

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

**MINUTES
FOR
PLAN COMMISSION
Wednesday, March 11, 2009, 6:30 p.m.
Waukesha City Hall, 201 Delafield Street, Common Council Chambers**

7 **Members Present:** Mayor Larry Nelson, Ald. Joan Francoeur, Jo DeMars, Rebecca Roeker, R.G.
8 Keller, Curt Otto

10 **Members Absent:** Ald. Paul Ybarra

12 **Staff Present:** Mike Hoeft, Doug Koehler, Dave Kopp, Paul Day, Brian Charlesworth

14 **Others Present:** Ald. Emanuele Vitale, Ald. Rick Tortomasi, Ald. Terry Thieme, Don Belman, Bryce
15 Styza, Tim Styza, Bernie Juno, Joana Hemschemeyer, Judy Fuller, Phyllis
16 Petarius, Richard Petarius, Joe Italiano, David Harris, Tim Sparks, Jenny Sparks,
17 Ben Thiel, Ruth Thiel, Ben McKay, Jay Peirick, Barb Liskowitz, Rich Liskowitz,
18 Jim Hoerig, Martin Sutliff, Peter Ogorek, Jennifer Jendrzeczik, Renee Bowerman,
19 Christopher Carr, George Forish, J. Scott Mathie, Russ Stewart, Erik Madisen,
20 Tom Deyter, Susan Ott, Pat Donahue, Mark Paschke, Sandy Nettesheim

23 The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

24
25 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

26
27 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Approve Minutes of February 25, 2009.

28
29 **Ms. DeMars made the motion to approve the Minutes of February 25, 2009. The second was made by**
30 **Mr. Otto and the motion passed unanimously.**

31
32
33 **AD HOC HOUSING MIX COMMITTEE REPORT** – A request from Ald. Francoeur, Chairman of the Ad Hoc
34 Housing Mix Committee, to consider taking action on the Ad Hoc Housing Mix Committee Report.

35
36 Ald. Joan Francoeur said that because the 2020 plan is about to be discussed and approved, and because
37 there is a Smart Growth legislation, it seemed that the timing was right and it would be desirable to discuss a
38 target for building types within the City and to test some of the hypothesis that people have put forward as to
39 why we have the kinds of buildings we have in the City. She made a referral to the Planning Department
40 and Commission, but it became apparent quickly that the Commission really didn't have the time at the end
41 of a long agenda to go into an in-depth discussion based on data with regard to housing types. So the
42 Mayor agreed to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee that the Council approved. They started the work in June of
43 2008. It has been approximately nine months of discussion and study because, although their mission was
44 quite clear and defined, they found that for many reasons it is layered, complex, and there are other tangent
45 issues that affect the discussion.

46
47 Ald. Francoeur referenced the report. She said she was grateful to the Committee. Some were present at
48 the meeting, and she referenced Jo DeMars, Steve Crandell and Mike Hoeft of the Planning Department,
49 David Harris, resource Manager for MetalTek, Ben McKay and Ald. Joe Pieper, Ed Olson, President of
50 Waukesha Memorial Hospital, Gary Riley, President of First Federal Bank, Bryce Styza, Patti Wallmer,
51 President of Waukesha County Chamber of Commerce, and Don Belman. The work took a long time

1 because, although some people felt that this was a simple question with a simple answer, they found there
2 was quite a complex framework within which they needed to have the discussions. She referenced a
3 graphic in the report. The purpose was to show the range of options discussed with regard to establishing a
4 recommendation to the Plan Commission and keeping a target ratio in the mix of housing buildings and
5 housing types. She referenced a list of resources and data that the Committee looked to that had direct
6 input into what kind of housing mix ratio they wanted to recommend. They found through discussions and
7 through public input that there were other items that were part of the context of the whole environment and
8 reality of the City. Those different areas and topics were listed in the report. The purpose of that served to
9 help guide them through the report itself that makes recommendations and looks at things and not just
10 making a housing mix ratio recommendation.

11
12 Ald. Francoeur said there was a continual theme that came out of all of the discussions and was the over-
13 arching umbrella under which all of this discussion was had and these recommendations are made and this
14 report was written, and that is quality. The continuation of quality in this community, whether it is how to
15 maintain quality that already exists or how to, through the planning process, ensure that quality will come
16 with the developments that come into the City, as well as many other areas.

17
18 Ald. Joe Pieper, the Common Council liaison to the Ad Hoc Committee, volunteered to present this report to
19 the Plan Commission. Ald. Pieper thanked the members of the Committee and City Staff as well for their
20 time and commitment to the City for the work that was done in putting this report together. The goal is to
21 present the Ad Hoc Housing Mix Committee report, and to answer any questions that the public may have.
22 As Ald. Francoeur indicated in the cover memo dated March 2, 2009, to report any of the recommendations
23 not only to the Plan Commission, which they will focus on, but recommendations for other departments and
24 advocates. The Committee requests that the Mayor, City Administrator, and Aldermen take the responsibility
25 for acting upon these recommendations. Lastly, once this body acts on the recommendations, it will be
26 presented to the Common Council as a matter of report. He wanted to begin with a presentation from Ms. Jo
27 DeMars, who also served on the Committee. The presentation highlights examples of properties in the City
28 that were examined by Ms. DeMars and community member Don Belman. The presentation will provide the
29 Plan Commission examples of what should be considered to ensure quality. Either green or brown field are
30 reviewed.

