

MINUTES

Community Development Authority Meeting

October 3, 2018

Members Present: Ken Brost, Stephanie Brassington, Peter Bloechl-Anderson, Toni Stolarik, Jerry Dietzel, Shaun O'Hearn

Members Absent: Sue Smith

Staff Present: Pauline Boness, Matt Schuenke

Others Present: Donovan Goben, Barbara Goben

1. Call to Order

Brost called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Public Appearances – none

3. Approval of Minutes

- a. Review and possible approval of draft minutes from the September 5, 2018 Community Development Authority meeting.

Brassington moved to approve the September 5, 2018 minutes Stolarik seconded the motion. Motion carried.

4. Business

- a. Review and possible recommendation to the Plan Commission on a request by Don Goben for a Temporary Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow a utility contractor to temporarily occupy 4314 Triangle Street with storage of materials and equipment. Property is in TID #3.

Boness informed members this property is in TID #3, which is why it is coming before the CDA. Don Goben owns the property. TDS approached him to use the site as a storage/staging area while they are working in the Village. Goben is looking to put up a 10' high fence, provided by TDS with electric gate for better security on the property, and allowing TDS use of the site for outside storage/staging of their materials on a temporary basis. Utility uses are a conditional use in this M-IC district. Boness advised the fence would be permanent.

At some point, Goblen is looking to do some redevelopment of the site. Whether fencing would be necessary in the future is unknown.

Members need to review the design guidelines for the Mienders Triangle sub-district. They are from the Terminal Triangle District Plan, which was approved in 2004. Boness reviewed the guidelines with members. If this property is going to be redeveloped in the near future, how do we want to view landscaping for this project? Brost stated he understands the need to protect property, but he would like to see the fence taken down when the project is over. O'Hearn replied he completely agrees with the fence being only temporary. Donovan Goblen responded it is a \$30,000 fence. They are continually having people trespassing on the property, possible illegal behavior and truckers parking there overnight to sleep. They feel a permanent fence will help keep this type of activity out of the area. Brost advised his personal opinion is if it was going to be a permanent fence he would want it to be a much more expensive fence and one to match those further up the road. If TDS were concerned, they would spend the money to put it up and to then take it down. O'Hearn feels putting up a barbed wire fence around a Village property is not acceptable. Goblen replied they do not store any personal property outside at the site; if any cars are stored, they are kept inside the building. O'Hearn added past conversations before Plan Commission indicated this site would be all indoor storage.

Boness reviewed the proposed fence would be a 10' high chain link with slates, and the barbwire on three sides. Brost felt it is not a long-term iron fence, which he envisions for the future of the site. Goblen indicated, their goal is to keep it safer for the neighborhood, keep out illegal activity and keep people out of the building. Brost replied he would like to see whatever type of fencing could be secure enough for temporary use, and then taken down in anticipation of the site being redeveloped.

Matt Schuenke advised it appears they are looking at two different issues. One is they have a short-term business venture with TDS for them to use the site for storage/staging of materials. The second is you plan to take advantage of the fence long term in the future. The intent of CDA's review is from an aesthetics standpoint. If the fence is temporary in nature, the type of fence that goes up around a construction site, it goes up, secures the area and then goes away. The idea that it stays in whatever fashion aspect is the concern. Schuenke asked what is your long term view of the property? Goblen replied. They want it to look better than it does now. The building is not an attractive one, they had been considering installing a fence for a while, to close off the site, make it look more attractive and keep it secure from unwanted activity in the area. They were contacted by TDS, and rather than paying rent, TDS would install a permanent fence. Schuenke advised what you are asking for is a temporary change in use of the property for one entity to come in on a temporary basis. Once TDS moves out what they leave is a remnant, Schuenke feels the permanent aspect is what is at issue. What the CDA is alluding to is the design guideline lines and seeing something aesthetically pleasing.

Brassington stated she does not feel what they are asking for is a temporary conditional use permit but a permanent one. Bloechl-Anderson stated there are two separate issues, one is for the temporary CUP, the other is the construction of the fence. Given the fact there may be redevelopment in the near future, how do we want to apply the design guidelines?

O'Hearn stated he wants to go back to the original use and purchase of this property and it was never for outdoor storage, with that he cannot see any type of fence going around the property.

Boness asked members to keep in mind this is M-IC zoning, if a permitted manufacturing company went onto the site and they wanted for example, to put up a fence for security, it would be allowed with a fence permit issued by the Building Inspector. Brost felt this is doing things backwards, if they were to put up this fence, it would make sense to redevelop the site with having the building in the front of the property and storage in the rear. There is not a real comprehensive plan for this site; as now proposed, any redevelopment would have to try to make a building fit in to where a chain link fence is. Goblen replied all they are trying to do now is to make the property look better and be more secure. Bloechl-Anderson stated he does not have any issue with a fence, just the look of a chain link. O'Hearn advised he would only be in approval of a temporary fence, unless another plan was brought before the committee with landscaping, and more design qualities to it; otherwise, he does not feel he could support something that was there for more than six months.

