

Plan Commission

Meeting

June 17, 2019

Members Present: Jeff Sorenson, Tom Rogers, Peter Bloechl-Anderson, Brad Czebotar

Members Absent: Dan Kolk, Bruce Fischer

Staff Present: Pauline Boness, Karen Knoll

Others Present: Keith Turntenwald, Blake George, Jennifer Hardesty, Alisa Leamy, Jamie Priske, Mark Boehlke, Robert Anderson, Carolyn Simpson, Tim Solberg, Travis Lesser, Gary Lukens, Aaron Falkosky, Tom Wordell, Bryan Smith

1. CALL TO ORDER

Czebotar called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

2. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. Review and approval of draft Minutes from the May 20, 2019 Plan Commission meeting.

Czebotar called the minutes from the May 20, 2019 meeting approved by unanimous consent.

4. BUSINESS:

- a. Public Hearing - Review and possible action regarding a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), requested by Lincoln Contractors Supply, to allow outside storage of commercial rental equipment at 4414 Terminal Drive, McFarland property zoned MIC Manufactured Intensive Commercial.

Czebotar opened the Public Hearing at 7:07 p.m.

Mark Boehlke of Hoffman Planning & Design – Lincoln Contractors Supply is purchasing the site as shown; it is located in an industrial area. They partner their sites with Fabick Rental, and as the building is larger, they will have a tenant, KS Energy. Lincoln Contractors will be using the site as an office, sales, rental and maintenance office. The use is an allowed use in the existing zoning district. They are asking for a CUP for the proposed outdoor storage. There will be some interior renovations, and exterior upgrades to the paved and parking areas. There will be an exterior truck dock on site along with three new exterior above ground fuel tanks.

They are keeping the same light poles, but may be changing out the fixtures, as the current ones are older. Boehlke reviewed the submittal for CUP conditions. They have not designed a sign to date; the plan is to use the existing base, along with proper permits. They have met all requirements from the Fire Department.

Tim Soleburg – 4405 Terminal Drive, manager of Flint Hills – inquired about traffic, as there is a lot of truck traffic currently in the area. How will they handle it, will there be a turnabout. Boehlke responded there is no plan at this time, the main road and lot is designed for trucks along with a long throat to the site.

Czebotar closed the Public Hearing at 7:18 p.m.

Boness asked how many employees they expect to have at the site. Boehlke replied 84 Lumber had at least 80; Lincoln Contractors will have about one-half as many. Rogers did not feel a traffic study is necessary.

Czebotar moved to approve a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), requested by Lincoln Contractors Supply, to allow outside storage of commercial rental equipment at 4414 Terminal Drive, McFarland property zoned MIC Manufactured Intensive Commercial based on applicant providing substantial evidence of meeting the Municipal Code Standards. Sorenson seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0.

- b. Public Hearing - Review and possible action regarding a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), requested by Transit Solutions Inc. to allow a transit service involving outside storage of vehicles, auto repair and maintenance of its vehicles at 5315 Paulson Road, McFarland property zoned MIC Manufactured Intensive Commercial.

Czebotar opened the Public Hearing at 7:22 p.m.

Blake George – advised he is here representing the owners of Transit Solutions. George has measured the parking lot and feels it is adequate for the parking. Transit Solutions is seeking, 27 stalls plus the 4 currently on site. Transit Solutions is not seeking outdoor parking for their vehicles; those will be parked inside the building during non-business hours. During the day, the employees will be parking their vehicles outside in the surface parking lot. George feels this is the appropriate zoning, and, they have the appropriate parking, it is in need of correct striping. They had an architect draw up a plan for the parking lot. They do not need firebreaks inside due to the classification of the building. They have planned air units for the auto maintenance; they will be doing minor vehicle repairs inside the building. There will be no change to the existing lighting. Only minor changes inside, some windows, carpet and paint. No additional signage is being requested. George feels this will be a good fit in the neighborhood, and should not be a concern to the residential neighbors.

Czebotar asked for clarification – the vans will be stored indoors, and then moved outdoors so the drivers can use them. George replied the vans would be kept inside; the employees will park outside, and then move the vans out of the building. The outside parking will be for employee's vehicles. Boness asked how many employees there would be on site. George replied there will be about 38 employees, with 31 one of them being drivers. Boness asked for clarification, George believes there are 38 parking stalls on site to accommodate the needed parking. The Plan Commission does not have a plan showing that layout. George replied yes, there are currently 38 onsite; he did a drawing showing the additional 27 parking stalls along with the five in front of the office, and a few more in front of the warehouse.