31
32 Ms. Jo DeMars said one of the things that happened is that when the Committee started doing its work they
33 realized there was a lot of data available. Some of it was quantifiable and some of it was not. Some was
34 simply anecdotal. But as they started gathering information, one of the things that became clear to the data
35 sub-committee was that it would be helpful if they knew what specifically they were talking about. Don
36 Belman was kind enough to donate his time and work with her. They looked at properties and took pictures
37 to bring back to the Ad Hoc Committee. She wanted to present these pictures and explain how that helped
38 form some of the recommendations. They decided that they wanted to look at a variety of properties. They
39 were looking for properties with a variation in density, rent price points, a variation in amenities – they
40 wanted to look at different properties around the City. They chose Dodie Drive, Mountain Village, River
41 Walk, Springdale Apartments, Kendall Park, and units in the Jackson Court area. They looked at the year
42 they were built, the number of units in the overall development, the density per acre, average rent, amenities
43 that might be offered, storage, parking, and landscaping. As a result of the fieldtrip and some of the other
44 information collected, these are the recommendations that came from the Ad Hoc Committee's report. They
45 are looking for the Plan Commission to continue to pay attention to these areas: development density,
46 usable greenspace, adequate storage and living space, extra assigned storage for large items, prohibited
47 outdoor storage, amenities, nature of site management (possible on-site management), parking, to be safe,
48 attractive, well lit and screened, and developer/owner track records. The Committee felt strongly that low
49 maintenance buildings and materials definitely contributed to the long-term lifespan of the properties.
50

1 With development density, one of the things they certainly found was that this was one of the most dense,
2 which is Kendall Park. Even though it is on a fairly small space, it has greenspace next to it. Density shows
3 that they can have a high density development that is still well maintained, that looks good, and serves its
4 residents well. River Walk is also a good example. It is not as dense because it has a lot of greenspace
5 around the buildings, but it shows that there can be multi-family in a very interesting way to be an asset to
6 the community. Jackson Court is much closer together. The people don't have outside area to use for
7 recreation, etc. It gives a very different feel about what they were offering to the people in Waukesha.

8
9 The next item was usable greenspace. Kendall Park is small but they put in a children's play area and they
10 back up to a marsh area. It is a feeling of openness and spaciousness. Springdale Estates is the oldest
11 property, but it has large areas of greenspace and a park-like setting. It felt as if she was walking through
12 the grounds of Carroll College – very attractive and very usable for the residents. They have a small picnic
13 area next to a community room and it is very attractive. River Walk adjoins a park, so there is a feeling of
14 spaciousness, openness, and massive greenspace. Jackson Court lacks greenspace and people are storing
15 things outside. Bikes and worktables were stored outside against the building.

16
17 Adequate storage and living space was another item. The best example was Mountain Village, next to
18 Waukesha Memorial. It was one of the more dense areas that they looked at. Because there is usable
19 storage space both within the units and as a special area assigned to each person, the outside storage and
20 locating of items that are not used very often was easy for the residents to manage. At Dodie Drive they
21 didn't really have a place to store items. The storage was mostly outdoors. A lot of it is inappropriate. If you
22 give people outside space, they will use it. Boxes and items are stored outside, just on balconies and patios
23 of this property. As far as extra assigned storage for large items, Mountain Village was the one that
24 impressed them. It had assigned storage indoors that was secure and the residents could store seasonal
25 items and things that were not used often.

26
27 Amenities is the next item. One of the ones the Committee found very attractive was the use of a meeting
28 space, a community room, indoor parking. Mountain Village was very attractive, nicely done, and had
29 excellent maintenance. The amenities offer people space to be outdoors. Springdale Estates has a park-
30 like setting.

31
32 The nature of site management, possibly on-site, it was found that on-site management offered much better
33 opportunities to know what was happening on the property and to manage the tenants. Parking being safe,
34 attractive, well lit, and screened, it was found that underground parking was best. As far as the applicant's
35 track record, when looking at some of the properties it is quite apparent what the track record is. There was
36 a broken basement window that was covered with a black, plastic trash bag. It is not only in development
37 but it sometimes in houses around the City that are just not well maintained.

38
39 Finally, in regard to low maintenance buildings and materials, Ms. DeMars presented examples of
40 outstanding buildings that have aged gracefully and beautifully and were a tribute to Waukesha and an
41 attractive place for people to live. She also presented examples of properties that have not been maintained
42 and are deteriorating. There is a lifespan to buildings and certainly adequate maintenance and
43 maintenance-free materials help extend that.

44
45 Ald. Pieper said as the Committee worked on the other piece of the recommendation, which is developing a
46 housing mix recommendation, they wanted to do their work within a framework that sought to maintain the
47 character of the City through a variety of different things. The first is keeping a variety of housing options,
48 the second is providing mobility within those housing types and price options for making sure they allow
49 residents who move to Waukesha the ability to move up in housing types and the price options and, lastly,
50 maintaining a component of affordable housing. A variety of data and data sources were presented and
51 explored by the Committee. Data came from US Census, WI Dept. of Administration, the City's Assessors

