



Meeting: **Planning Commission**
Place: **106 S. Main St.**
Date: **May 15, 2012 @ 6:30 P.M.**
Webpage: **www.poynette-wi.gov**

Minutes

Called to Order at 6:30 PM. Present were: Burke, Belay, Ross, McFadden, Saftig, and Hanson. Absent- Dave Sampson

1. Approval of Agenda: Ross/McFadden motion to approve the Agenda MC 6-0
2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from April 17, 2012: Hanson/Saftig motion to approve MC 6-0
3. Public Comment/Public Correspondence: None
4. Scheduled Appearances: None
5. Application Items
 - a. Site Plan Approval for Poynette Iron Works 291 E. North St. building addition: Village Planner Roffers and Village Engineer Henningsgard researched the request and recommended approval of the project. Revised site plans were handed out showing the building missed on the previous site plan and addressing the parking concerns raised by Village consultants. Roffers stated that recommended conditions 2B and 2C on his and Erik's report are no longer needed given the revised plans. Based on a request by the applicant, the Commission agreed that wheel stops shown on approved plans from 2011 would no longer be required. Guy and Bob Senkowski, representing Poynette Iron Works, added that they have started the landscaping process on the 2011 project. There was discussion about the storm water agreement in place and Henningsgard noted that it seemed that this new building will only butt up to the pipe, not cover it. Roffers suggested the need to revise the agreement to encompass this and future projects, so that the agreement does not have to be revised again. Ross/Saftig motion to approve the site plan submittal subject to the following conditions: (1) The project shall be built in accordance with the building elevations and general site plan dated May 9, 2012; and (2) the applicant shall again amend the drainage easement agreement, or further amend the 2011 agreement amendment, to accommodate the new building addition, plus any future additions that might be approved under a subsequent site plan approval process of the Village. MC 6-0.
 - b. Site Plan Approval for Pioneer Place #2 additional parking spaces: The Village Planner and Village Engineer described the project and their recommended conditions of approval. Hanson/Belay motion to approve the site plan submittal, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The project shall be built in accordance with the submitted site survey dated 4/20/12, except as changes may be required to meet the conditions that follow.
 2. Prior to parking lot construction, the applicant shall amend the site survey and resubmit it for Village Planner approval, including the following amendments:
 - a. Within the legend, add the word "shrub" after both "Proposed deciduous" and "Proposed coniferous."
 - b. Within the landscape note, change "private" to "privet;" remove "dwarf" from before "spirea;" and specify that all selected shrubs have a minimum 3 foot height at maturity (intended to better

buffer cars in parking lot and dumpster area). Specify that the Village Planner will approve final species selections before planting.

- c. Indicate that, if the two existing trees cannot be successfully relocated, that new deciduous trees will instead be planted in the indicated locations.
 - d. Indicate the proposed cross section of the asphalt area (minimum 2 inch blacktop with 4 inch base).
 - e. Indicate any proposed parking lot lighting, which may not exceed 3 footcandles at any property line and shall be directed away from the street.
 - f. Indicate what the proposed storm sewer pipe abbreviations CSPA and CSCP stand for, and obtain Village Engineer final approval of the overall storm water drainage approach.
 - g. Specify the installation of silt fence or sediment logs along the western extent of the disturbed areas, and continual maintenance of such erosion control measures during construction.
 - h. Provide a plan revision date.
3. The applicant shall install, maintain, and monitor erosion control approaches as specified in the revised site survey. The Village Engineer may direct additional or alternative erosion control measures on an as-needed basis during construction.
 4. Following construction, the applicant and Village Engineer shall monitor the area of the discharge of the 18" storm sewer pipe for erosion. If deemed necessary by the Village Engineer, the applicant shall install permanent erosion control measures in this area.

6. Business Items

- a. Determination of Unlisted Land Use and Review of Conceptual Idea for Reuse of Storage Building Lot North of Pauquette Pines Lane: Roffers presented his written report and discussed the complicated nature of this request as it involves recorded CSM restrictions on approved building setback, uncertainty regarding future improvement of Lighthouse Way, and potential rezoning and conditional use permit. He asked for the Commission's reaction to these issues, and review of the concept. Discussion followed and Mike Thurston handed out pictures showing the property involved and his proposal regarding building layout and setback, which he proposed to be less than the 30 foot minimum suggested by the CSM. Several Commission members expressed their concern that the proposed use would not fit in with the planned residential neighborhood around it, and may make it more difficult to achieve high-quality residential development in the area in the future. Ross and Burke indicated that their primary concern was that the revised building would not be set back at least 30 feet, which also would result in a paved driveway area very close to the Lighthouse Way right-of-way. Henningsgard was excused from the remainder of the meeting.
- b. Discussion of preferred approach to address larger removable swimming pools: At staff's request, the Commission discussed zoning ordinance exemptions for fencing around smaller temporary pools, as some of the new temporary pools being sold are larger than the zoning ordinance permits without a fence around them. It was decided that the present fence and pool requirements in the zoning ordinance should remain as-is and be enforced as they currently stand, for public safety reasons.
- c. Continued review of Draft Zoning Ordinance (Articles 5-7)

The Commission offered the following comments on Articles 4-7 of the 1/12/12 draft zoning ordinance:

1. In Section 2.4.02(1) and (2), change the minimum gross floor area for single family residences to 1,000 feet and the minimum gross floor area for two-family residences to 1,400, or otherwise adjust them to match what was approved for the Westridge development.

2. With respect to Section 2.4.09(2), make sure to include hoop sheds as a type of “Accessory Residential Structure” and require that they meet accessory building placement and setback requirements.
3. Remove Section 2.5.03(a), regarding increased setbacks where a lot is adjacent to a 100+ foot wide highway right-of-way.
4. Question as to whether provisions for accessory farm buildings in Section 2.5.05(1)(a) was necessary. The consensus seemed to be that some of these structures may remain in the village.
5. Within the various tables in Article 5, remove dimensional standards for AP and other districts that Commission previously directed be removed.
6. Within the residential district tables in Article 5, adjust dimensional standards for the SF-M district at least to match what was approved for Westridge.
7. Bring the zoning district names into Figure 2.5.05(1).
8. Within Article 6, remove the D Design Overlay District, bringing applicable standards to appropriate “base” zoning districts and other sections of code where they may fit.
9. Within Section 2.6.04(3), change last sentence to remove “a mix of” and “and off-street.”
10. Regarding the description of the WR Well Recharge Overlay District, make sure to also map where this district is located on the new zoning map. Roffers to check with Henningsgard about whether well recharge areas have been mapped.
11. Regarding Section 2.7.02(1), the Commission asked whether site plan review and design standards would be required for “changes of use” as implied in this section. Roffers replied that it was rarely the case in his experience that a simple change in use that did not also require site or building changes would require site plan review or other special approvals, unless the new use was a conditional use in the district. Roffers will check this section against the site plan section later in code.

The Commission decided to cover Articles 8 and 9 of the draft code at its next meeting.

7. Staff Reports – Mark Roffers submitted his written report, and indicated likely upcoming agenda items.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:24 P.M.

Minutes Approved July 17th, 2012