground parking from 50 to 46 stalls. In exchange, the development will provide an additional 21 long-term and 13 short-term bicycle parking stalls beyond the ordinance requirement, incorporate public art into the building’s façade next to the front door and wrapped it around the on-site electrical transformer box; and install a 10 kilowatt rooftop solar system providing a cleaner and more affordable energy source for the building’s residents. In addition, the City is recommending the PUD require the applicant to provide supportive services to its residents as long as the property remains affordable housing. Based on the applicant’s proposal, staff recommends approval of a planned unit development, subject to conditions.

SITE PLAN REVIEW

Site plan review applications are considered quasi-judicial actions. In such cases, the City is acting as a judge to determine if the regulations within the Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Ordinance or Subdivision Ordinances are being followed. Generally, if this application meets the City's established requirements, it should be approved. The Mixed Use district standards are detailed in City Code Section 543 – Mixed Use. As planned, the subject property is largely compliant with the performance standards of the Mixed Use district. Proposed deviations are detailed in the PUD section above. Review of this development against the Mixed Use district’s standards is provided below. Based on these findings, staff recommends approval of the site plan, subject to conditions.

Downtown Development Standards. The Downtown Development standards address parking design, location of the pedestrian entrance, and the building bulks standards including height, setbacks and floor to area ratio (FAR).

- **Parking Design.** Each off-street parking area is encouraged to be designed and located so that parking lots on adjacent parcels may be linked. The off-street parking design and location appear

to lend itself to a potential connection with parking for a future redevelopment of the church parking lot to the north.

- Pedestrian Entrance. The principal functional doorway for public or direct-entry access into a building shall face the fronting street. Corner entrances shall be provided on corner lot buildings or have dual entries. A secondary entrance may be oriented towards off-street surface parking. The current design meets this standard.
- Height. The Mixed Use district requires a minimum 4-story building from the alley south of Mainstreet to Excelsior Boulevard. The applicant’s plans call for a 4-story 49’ 10” building in conformance with this standard.
- Floor to Area Ratio (FAR). The Mixed Use district establishes a minimum 3 and a maximum 5 floor to area ratio (FAR). FAR is a measurement of density calculated by dividing the floor area of a building by the lot area of the parcel on which the building is located. According to the applicant’s plans, the subject property has a FAR of 1.63. This is below the minimum requirement, resulting in a smaller and less dense building than the applicant could be entitled to under the Mixed Use district. Deviation from this standard is acceptable based on the PUD proposal.
- Setbacks. The table below compares setbacks for the existing R-5 district and the proposed Mixed Use district zoning categories. As designed, the site would not meet the setback requirements of the R-5 district but conforms with all but the front (east) yard maximum setback of the Mixed Use district.

Setback Comparison for the R-5 & Mixed Use Districts				
Category	R-5 District	Mixed Use District	Proposed	Status
Front (East)	30’	Minimum = 1’ Maximum = 5’	7’	Non-Conforming
Side (North & South)	15’ or ½ Height= 25’	0’ (Zero)	North = 27’ South = 8’	Conforming
Rear (West)	25’ or ½ Height= 25’	10’	35’ 9”	Conforming

In the Mixed Use district, buildings require a minimum 1’ and a maximum 5’ front yard setback. The applicant is proposing a 7’ front (east side) setback. Prior to the Planning & Zoning Commission, the applicant revised their plans to increase the south and east side setbacks. This change was necessary to create area for a required 15’ setback from the St. Joseph’s church parking lot. It had the added effect of eliminating the optional proof of parking along the northern property line. Several of the comments from the public and the applicant requested south and east setbacks greater than the required 5’ maximum. Staff is agreeable to increased south and east side setbacks through the PUD provided it does not create other zoning violations.

Off-Street Parking & Travel Demand Management. As designed, the proposal exceeds the overall off-street parking requirements for properties in the Mixed Use district but falls short of the required number of underground parking stalls. The Mixed Use district requires a minimum of one enclosed parking stall per unit and one guest stall per 15 units. Based on these standards, the property should provide 50 underground and 4 guest stalls for a total of 54 stalls.

By comparison, the applicant's plans increased the number of underground parking stalls from 43 in the concept plan to 46 in the current plan. In addition, the site will have 12 surface stalls for a total of 56 off-street parking stalls or 2 more than required.

The City's off-street parking standards allow for, and the applicant agreed to conduct, a parking and travel demand management study to identify specific traffic impacts and parking needs. Findings from the study are detailed in the Engineer Review section below. Originally the concept plan included 11 additional "proof of parking" stalls that could be constructed should conditions warrant. However, the applicant removed this proof of parking when it was determined by both the zoning standards and the traffic and parking study that these stalls were not required.