1 office, SEWRPC, Community Development, and many others. They quickly found out that analyzing a large
2 amount of data would be a challenge. That is one of the reasons that the work of the Committee took longer
3 than they first had anticipated. It is important to note that the goal was not to be expeditious, but rather
4 provide a recommendation and body of work that can be used by a variety of stakeholders well into the
5 future. As they begin to highlight the data that the Committee used, he referenced a table in the report. Ald.
6 Pieper said the data was supplied to them by the City Assessors office. It showed how condominiums were
7 evaluated by the Committee. The chart showed the difference in both numbers of units and percentages as
8 condos moved from the multi-family category to the single-family category. The Committee had many
9 discussions about how to treat condominiums in this report and in this recommendation. They decided to
10 include condominiums in the single-family category for two reasons: 1) they are taxed as a single unit, similar
11 to a traditional home. The ownership of that unit is also very similar to that of a home, usually one family.
12 Based on 2008 data, they are at about a 60/40 mix of single-family and multi-family. He also highlighted two
13 different tables in the report. They broke down the categories and provided detail in the number of
14 dormitories on the Carroll campus. He wanted to show the variety of data that the Committee looked at and
15 the different stakeholders they considered as they put their recommendation together. One question that the
16 Committee discussed was how does the City of Waukesha compare to other municipalities? Ald. Pieper
17 referenced a different exhibit. It showed that in comparing the City of Waukesha with the neighbors, we
18 have a higher percentage of multi-family properties. The City provides a variety of housing options that
19 allows residents to progress to different housing types. It also shows that we have the capacity to begin to
20 shift our ratio as the Committee recommends.

21
22 As part of the Committee's work, two common perceptions were explored. The first was that the
23 manufacturing base has historically required the City to provide affordable housing to support the workforce.
24 The Committee wanted to see if the perception is still accurate, given the change in an overall economy.
25 With the assistance of the Waukesha County Chamber of Commerce, 29 employers, representing a variety
26 of industries including manufacturers, were surveyed. A copy of the survey and the resulting data were
27 detailed in the report. Ald. Pieper said that Patti Wallner and her staff would provide any additional
28 information if there were specific questions behind the survey. By looking at the data, what they learned is
29 that while housing is important, the businesses reference education, transportation, and tax concerns as
30 more, or just as important, as housing. The other perception that the Committee explored is that the City
31 receives a greater tax return from owner-occupied properties. The City sees a greater return from owner-
32 occupied properties in the cases that the Committee examined. They looked at very specific examples in
33 that regard, and that is what they took away from the specific cases they looked at.

34
35 Ald. Pieper said in conclusion, the Ad Hoc Housing Mix Committee recommends to the Plan Commission a
36 target mix of 65% single-family (which includes condominiums) and 35% multi-family in the City of
37 Waukesha by the year 2030. Be it further understood that this recommendation is not intended to be a
38 quota, but rather a guideline. Lastly, the progress to this mix shall be addressed and reviewed by Staff and
39 the Plan Commission for a Committee every five years, starting in January of 2014.

40
41 Ms. Roeker said with respect to the condominiums, when the Committee was looking at the number of
42 condominiums in the City, how did they classify structures that were built as anticipated to be condominiums
43 but may be currently used as general multi-family properties? They have seen several of those projects
44 come before the Plan Commission and they were proposed to be constructed as condominiums and to be
45 sold as condominiums some day, but are presently utilized as rental properties. Ald. Pieper said based on
46 the data that the Committee looked at from the Assessors office, if it is something anticipated to be a condo
47 in the future but is not a condominium today, it was classified as multi-family.

48
49 Ald. Emanuele Vitale asked why the Committee decided to take this up to 2030. Why couldn't it have been
50 closer to the time of the meeting? Why 21 years rather than 15 years? Ald. Pieper said when the motion
51 was made, the Committee talked about 2020 or 2030. Being that they are in 2009, realistically they are 11

1 years from 2020. There is some magic around 2020. There are some different land use plans and some
2 different things from SEWRPC that revolve around the year 2020. When they talked about it and discussed
3 it they realized that something like this doesn't exactly turn on a dime. This is something that is going to take
4 the work of not only developers and stakeholders and people who build and do this type of development but
5 also the work in the City and the Plan Commission. They wanted to be realistic in getting to the 65/35 and
6 they felt that by pushing it out to 2030 that would give the City a more realistic expectation of getting there
7 vs. bringing it back to 2020 or any date earlier than 2030.

8
9 Mayor Nelson asked if there is a recommendation that future Plan Commissions re-examine this? Ald.
10 Pieper said it will be reviewed every five years. The other part of their discussion was to not put this on a
11 shelf and forget about it. That is why when the Committee made the motion there was a lot of discussion
12 about how often this should be reviewed, and it was decided every five years. Therefore, every five years
13 they ask the Plan Commission and City Staff to take a look at this document and see how they are
14 progressing. Have they advanced? Have they detracted from the ratio? Where are they? The goal is for
15 this to be looked at a lot more often than every five years since this will be a guideline for the Plan
16 Commission to use as they look at every type of development to get them to the 65/35.

17
18 Ms. DeMars said in looking at all the data, the Committee felt that this was a mix that would work well for
19 Waukesha. They thought this was a worthy goal and an appropriate goal. They recognize that in ten years
20 there might be very different economic forces and it may be something that the Planning Department and the
21 Plan Commission feel no longer is workable. It is a goal and it is something the Committee felt was right and
22 appropriate, but it is not cast in concrete. It needs to be something that lives and breathes.