Jennifer Hardesty – GM Transit Solutions - advised this is a family run business; three sets of couples work there and drive together. There are some employees who leave their vehicles at home; she believes there are about 35 employees daily who would be parking on the property.

George submitted a new parking plan to Commissioners, advising this is different from what was in packets, showing an area for up to 27 new stalls for the site. The adjoining business on the property averages about six employees.

Sorensen asked for confirmation, is this the first time any Village staff has seen this parking layout? Boness confirmed that. Sorenson felt it was not a well laid out or feasible plan, architects do not design parking lots, civil engineers do. George stated Dimension IV who designed this, feels this would meet code for a parking lot. Boness inquired what would take place in the spring and fall when the adjoining business's box trucks arrive on site. George advised he has spoken to the business across the street, the box trucks would be accommodated at neighboring properties. Rogers asked if this was the current footprint the parking area. George replied yes, they would prefer to not have to add additional impervious area. Commissioners and George discussed the trees on site, the current impervious surface, the parking layout submitted at the meeting, where new parking could be established, and trees helping to buffer the neighboring views.

Rogers felt Transit Solutions needed a better-designed parking lot layout, there are odd angles, and, stalls where you would have to back all the way to the street to even get out of the stall. Rogers pointed out the parking stalls against the building appear to be compact stalls and another appears to be going out into the street. There are some with no clear way to access if there are other cars in the lot. Sorenson agreed and felt planning parking based on current employees is short sighted, what happens if one "couple" retires, or leaves the company, and you replace them with two separate individuals, you cannot base only on current staff. Boness advised based on an initial review tonight, the parking lot does not appear to work providing proper access to the stalls as proposed, it would be better to see an actual parking plan showing the turning radius of the cars.

Hardesty replied to the questions about the number of employees, management is all in their mid-thirties and have a stake in the company. They plan to be around until they retire. Transit Solutions has the option to send vehicles home with employees if there is a parking issue. In the past decade they have had a 3 – 6% increase in business, they are comfortable where they are, they do not envision any big expansion. Most of the vehicles are on the road during the day. Czebotar inquired if employees could park inside the building during the day. Hardesty replied that is not something they have considered but could look into it as an option. Sorenson stated this also raises the question about traffic in the area.

Ryan Smith – 5308 Golden Grove Circle – Smith is concerned as he is so close to the property. His concerns are about the hours, which have not been disclosed, and noise levels.

Hardesty replied they are open from 6:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m. Monday – Friday with 75% of the drivers there from 7:15 – 4:00 p.m.

Smith advised they had issues with the prior business who occupied the space, they opened at 8:00 a.m. and you could hear beeping of the vans and noise in the lots. Smith would prefer, if this were approved, to have a start time of 8:00 a.m. versus 6:00 a.m. He feels this is detrimental to his property. He also does not feel the parking lot layout as shown will work. He also had issues with the current owner by coming onto his property and trimming trees without advance notice.

Alisa Leamy – 5310 Cook Street – has questions about the for sale sign on the building, is it changing ownership. The parking lot layout appears to be on an area that is gravel. She is concerned about the wooded area being cleared and the noise in the morning from that many vehicles coming and going at the same time. Along with the significant erosion issues in the area.

George responded the building is listed as “available” and is not for sale. They will be getting a permit to do work in the area and redirect the water flow.

Hardesty addressed the concerns over vehicle noise; with all the vans parked inside, you will not hear any beeping or noise.

Czebotar closed the Public Hearing at 7:52 p.m.

Sorenson asked are we acting based on the plans submitted in packets, or, is the formal submittal what was handed out tonight. Bloechel-Anderson concurred he is looking for clarification for what is being proposed. There are differences in the proposal. Boness indicated the entire use requires a conditional use, not just the outside use, but also the use of the building for the transit business. George stated, there would be times between shifts when there will be vehicles outside, but at night, all vans will be put inside. During the day, employees will be parking their

vehicles outside. Czebotar asked, if they will be parking some of the vans outside during the day, doesn't that exacerbate the parking issue? Hardesty replied if necessary they would have people park inside, the vans would only be outside if they were being worked on, she does not feel vehicles parking outside would be detrimental. There are varying shifts when staff comes and vehicles go out.

Sorenson inquired about the maintenance and repair, what kind of work is intended to be done. There is a proposed vehicle lift, where will the oil and waste be stored. Hardesty advised they currently do light maintenance, oil changes, check breaks, general maintenance. They have handled the oil two different ways at the current site, a small oil storage container that is picked up and recycled, or they have had to dispose of it on their own. They are hoping to continue to use the service. Sorenson pointed out that was not addressed in the project proposal questions. He does not feel they are getting the whole picture of this proposal, there was a question in regards to waste generated and it was not addressed.