Bicycle Parking. As planned, the subject property will exceed the bicycle parking requirements of the Mixed Use district. The Mixed Use district requires 1 long-term bicycle parking space per 2 units and 1 short-term bicycle parking space per 20 units. Based on these standards, the development is required to provide 25 long-term and 3 short-term bicycle parking stalls. As part of the PUD, the applicant is proposing to provide 46 long-term and 16 short-term bicycle parking stalls. This is 21 more long-term and 13 more short-term bicycle parking stalls than required by the Mixed Use district standards. Staff finds this additional bicycle parking will be especially important given the subject property's location close to transit and downtown Hopkins.

Shadow Study. The Mixed Use district requires a shadow study for all buildings four stories or higher. The applicant's plan include a shadow study that shows no significant impact on surrounding properties.

Exterior. The Mixed Use district requires the primary exterior treatment of walls facing a public right-of-way or parking lot on a structure to be brick, cast concrete, stone, marble or other material similar in appearance and durability. Regular or decorative concrete block, float finish stucco, EIFS-type stucco, cementitious fiberboard, or wood clapboard may be used on the front façade as a secondary treatment or trim but shall not be a primary exterior treatment of a wall facing a public right-of-way. Staff defines primary as at least 80% of the wall while secondary could be up to 20% of the wall.

While the applicant's plans fail to meet these standards, they have revised the exterior materials based on comments from the City Council during the concept plan review process. The revised plans now include a greater mix of brick and fiber cement siding in more colors to enhance the appearance of the building. The plans show the building is 44.8% brick on the north elevation, 56.5% brick on the south elevation, 74.6% brick on the east elevation and 64% brick on the west elevation. The proposed mix of exterior materials is acceptable based on the PUD proposal.

Building Orientation. As proposed, the development meets the Building Orientation standards of the Mixed Use district. Buildings within the Mixed Use district must be oriented toward the pedestrian by providing a direct link between each building and the pedestrian walking system, with emphasis on directing people to a transit station. The plans show the main pedestrian entrance to the building will connect to the City's trail and sidewalk network along 12th Avenue North. This network provides direct pedestrian access to the existing transit routes along Mainstreet and 11th Avenue South as well as a connection to the future Downtown Hopkins and Shady Oak light rail transit stations.

Façade. The applicant's plans show greater façade articulation than allowed in the Mixed Use district. The Mixed Use district façade articulation standards call for the primary street side façade of a building shall not consist of an unarticulated blank wall, flat front facades or an unbroken series of

garage doors. The front of a building shall be broken up into individual bays of a minimum of 25 feet and maximum of 40 feet wide. According to the applicant, in response to comments received from City Council during the concept plan review they have revised the east (12th Avenue South) façade to be more substantially articulated and have given more emphasis to the building's masonry base via different brick surface textures and color. This design is acceptable based on the PUD proposal.

Sidewalks. The Mixed Use district requires a minimum 5-foot wide sidewalk along the frontage of all public streets and within and along the frontage of all new development or redevelopment. There are existing sidewalks along both 1st Street South and 12th Avenue South. The applicant will add sidewalk along 13th Avenue South that connects to the existing sidewalk. To facilitate this sidewalk design, the City Engineer shall require the applicant to dedicate the necessary easement in a form acceptable to the City Attorney.

Pedestrian/Streetscapes. The Mixed Use district requires pedestrian streetscape improvements along all sidewalks. If the existing right-of-way does not allow for street trees, landscaping, trees, planters or street furniture, they will be added to the interior side of the sidewalk where the setback will allow.

Pedestrian improvements of at least 25 percent of the landscaping budget shall be included in the development. These improvements shall create a high quality pedestrian experience through the provision of benches, planters, drinking fountains, waste containers, median landscaping, etc.

Pedestrian-scale light fixtures that shine downward on the sidewalks and walkways shall be no greater than 12 feet in height and must be provided along all sidewalks and walkways to provide ample lighting during nighttime hours for employees, residents, and customers. A condition of approval shall require the applicant to provide and receive approval of a lighting and photometric plan prior to the second reading of the rezoning ordinance.

To meet this standard, the applicant shall provide three street lights as required by the City Engineer along 1st Street South as well as other improvements necessary to meet the 25 percent of landscaping budget requirement.