23
24 Ald. Vitale said if next year a developer comes to this Commission and wants a large multi-family
25 development, what will be used as a ratio? Ald. Francoeur said one of the things at play is if you take a
26 snapshot of the City at any time one year vs. another year, you may not be absolutely achieving a goal. If
27 you are trending toward achieving that goal, then you are making progress. In the approval process both for
28 the dialogue the Planning Department has and the Plan Commission, this is one component of
29 consideration. The main thing is the quality of the development – does it stand on its own merit.
30 Hypothetically, in one particular year if there is a proposal for a development and for that year it appears to
31 skew the ratio in a different direction, if it is a good development and it stands on its own merit and that is
32 good for the City and it gets approved, there is a longer timeframe by having a goal that stretches over a
33 longer period of time to be able to make that up and to re-balance the ratio or to take that as a consideration,
34 as opposed to making this a quota that must be attained in every time period and in every year. That would
35 put them in a position of making decisions based on criteria that may be not in the best interest of the City.
36 By making the timeframe longer, it can accommodate some flexibility and not look at everything in a strict,
37 formula way, and apply that as the only criteria for approval. Ald. Vitale said because they are moving this
38 out about 21 years, there might not be land available in 21 years for any development and they might be
39 locked in. Was that taken into consideration? Ald. Francoeur said the way in which it would have been
40 taken into consideration is that they are aware there are green developments in the City. In other words,
41 lands that have not been developed, they have grass on them and they are starting from scratch. But they
42 also have areas in the City that are referred to as brown field development – they are redevelopment. Even
43 if they were land locked and had no more greenspace to develop, there is the probability that they have
44 redevelopment going on in the City. Even buildings have life cycles and there are parts of that life cycle that
45 demand more attention and some buildings simply die and need to be replaced. Sometimes the area needs
46 to be re-purposed and develop a different kind of housing type. In that sense, the Committee took that into
47 consideration.

48
49 Mr. Keller said conceptually the Plan Commission and the Planning Department would look at future
50 proposals as trying to obtain the 65/35 ratio. A multi-family developer would tend to drift away from that ratio
51 and a single-family developer would direct it that way. Ald. Pieper said this is a guideline for the Plan

1 Commission and it is not a quota. It is something that the Plan Commission can use as they evaluate a
2 particular development on a variety of different measures. The development stands on its own and if it fits
3 and is a good development, it may very well get approved. But it is something that the Plan Commission
4 should certainly use as a guideline or as an additional step as they work with a developer.

5
6 Mr. Keller asked about the ratios of other communities. Ald. Francoeur referenced another table in the
7 report. Mr. Ben McKay said other communities have targets to reach over a period of time. The table
8 referenced where they are today, with the percentages of single-family, two-family, multi-family homes as
9 they exist today. (The actual percentages were from 2006.) Mr. Keller said if, in theory, they get more tax
10 breaks in single-family, and if the communities that have larger single-family to multi-family, and since the
11 City of Waukesha is the largest City in Waukesha County, wouldn't the motivation be to push the ratio higher
12 in single-family than multi-family. Ald. Pieper said in the instances where the City receives greater return on
13 owner-occupied property from a tax standpoint is true in the cases the Committee examined. It is not fair to
14 say that in every single instance the City receives a higher return on taxes if something is owner-occupied
15 vs. something that is not owner-occupied or multi-family. It is a set of data they looked at. He wanted it to
16 be clear that it was in specific examples that they looked at. If there is multi-family development that stands
17 on its own and is a good development for a variety of different reasons, tax base, amenities, location, etc. it
18 is something that he thinks the Plan Commission should still certainly consider for the City.

19
20 Mayor Nelson said any given project, no matter what type of housing it is, the Plan Commission has strongly
21 evaluated the quality of the project. He believes that over the last three years the only project that falls into
22 the multi-family category was a project on the west side of town called The Lodge. The discussion was that
23 the quality of that project, the density, the amenities, the way that it was done, were things that the Plan
24 Commission looked at and caused the majority of the Commission to approve that project. Even though that
25 project might have gone slightly different from the guidelines, the quality of that project convinced the Plan
26 Commission that it was worthy of approval. It is important to understand that this report, if adopted tonight, is
27 something that the Plan Commission will use with each development or project.

28
29 Ald. Francoeur said one of the reasons it took the Committee nine months to come to this point was that
30 nothing was an "absolute." You could not make absolute statements. They started with principles that were
31 to have within the community a variety of options so that all community members can be served from those
32 who have the least resources to those who have the most, and to have the right balance and mix. That is
33 why they came up with the ratio that they did. Some of the other communities have targets and some do not
34 get to that target. Our City compared to the rest of the County, we have a strong leadership role in
35 affordable housing. We have a representation of all levels of housing and their price points, and we want to
36 maintain that and not radically change the profile of the community because it is one of our strengths. Our
37 diversity is our strength and the diversity of housing options, single-family, multi-family, rental, owner-
38 occupied, is part of the success of the community. The Committee did come out in favor of the ratio they are
39 proposing through this report and also encouraging ownership, because they are also trying to create a
40 vision and paint a picture for developers and other people who come to this community.

41
42 Ms. Jennifer Jendrzejczyk of 724 Hamilton Avenue said she likes the goal of 65/35 mix. The density of
43 development in the report caught her eye. With this proposal of 35% rental, is there a recommendation on
44 the density of the project? Is there a guideline in regard to more dense vs. less dense? If so, what would
45 that be? Ald. Francoeur said she did not know if they made a specific concrete statement about density. But
46 on the list of recommendations embodied in the report it is suggested and requested that the Planning
47 Department look at the existing code and is there a need or a desirability of having a Residential Multi-family
48 Zone with less density than is currently in the code. Although it is not required and maybe not desirable, she
49 feels that everybody brings in a proposal that takes it to the maximum of what is allowable. They do this to
50 leverage their investment. The Ad Hoc Committee is asking the Planning Department to look at it.