Czebotar stated it appears from Commissioners they need additional information to consider this request, there appears to be some information which is missing along with a great deal of concern over parking, and no parking plan showing dimension's. Rather than taking action on this, do Commissioners want to deny the application, or, wait to take action until a later date when information that is more complete can be provided.

George advised he understands the concerns of neighbors. They can go back to the parking, and resubmit a plan; he did not realize the oil would be an issue. Sorenson inquired about the ventilation and air handling system in the building due to having vehicles inside. George replied it is a state code and they intend to pull a permit and have one installed, if that is something that is a concern they can provide information on that also. Boness replied they likely do not need all the details, but the fact that an air handling system is needed should go into the narrative of the proposal. Sorenson pointed out he is looking at this from the point of view of neighboring properties, you have potential for 30 vehicles to be running inside a building and with a possible single exhaust pointing towards neighboring properties, specifics on something like that would be needed to make a decision. George explained it is a balanced system, with sensors in it.

Bloechl-Anderson would like to see a parking plan that would work, and have more details and measurements on it, along with something to show the neighbors that this design will shield the sounds of the vehicles inside of it, and, if trees have to come down to accommodate parking, will this affect the buffer. George stated the trees are not intended to come down. The parking lot designed was a "maximum" design, if needed they will reduce to it 17 stalls, and provide more detail to accommodate the proposed use. They intend to use the existing paving.

Czebotar stated instead of denying the request they will ask the applicant to provide information that is more specific. They should contact the Community Development Department when they have more specific information, and be scheduled on a future meeting. George advised they could get architect stamped plans if the Commissioners would prefer that. Rogers asked if they could provide more description of how the cars move around on the site, what time do cars come in and leave. Are there set times? Hardesty replied there might be one or two that come in before 7:00 a.m., most come between 7 – 8:30, and then return by 4:30. Boness asked them to supply more specifics, are there specific shifts, what a typical day is, how many vehicle arrive at a specific time. Rogers added also give a range of times and what can be expected. For example “at 8:00 am we average 8 cars coming in and 10 vans going out”. Czebotar added this also goes to help answer potential traffic, how many are coming and going at a particular time.

Czebotar stated they would postpone action on his item until Transit Solutions can provide further information based on the feedback and questions from Commissioners and staff tonight.

- c. Public Hearing - Review and possible recommendation to the Village Board regarding a request by RCA Trust LLC for a revised 4 Lot Certified Survey Map (CSM), property located at 4703 Terminal Drive, McFarland, WI. The property is currently zoned Planned Development District (PDD).

Czebotar opened the Public Hearing at 8:11 p.m.

Aaron Falkosky representing Quam Engineering – reviewed the changes and updates on the CSM including the water easement. Everything else has remained the same. Boness added it now identifies the maintenance access easement, and one of the lot lines has changed slightly.

Czebotar closed the Public Hearing at 8:14 p.m.

Czebotar moved to recommend approval to the Village Board a request by RCA Trust LLC for a revised 4 Lot Certified Survey Map (CSM), property located at 4703 Terminal Drive, McFarland, WI. The property is currently zoned Planned Development District (PDD). This requires Village Board approval due to right of way dedication and needs surveyor and owners signature affixed to the CSM. Rogers seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0.

- d. Public Hearing - Review and possible recommendation to the Village Board regarding a request by Ezra Properties LLC regarding Ordinance 2019-11 a revised Detailed Development Plan for Phase 1, and General Development Plan for Phases 2, 3, & 4. for the property located at 4703 Terminal Drive, McFarland, WI. Ezra Properties LLC plans to construct a 3-story 27-unit multifamily apartment building and storage building in Phase 1. Phase 2 will have a 3-story office building. Phase

3 will have a 4-story office building. Phase 4 will consist of a 27-unit 3-story multifamily apartment building. The site is approximately 11 acres.

Czebotar opened the Public Hearing at 8: 17 p.m.

Falkosky advised there is one small change from previous plans; there is a small house addition. They are flipping the location of the buildings in phases 2 & 3, putting the buildings closer to the highway based on advice they were given to make the buildings more visible. Other than those changes, the plan is the same.

Boness advised Commissioners there were some questions received from neighbors in the area. Czebotar asked about the concerns about a possible Indian mounds on the property. Falkosky stated as part of the DNR application they did screen for possible burial sites. There is one area; they are in contact with the DNR and Historical Society on how to handle this during construction. There will be an archeologist on site monitoring the work when removing topsoil. The procedure would follow the Historical Society regulations. Boness asked if there was the possibility, they might need to alter the site plan due to possible burial sites. Falkosky replied not necessarily, the artifacts could be removed from the site based on the conditions of their approval.