Boness inquired of the timeframe for TDS. Goblen replied it could be six to nine months per TDS has indicated. Bloechl-Anderson advised he would like to see a plan showing which portion would be barbwire and what type of landscaping; as, this is not a temporary fence. To hold them to the TIF guidelines the CDA needs to know what they are proposing for fencing will fit within the guidelines. Goblen replied their intention was to provide a permanent fence. Brost inquired if Goblen could get rent from them, have them put up a temporary fence and then take it down when they are done. You can then organize yourself for a long-term development of this site. Boness informed members they have had a couple of visits from the fence company, they have indicated that TDS would like to have a secure area. It sounds like they may have not put some items out there without having a fence. Dietzel does not feel chain link is attractive and would like to see a more appealing fence, could they negotiate with TDS for a more attractive fence for the look of Highway 51? Goblen indicated they are looking to work with TDS, but need to know what the CDA wants to see.

Boness advised they could try to pull a special meeting together if Goblen felt they could put something together quickly.

Boness advised they are trying to accommodate TDS, this gives them somewhere to put their items rather than in the streets. Boness stated if there is a special CDA meeting, it would have to take place before the next Plan Commission meeting or the process would be delayed into November. Goben advised they would attempt to get something back to the CDA. Members felt they could make a meeting the week of the 8th of October. Staff would try to get a quorum together. No action was taken by the CDA.

- b. Review and possible recommendation to the Finance Committee and Village Board regarding a 20 year, \$930,000 G.O. State Trust Fund loan for the purchase of the Farwell Street property.

Schuenke reviewed the property on Farwell was purchased in the end of July and they have now taken over ownership. They have expended the funds to purchase the property and this would be money borrowed and intended to “reimburse” the Village for the purchase. The value that is created by development will go to paying back the loan terms. The state trust fund loan program offers favorable terms and interest rates for the life of the time they would need the loan. As they waited until after September 1st, they do not require payment until the year after. It is a general obligation loan from the State. The Village has used this program in the past. It was approved by the Finance Committee and recommended for approval to the Village Board.

O’Hearn moved to make a recommendation to the Finance Committee and Village Board regarding a 20-year, \$930,000 G.O. State Trust Fund loan for the purchase of the Farwell Street property. Brassington seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

- c. Discussion and possible action on a recommendation to the Village Board regarding the sale of 5411 Bashford Street by the Village of McFarland.

Schuenke indicated, the Village purchased this property in the past year. There were some environmental issues, which have been cleaned up. The Village has expended some funds and is now ready to market the property, as was plan. The TID will benefit from someone building something there. The property is about 10,000 sq.ft. When previously discussed, the desire was to try for small commercial business. Schuenke has spoken with a realtor regarding Bashford Street, the lowest risk would be for it to be residential, sell it and someone build a home there. If it was to be commercial, it may sit for a while and take a longer time for the Village to recoup its money. With commercial, there are more challenges. There was always the thought of buying the property to the west, but there is some historical significance to that property. Lastly it can be listed as both residential and commercial and see what happens. You can give a deadline to look at offers.

Brost stated it was discussed at a prior meeting for members to think over what we would like to do with this property. Members discussed various businesses whom

they had spoken with regarding the sight. One of the concerns for commercial is the onsite parking. O'Hearn discussed a customer of his who does bike repairs and may be looking for a place to open a repair shop, but he is more interested in a mobile aspect where he would go to the client. O'Hearn stated the majority of the people he spoke with who thought of opening a brick and mortar type store were concerned about financing, and not being able to have an apartment above the business so the apartment rents covered the mortgage. Brassington questioned can it be listed both ways? Schuenke replied his only concern about listing it both ways is being inundated with residential requests. If you wanted it just commercial, you can turn it over to a realtor and advise you only want commercial proposals and list for a set period. It all depends on how long you want to sit on the property. Schuenke advised we would already lose the tax value for something not being built this year. O'Hearn would like to list as commercial; and, if nothing happens, we can list as residential in the spring of 2019. Members discussed the historical aspect of the property next door. Brost stated he did not feel a lot of pressure with waiting. Members discussed various time frames for listing the property. Schuenke advised what they need is a motion to move this to the Village Board and he will get proposals for listing it, he can then take it to the Village Board to move the process along, and see what happens. If nothing, they can discuss again in February.

Brassington moved to recommend to the Village Board to list the property at 5411 Bashford Street as commercial property. Dietzel seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

d. Update on the RFP process for Farwell Street property redevelopment.

Boness reviewed the update sheet from packets. Three firms came to the Q & A. Since then two other firms have indicated an interest. RFP's are due by November 1st. Schuenke has had a couple of questions, and responded as needed. Schuenke advised there are two parties who are very interested. One piece of information shared with them on October 4th was the Village might apply for an additional grant to help assist them with additional funding to support the project. It is not an easy process to do, but would be enticement to keep people interested. The main comment they hear is just receiving the land is not enough, and the materials for the requirements are too expensive. Members discussed potential options to discuss financial gaps in developer's proposals. Members felt we could address, if a number of developers identify this scenario in their RFP.

e. Community Development Highlights
No comments

5. Adjournment.

O'Hearn moved to adjourn, Brassington seconded the motion. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.