51

1 Ms. Bernie Juno of 1304 Blackhawk Trail, Apartment 8, said she has an observation or a concern. That is
2 the ratio or cultural make-up of homeownership in the City of Waukesha as compared to the rental
3 percentage of race or cultural considerations because home ownership in itself is limited to a certain
4 economic level in this community. Was that looked at? Ald. Pieper said it was not for a variety of reasons.
5 This report and this work was geared around housing types and not around who necessarily lives in those
6 housing types. It is very important for them to know and understand that discriminating against a specific
7 group of folks as far as where they are going to live is something that nobody wants to do and something
8 that cannot be done. It is something landlords cannot do and it is something that the City should certainly
9 not do. They wanted this report to be kept more on the grounds of looking at specific housing types rather
10 than going down to specific demographic and make-up of the residents who live within those types. Ms.
11 Juno said that raises the concern that inadvertently by raising the homeownership percentage and trying to
12 attain that, they could be inadvertently discriminating against either an economic or a cultural class. She is
13 not suggesting that is what it does; she is just suggesting that it should be looked at because it is a valid
14 concern.

15
16 Mr. McKay said they did look at households with a high cost burden within the City of Waukesha, within
17 Waukesha County, and within the region. They did quite a bit of work on comparing what is happening
18 within the City as opposed to what is happening within the County, every community within the County, and
19 also each County within the region. Generally, they determined that the situation in the City of Waukesha is
20 fairly on par to what is happening in the rest of the Counties in the region and is actually fairly similar to other
21 communities within Waukesha County that at least are incorporated.

22
23 Mayor Nelson said the charts in the report do show that in Waukesha County, without question the City of
24 Waukesha is the leader in affordable housing. He met with representatives last year from the Greater
25 Milwaukee Association of Realtors that cover all of Southeastern Wisconsin. One of their comments to him
26 was that in these difficult economic times, the fact that the City of Waukesha has housing that is available for
27 people of lower income, middle income, and higher income, the City of Waukesha is actually in better shape
28 than a lot of the neighboring communities because we offer options for people of all income levels. There
29 are other communities in the region that cannot say that. We have an Equal Opportunity Commission if
30 there ever was discrimination for race or background that a person can file a complaint and get a fair legal
31 hearing if there ever is any kind of discrimination. He served on that Board for six years when he was an
32 Alderman. In that time there was only one complaint that alleged some discrimination. It was unanimous
33 that the evidence did not bare that out.

34
35 Ms. DeMars said race was not looked at but they did look at housing type. She can say that they spent a
36 great amount of time looking at income to cost of housing. There are four charts that look at the issue of
37 high housing cost burden. That exemplifies how much time they spent. They are not talking about people
38 who can afford a house to purchase. The high housing cost burden looks at the cost of housing either to
39 own a home or to rent a property. They looked very carefully at the high cost of housing and what the
40 burden was. They paid a great deal of attention to not wanting to push people out of the community. It was
41 very important to them to have adequate housing to service those needs.

42
43 Ald. Vitale said he feels there are too many rental properties in this City. You cannot have a city with too
44 many rental properties because he believes a lot of the people are transients. They are there for a year or
45 two and then they are gone. In his humble opinion, the true heart of a community is people who have
46 developed roots by owning their own property. He understands that not everyone can or wants to own
47 property. When this Committee was first initiated he thought it would be appropriate to have a ratio of 70/30.
48 He also thinks it should go to the year 2020. He understands they are planning for the future. But you
49 cannot have a community of all rental properties. It would not be a viable community. He thinks the ratio
50 should be slightly increased for single-family because the ownership of single-family homes is the backbone
51 of a community; not that it is the only criteria. You have to have manufacturing and business, etc. that

1 makes for a proper mix of any community. Brookfield, for example, has a ratio of 80/20. They don't have a
2 lot of affordable homes. He goes back a long ways and he remembers when most of the homes built in this
3 City were about 1,000 sq. ft. Now they have been gravitating to 3,000 or 4,000 sq. ft. homes and those
4 homes are not affordable to the average person. He feels the City should have a mix of all kinds of homes –
5 those that are large and those that are small. What does this Committee feel constitutes as an affordable
6 home? Ald. Francoeur said the Committee believed that its focus was on building types and affordable,
7 irrespective of the ethnicity of the person who is renting or buying. The issue was whether or not they have
8 access to something that is affordable. The Committee was very conscious to offer options to everyone in
9 the community. She encouraged them to read the report where it explains how they reached affordability.

10
11 Mr. McKay said in general, a benchmark used for affordability would be what HUD defines as affordable for a
12 household, which would be spending 30% or less of one's gross income on housing costs. If you were a
13 homeowner that would include the mortgage, utilities, taxes. For a renter it would be utilities and rent. It
14 would specifically be figured out as taking 30% of Waukesha's median household income, or you could look
15 at different income ranges, such as low-income household, moderate-income household, and above
16 moderate-income household and determine what would be affordable for those different ranges.