Landscaping. The applicant's plans meet the minimum landscaping requirements of the mixed use district. This standard requires landscaping improvements equal to 1 percent + .10 percent of project value in excess of \$4,000,000. According to the applicant, the project is valued at \$11,000,000, which requires \$121,000 of landscape improvements. The applicant's landscape plan includes a variety of plantings and meets this requirement.

Signs, Canopies and Awnings. The applicant's submittal does not include sign plans. All signs must be approved through a separate administrative permit subject to conformance with the standards of the Mixed Use district and sign regulations contained in Section 570.

Trash Enclosure. The applicant plans to store trash containers within the underground parking garage. According to the applicant, the trash service will pull into the driveway to the underground garage and remove the trash containers from within the garage for each pickup. Trash pick-up shall not occur within the public right-of-way.

ENGINEERING REVIEW

An engineering review was completed on October 14, 2019 on the plans and transportation and parking study submitted for Site Plan Review, Rezoning/PUD and Administrative Subdivision dated

Plan Comments

- Nine Mile Creek Watershed District approval required. Provide copies of all watershed permits.
- Utility service excavations extending beyond the centerline of a roadway require a patch extending across the full width of the roadway. The road section patch must meet city of Hopkins standards.
- A review of the city's water model will need to be completed to ensure adequate capacity and fire flow exist at this location. The costs for review will be borne by the applicant.
- Any old or unused sanitary sewer and water service lines extending into the site must be removed to their respective mains and disconnected.
- The sanitary sewer at the proposed service connection location is PVC.
- New sidewalk along the perimeter of the building must meet the Americans with Disabilities (ADA) act standards.
- As part of the sidewalk improvements, the applicant must install a pedestrian curb ramp at the northeast quadrant of 13th Avenue S/1st Street S.
- New driveway aprons shall meet city of Hopkins standards.

Transportation and Parking Study Comments

- Traffic generation from the proposed development is not expected to cause undue congestion or require traffic control changes as the surrounding roadway network has sufficient capacity.
- Traffic generation from the proposed development is not expected to create safety problems or concerns.
- Parking generation from the proposed development is not expected to create undue stress on the on-street system. Per the ITE Parking Generation Manual, this development is expected to create a peak parking demand requiring 68 spaces; the proposed on-site parking created is 69 spaces, 11 of which are proof of parking at this time. Ample on-street parking is available on adjacent streets. If on-street parking issues do arise in the future, the proof of parking may need to be developed.

SUBDIVISION REVIEW

The 2.5-acre subject property was originally platted as part of the West Minneapolis Addition in 1887. The property is currently used as a 170 stall surface parking lot for St. Joseph Church and the Chesterton Academy. At the southern end of the parking lot is approximately 1-acre green space. The applicant plans to subdivide off the 1-acre green space for the proposed 50-unit multiple family apartment building. It should be noted that the proposed subdivision and multiple family apartment building will not reduce the amount of existing off-street parking provided for either the church or school.

To facilitate this design, the applicant will need to subdivide the subject property. As proposed, this subdivision would likely meet the requirements of the zoning ordinance and therefore be processed through the Administrative Subdivision process. It should be noted that approval of an Administrative Subdivision does not require formal review by the Planning & Zoning Commission or action by the City Council. As part of this process, the applicant will need to dedicate an easement for the sidewalk along 13th Avenue South, vacate an existing utility easement and revise the plans to conform with all required setbacks including a 15' from the edge of the church's parking lot to the southern property line shared with the Beacon development.

With any subdivision, the City has the ability to collect park dedication in the form of land or a fee. The standard park dedication fee for multiple family residential subdivisions is \$3,000 per unit. Based on plan's 50 unit design, this project would be required to pay park dedication of \$150,000.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Vote to approve. Voting to approve the first reading of the rezoning and site plan applications will allow the applicant to proceed with construction of a 4-story 50-unit apartment building, subject to approval of the second reading of the rezoning ordinance.
2. Vote to deny. Voting to deny the rezoning and site plan applications will not allow the applicant to proceed with construction of a 4-story 50-unit apartment building. Should the City Council consider this option, the City Attorney recommends it direct staff to prepare written findings based on the Council's discussion and reasons for denial.

NOTE: As detailed in the Rezoning section of the report, state law requires a super majority (or 4/5) vote to approve the rezoning. In addition, the site plan application is dependent on approval of the rezoning application. Should the City Council vote to deny the rezoning application, the City Attorney recommends the Council also deny the site plan based on the finding that it is inconsistent with the existing R-5 zoning.

3. Continue for further information. If the City Council finds that further information is needed, the items should be continued.