Sorenson wanted to know why the building is now proposed as taller and closer to the highway. Falkosky replied so it is more visible from the highway. Phase II would have a 10,900 sq.ft. footprint and Phase III would have a 7,000 sq.ft. footprint. Boness had concerns about potential additional traffic due to the additional office space, which at this point is an unknown.

Sorenson questioned, when previously discussed it was stated renting office space is going to be the harder part of the project, which was why Quam proposed to build the apartment first. Now it is coming back with increased office space, what would be the driving force behind that decision? Falkosky was not sure of the reason, possibly a selling point. Bloechl-Anderson advised at the CDA meeting Quam did state the taller building would have a better view of the lake and capital and it would maximize the amount of office space Quam can put there.

Czebotar inquired about the addition to the home currently on the site. Falkosky advised he has an updated plan from what was submitted for meeting packet.

Falkosky showed a plan indicating the addition would now be a two-story addition with garage space on the first level, and living space on the second floor. The total would be 1780 sq.ft. Travis from Cleary Buildings reviewed the plans and advised the total footprint will be 2360 sq.ft. totaling over 4000 sq.ft. of usable space. Sorenson questioned they are putting on addition that large and it will be torn down in five years under Phase IV. Falkosky responded yes according to the General Plan it will be torn down. Boness informed Falkosky they will need to revise the General

Plan as it describes the square footage of the addition of 1700 sq.ft. not the 4,000 sq.ft. described tonight.

Sorenson inquired what the maximum occupancy of the office buildings would be. Falkosky replied it has likely not been worked out. Commissioner's discussed the possible need for a traffic study, and how they are only looking at Phase I at this point, there will be more details as the project proceeds and you can ask for more information at that point. Sorenson pointed out, how much latitude do you have to say you do not like the four-story building; a lot of this project is based on what is envisioned in Phase I. Boness advised if Commissioners have concerns, any approval would need to indicate that, right now you are being given that detail whether you like it or not. Sorenson advised he is not sure he would like to see a large tall building at the main entrance to McFarland. They are likely not to be hidden much due to the loss of trees in the area.

Bloechl-Anderson stated one of the things the CDA was looking at was the proposed height of the buildings, they were told they be lower than the current trees on site. Rogers pointed out those trees could all be gone by that point. Sorenson was not in favor of buildings of that height as you drive into McFarland. He would like to see what that would actually look like, a drawing of a four story building on that actual site. Czebotar stated what we are looking at tonight is whether to recommend to the Village Board the revised Detailed Plan, and the General Development Plan for Phases 2, 3, & 4, which will still need a Detailed Plan approval. Boness replied if Quam shows you a four-story building in General Plan and you approve it, it is a good question as to whether you can say no, you want it to be three stories as previously shown at a prior meeting. Quam is showing four stories at this time and if you approve, you are saying "ok". Boness felt this is a good question, and, if this is their question, we should ask for an opinion from the Attorney.

Czebotar advised if we recommend this to the Village Board with some concerns, we could have an answer from the attorney by the next Village Board meeting. Boness asked for confirmation, if that is the question, Commissioners want to know how much you are married to the General Plan, if it says "four stories" and you come back in three years, and say as a board you only want it to be three stories, do you have the latitude to say it can be only three stories. Is that basically, what you are asking? Commissioners confirmed yes. Rogers agreed to Sorensen point, what the visual impact would be as you are coming into town is a fair question to ask. You do not need the details of the building, but you can show the mass, that is not a very difficult thing for Quam to work up. Bloechl-Anderson concurred. Sorensen confirmed that is what he would want to see before he approved the height, unless they had the latitude to change in the future, he is not comfortable going forward with the General Plan as submitted. Rogers agreed and felt having full understanding of a proposal is helpful for everyone. Boness confirmed with Commissioners that is what they want to see. Czebotar summarized what he is hearing is Commissioners are looking to postpone action on this item, until they have that type of information.

Commissioners discussed their potential ability to have the latitude to change something in the future; they felt it was too much of an unknown at this point. Sorenson stated he would be more comfortable postponing until they had more information. Czebotar asked of Sorenson if he wanted to make a motion to that extent. Sorenson inquired if they had to as on agenda item 4(b) they did not, but asked them to come back with more information. Boness stated she understands the developer is trying to close on the property; however, this is something they did not anticipate. The Village made all scheduled decisions, and made decisions based on a different plan, the developer came back with changes. Commissioner concurred.