17
18 Mr. Don Belman, a member of the Ad Hoc House Committee, said he wanted to furnish some numbers for
19 the Commission related to affordable housing in the City of Waukesha. During the Committee's studies they
20 found that if they compare the City of Waukesha to the entire County, the City of Waukesha has 35% of all
21 the multi units in Waukesha County. The City of Waukesha has approximately 13% of all single-family
22 houses in Waukesha County. That puts things in perspective. If they look at the MLS data for all of
23 Waukesha County in the year of 2008, they find that in the price range up to \$150,000, the City of Waukesha
24 has over 50% of all the houses sold in the County. We have 42% of all houses sold in the County last year
25 between \$150,000 and \$175,000. He thinks those are significant numbers. It tells him that the City is
26 carrying a fair share of what needs to be done. If they compare the City of Waukesha with other large
27 municipalities, Menomonee Falls, the City of Brookfield, the City of New Berlin, and the City of Muskego,
28 those four municipalities have a total of about 43,500 single-family homes in those municipalities. The City
29 of Waukesha has approximately 16,000 single-family residences. If they get into multi-family and two-family,
30 Menomonee Falls, Brookfield, New Berlin and Muskego have about 10,400 multi units. The City of
31 Waukesha has close to 13,000. What is the bottom line? The bottom line is that the City of Waukesha has
32 more multi units than the other four municipalities combined. The City of Waukesha compared to other
33 municipalities in this County is doing an admirable job.

34
35 Mr. George Forish of 1108 Fleetfoot Drive said he is a landlord and owns an eight-family. He lives next door
36 to it, which is an advantage. Prior to owning the building, he lived in the building as a tenant and a resident
37 manager. When he bought it, one of the things he decided to do was upgrade. He learned as a business
38 owner that investments return in direct proportion to what you put into it in effort and diligence and paying
39 attention. He asked if they can address ways to help encourage and promote landlords to be better
40 landlords. Ald. Francoeur said there is a recommendation in the report that encouraged the City to continue
41 its education of landlords. She received a note from the Housing Inspector that says he does participate in
42 those kinds of conversations that right now are sponsored by the Police Department that talks to new
43 landlords in particular and current landlords about things they can do to have a quality building and quality
44 tenants. What they would like to encourage is to look at code enforcement and quality of existing structures.
45 Yes, they looked at those things and the whole report is aimed at quality.

46
47 Mayor Nelson acknowledged the entire Ad Hoc Housing Mix Committee and thanked them for all their hard
48 work.

49
50 Mr. Otto made the motion to adopt the Ad Hoc Housing Mix Committee report and its
51 recommendations and Ms. Roeker offered the second.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

Ms. Roeker thought the presented report looks at a lot of the particular characteristics of a plan that they have already paid detailed attention to when a proposed plan comes before the Plan Commission. She enjoys having a specific document or reference that they can point to when looking at a proposed project and let an applicant know what they want to see and what their guidelines are. This document does exactly that. She appreciates all the detail that went into calculating this proposed ratio. There are no simple answers and there is a lot of analysis that needs to go into that ratio. One of the things she is very excited about is the focus on redevelopment in the City. They are running out of green land and there is tremendous opportunity in this community for redevelopment of existing properties and existing uses. She hopes all the developers will look at redevelopment of certain areas within the City so they can continue to improve the quality of their developments in the City.

Mayor Nelson said this report dovetails well with what has been the focus of this Plan Commission and the Planning Department. That is that any project that comes before this Commission, no matter what housing it is or what development it is, the City of Waukesha wants quality development and quality redevelopment.

The motion passed unanimously.

MONTHLY REVIEW – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – ST. MATTHIAS CHURCH – DROP-IN SHELTER –

A request from the Plan Commission for a monthly review of the conditional use permit allowing the Hebron House of Hospitality to operate a temporary drop-in shelter at St. Matthias church at 111 E. Main Street. *Previously discussed February 11, 2009*

Mr. Doug Koehler said he received a letter from Rick Fifric in support of this shelter. He also received a phone call from a neighbor in the area with a complaint. One of the residents was verbally harassing a student walking to school one morning. Mr. Koehler talked with Staff at the Hebron House and they had remedied that situation. New statistics were provided for the number of people they have been served at the shelter. They have added a number of how many people whose last address was in the City of Waukesha, and that number is 75%. All information remained basically the same. This item requires no action.

PRELIMINARY PLAT – ROLLING RIDGE SOUTH #9 – A request from Harmony Home, Jahnke & Jahnke and John Stigler to consider approving a preliminary plat containing three (3) single family lots on 0.93 acres of land. Located on the south side of Coldwater Creek Drive, and east of Meadowbrook Road (CTH "T"). *DAVE (3-F-4) [J4]*

Mr. David Kopp described the general area surrounding the land in question, which is just next to the Meadowbrook Shopping Center and Pebble Creek. He said this location is in the same general residential neighborhood of Rolling Ridge and as the new apartment complex under construction for The Lodge. Like just about everywhere else, this area has greatly slowed down in development due to the economy. This is Rs-3 zoning, with a single family residential (PUD). It is south of Coldwater Creek Trail. The original idea and intention for the long term land use for this site was that it would be built for a daycare center many years ago. The Meadowbrook Shopping Center lies right to the south. Recently they re-examined the area and have apparently to use it for residential growth instead, so they have brought in a proposal for a small three lot plat. The lots are labeled as 433, 432, and 431. There are quite a few planning constraints in effect here. Primary is that the plat's nearness to the ROW for the by-pass (Meadowbrook Road) which has a large setback requirement. There are also some other site infringements that serves to help restrict residential activity in this area. There is 12-foot wide utility easement that runs across the rear of all 3 lots. The plat shows an accommodation to the southeast for storm water that travels from the north toward the south. There are some different existing PUD layouts and agreements that also have an effect on this proposal.

1 Those PUD areas were pointed out. Staff also wanted the Commission to note that there are some
2 discrepancies between the various PUD boundary lines and those errors will have to be corrected. On the
3 south side there is very nice wooded area that must be preserved. This portion of the plat also has some
4 very steep slopes that will have to be taken into consideration, along with the very nice existing tree lines that
5 Staff has already noted must be preserved. In short, there are many challenges in this location. When this
6 plat was first proposed, they talked with Jahnke. Then they came up with some constructive criticism of the
7 plat and the site. What concerned them first was that the lots are relatively small and shallow. Once they
8 subtract the distances for the required setbacks, and look at the resulting building envelopes, it was Staff's
9 opinion that they are going to have a difficult a time to build on them. Once allowances are made for all of the
10 easements and setback, including for the Meadowbrook Road ROW, the lots suddenly seemed to become a
11 lot smaller to Staff. The other lots to the north that are under construction are shown to be 14,155 sq. ft.
12 while another one is depicted as being 12,963 sq. ft., and a third one was 14,998 sq. ft. The lots in question
13 are 50-60% smaller than these lots. Staff continues to have concerns over with the rear setback areas and
14 how three buildings would fit on these lots. Their decision was that this is not something that worked as well
15 as it should. So instead of three lots, Staff believes that this area could really only support two such lots. If
16 that is not acceptable to the developer, then Staff recommends that this plat should be denied.

17
18 Mr. Keller asked why the north property line does not match the road right-of-way like it does across the
19 street. Mr. Kopp said this entire layout or use was never anticipated as residential lots years ago; the road,
20 the storm water management approach, the retaining wall, and everything else that is in this location now
21 has taken precedence over the Coldwater Creek roadway. So what is left is this relatively small and isolated
22 parcel of land now being squeezed in between all the other activity. This is where Staff's concern comes
23 from. We believe that too much is being squeezed and retrofit into this one spot and there isn't enough room
24 to do it adequately. This residential area is an exceptionally quality development, so Staff feels that the
25 developers should not "cut corners" on some of these lots just because it is tight or difficult. The slopes and
26 the very nice tree line that was shown on the aerial photograph and the entire woodland needs to be
27 protected from encroachment or erosion, while the setbacks from Meadowbrook Rd. will still need to be
28 accommodated. There have been a lot of changes and retrofitting taking place here, and they are now at the
29 end of that process.

30
31 Mr. Tim Styza with Harmony Homes said the sidewalks are in right now in front of the three lots. Sewer
32 lateral is also into all three spots. The building envelopes do not encroach on any of the wooded areas at all.
33 The supposed retaining wall is actually the limestone underneath the ground along a driveway to the
34 apartment. The only lot that really has a slope consideration would be lot 433, and that is really only in the
35 southeast corner of the lot that wouldn't affect the building envelope. That lot would probably have a home
36 with an exposed basement, which is very popular. They still have the setback from Meadowbrook Road.
37 Although the lots are smaller compared to the lots across the street, overall, compared to the whole
38 subdivision, they are very much in line with the existing lots. They have other lots in the subdivision with the
39 same size or even smaller building pads and the homes fit with no problem. He would still like to see the
40 three lots go forward. He could provide spot elevations for the Commission and add more to the data they
41 have already provided on the existing slopes of the lots and show more details to the drawings.

42
43 Ald. Francoeur said she had driven this property today and was encouraged to see the quality of homes that
44 have been erected in the overall Rolling Ridge South development. In this case, she agrees with Staff's
45 observation. Lot #433 did not look desirable to her, and the lot looked as if it was being "forced" compared to
46 the amount of land that is there. The view from this parcel actually went directly into the new Lodge
47 Apartment complex, with its main access driveway from Coldwater Creek Drive, and from there on to the
48 entry to the rest of the Rolling Ridge subdivision. In her opinion, she felt Staff's recommendation is
49 appropriate and desirable.

50

1 Mr. Hoefft said that Mr. Styza had made the comment that “none of the building envelopes go into the tree
2 area.” He strongly disagreed with that, again pointing out the pronounced and extensive wooded area on the
3 aerial photograph. Much of the wooded tree line area shown in green is on the steeply hillside on the
4 southern end, and the Staff wants to make sure that they preserve the woodland areas from harm. Then,
5 the building envelope on the easterly lot actually goes down the slope and into the wooded area. Fully half
6 of the lot looks to be in those woods. Then there is the case where the lot on the west side of the proposed
7 plat is shown as merely 95 feet wide. The subdivision and platting code says that “lots bordering along
8 major thoroughfares should be bigger so that the houses can be further away.” Meadowbrook Rd. is a future
9 bypass; someday it will probably be rebuilt to function like the Les Paul Parkway; it already functions much
10 like one. Therefore, Staff would like to try and make that last lot bigger so people who someday build there
11 can keep the house further away from the future bypass. The one lot for the house across the street that
12 has already being built is shown to be only about 31 feet from the Meadowbrook Road right-of-way and that
13 lot is depicted as being 105 feet wide. That additional distance gives them that much more room to move a
14 structure away from the bypass. Combining Staff’s desire to make certain that a wider lot will be built on the
15 west side. That will help assure that we get the house out of the slope down to the apartments on the east
16 side, too. All of that is what has caused Staff to recommend in favor of denial.