Czebotar moved to recommend to the Village Board a request by Ezra Properties LLC regarding Ordinance 2019-11 a revised Detailed Development Plan for Phase 1, and General Development Plan for Phases 2, 3, & 4 for the property located at 4703 Terminal Drive, McFarland, WI. contingent upon the ability of the Village Board to further review and possibly change the of the height of the office buildings in Phases 2 & 3. Sorenson seconded the motion.

Boness asked if you do not have the ability to do that, what does that mean. Sorenson replied forwarding this to the Village Board is contingent on being able to make that change, if it cannot, this would come back to the Plan Commission. Czebotar, Rogers and Bloechl-Anderson concurred. Rogers stated we also need clarification on the proposed change on the square footage on the house, is there anything else needing clarification? Boness asked for clarification in the General Plan, on the narrative, it should read "54" units instead of "74" units. Boness inquired if Commissioners wanted to address the letters received. Czebotar replied they have been provided for consideration.

Czebotar called for the vote. Motion carried 4-0.

- e. Review and possible recommendation to the Village Board regarding an amended development agreement for Phase 8 of Juniper Ridge Subdivision.

Tom Wordell of D'Onfrio, Kottke & Associates – representing Veridian he is available answer any questions; the agreement was submitted for review by staff. Boness advised by approving this you are also approving the release of lots being able to be sold as shown in exhibit "C". The Police and Fire and Rescue Departments are in favor of this, as it will connect North Peninsula Way with the subdivision to the south.

Czebotar moved to recommend to the Village Board approval of an amended Development Agreement for Phase 8 of Juniper Ridge Subdivision. Sorenson seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0.

- f. Discussion and possible action to instruct the Village Attorney to draft an ordinance to amend the Village of McFarland sign code.

Boness reviewed there is a memo from Atty. Evans, along with a copy of proposed changes, is the Commission at the point where we can draft the proposed ordinance for the July meeting.

Sorenson questioned the maximum of four small signs on each property, are those temporary signs, these are exemptions to the sign permit (section e) if we are going to update the code, shouldn't we look at the whole thing. For example, the old temporary sign on Farwell Street in front of the True Value, it is falling over, and blows in the wind, which is against the ordinance, a sign like this should be temporary; it does not enhance what is to be the main thoroughfare for the community.

Sorenson understands the intent of allowing four per property is to handle i.e. restroom locations, small parking sign, but it appears to be used in an unclear way by some; four is too many on some of those sights. Perhaps a number per acre, otherwise any property can have four signs squeezed in together. Boness suggested tying it to the frontage. Sorenson replied that could work, but you may have a large site with very little frontage, who may have a need for directional signs. Rogers inquired if direction signs fall under the traffic category, or are they considered under this part of the ordinance. Boness will clarify that question with the attorney.

Commissioners discussed types of materials for signs that are intended to be more permanent in nature, how a more quality material can look better than just a plywood board sign, along with how signs are regulated now by size, and number of signs. As the Plan Commission is concerned about the materials a building is made out of, shouldn't they be as concerned about the appearance of the sign on the property. Sorenson asked, do we want to allow the installation of cheaper looking signs? Rogers suggested you could say something about the appearance being faded; (8-491) Sorenson suggested it state something about durable, weather resistant, maintains its color over time, language indicating that type of material rather than a specific material as materials change over time. Rogers agreed. Boness replied that is something they can look at. Czebotar inquired about temporary signs 8-499, there are currently temporary signs that go up once a month for a period of time, and would this language prohibit that? For example the food truck events. Rogers suggested language for a special event, like "unless otherwise approved by the Plan Commission for a special event/request" or "approved events". Commissioners also discussed that is a "short period of time" per the wording in the current code. Along with adding the wording construction signs, under the definitions category, it does not specify what they are made of. Boness will forward this to the attorney, she advised sometimes the attorney will have a model ordinance, Schuenke or the attorney may be handling this at the next meeting.

5. STAFF REPORTS

- a. Highlights and updates – no comments

- b. Property Maintenance – regarding 5915 Exchange Street - Commissioners questioned no response from the owner. They would like to see this move along. Boness stated there might have been a difference of opinion as to the condition of the brick and what needs to be done with it. Czebotar would like to see more specifics on the status of the complaints.
6. SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING DATE – July 15, 2019
Czebotar recognized Boness for her years of service and indicates this is her last meeting as she is retiring.
7. ADJOURNMENT
Sorenson moved to adjourn, Rogers seconded the motion. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.