17
18 Mr. Styza said the lot on the easterly side does not have very much woods around it. He would be happy to
19 stake out the building envelope on the lot and invite anyone to look at it and see where the corner of the
20 house would go. They also have architectural control in all their developments, so they would be able to
21 make sure that there would be no damage to any trees.

22
23 Mr. Hoefft clarified that the green area was overlaid directly onto the aerial photograph that was taken in
24 2007. Unless those trees have been illegally taken down, they all should still be there.

25
26 Ald. Francoeur said if this was denied, because it is being shown as three single-family lots, and they would
27 suggest that it be redrawn to become just two single-family lots; was that a possibility? Mr. Hoefft said this is
28 a subdivision plat that was submitted in conformance with the applicable state statutes. Therefore, City is
29 required to either approve the plat, or they must officially act to deny it. Staff’s recommendation is to deny it.

30
31 Mr. Styza said either approval or denial would have to be done within a certain time period. If it was held
32 over until the next meeting, the approval would still be well within the limitations found in the statutory
33 requirements of the State, but Plan Commission would still be acting in a timely manner. Mr. Hoefft said that
34 is why Staff is recommending denial of this plat.

35
36 **Ald. Francoeur made the motion to deny the preliminary plat application for the reasons expressed**
37 **by the staff and Mr. Keller offered the second. The motion to deny the preliminary plat passed**
38 **unanimously.**

39
40
41 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SONIC DRIVE-IN – E. MORELAND BOULEVARD – A**
42 **request from WCL Assoc. and Twilight Burgers LLC to consider approving final plans for a drive-in restaurant**
43 **building to be built in place of the bank at 2208 E. Moreland Boulevard. *Previously discussed February 25,***
44 ***2009***

45
46 Mr. Mike Hoefft said this was given preliminary approval at the last meeting, and they are now back with
47 revised plans, looking for final approval. He presented an aerial photograph showing the location of the
48 property. One of the issues discussed was with grading on the site along the eastern portion of the site.
49 They will need to build a retaining wall in order to get the site layout that they want. He presented a drawing
50 showing the proposed retaining wall. The northerly portion would be about four feet high and it tapers down
51 to zero at either end. It is not a long section of high retaining wall. Staff feels that should be doable. Staff

1 would like landscaping along it. The wall would be a versa lock system with a wrought iron railing on the top
2 where it is highest. There was comment that the slopes are about 10% on the southerly driveways; both
3 coming in off of Moreland and one that goes into Heritage Drive. They are relatively steep but 10% isn't a
4 terrible slope. They have a drive on the north end that is calculated at about 4%. The grading plan looks as
5 if it should work. They also discussed sidewalks. Originally staff thought they should run sidewalk along
6 Heritage Drive all the way down to Moreland Blvd. on the east side of their property. It turned out that after
7 discussion with the Engineering Department, a sidewalk going east along Moreland Blvd. would be difficult to
8 build. There is sidewalk on the north side of Heritage Drive, running east in front of Stein's Gardens. So
9 they probably wouldn't put one on the south side of Heritage. Having a sidewalk on the Sonic side of
10 Heritage would only serve Sonic. People coming from the residential area to the northwest could walk
11 around and get into the patio area. In looking at the site plan, Staff thought if that was the only reason for the
12 sidewalk, people would probably walk up the driveway. So it was asked that they put a sidewalk along the
13 driveway so people would have that option, instead of walking in the driveway itself. The proposed sidewalk
14 would now run all the way to the front, and people can cross the front to get to the patio, and it would go up
15 to Moreland. Hopefully the sidewalk will extend along Moreland to the west so that people can get from the
16 Westbrook Shopping Center to this site. They were asked to curve the northerly driveway slightly into
17 Heritage so it is more of a right angle for traffic visibility, which is a better way to design a driveway. The
18 existing driveway goes more at an angle, and so they have revised the driveway on the plan.

19
20 The neighbor's office building sits five feet off the lot line and has windows on three floors, looking out at this
21 site. The owner of that building asked that they have some landscaping put in. The earlier landscaping plan
22 showed some large pine trees, and the owner of the neighboring building did not want those windows
23 blocked. They now show a low level hedge. The labeling shows ground cover, but it might be mislabeled. It
24 would be nice to have a couple trees on the west side. Ornamental trees such as crab trees in that area
25 would be a nice idea. Landscaping is shown along the bottom of the retaining wall on the east side. There
26 is an area along the top of the retaining wall where the railing will be that doesn't have anything shown. It
27 would be nice to help define that area between the retaining wall and the pavement by having some low
28 shrubbery there. They could maybe move the retaining wall a little bit further east to get more room in order
29 to add shrubbery at the top of the retaining wall as well as at the bottom, so cars can see that is the edge.
30 Otherwise the landscaping is nice along the front and the rest of the site.

31
32 The architecture of the building hasn't changed from preliminary. Mr. Hoefft also presented plans for the
33 dumpster and architectural structure and the canopy. In one drawing it looked like the lighting on the under-
34 side of the canopy would be fluorescent tubes, and the owner next door had concern about those glaring into
35 the windows. But this is just a stock drawing, and they would not be using fluorescent tubes. Instead they
36 will be using a round fixture with the bulb shielded. There would be a full cut-off wall pack that will be on the
37 wall around the building at a number of locations. There are two different options of lights for the parking lot.
38 One has the lens curving down and a bulb below the casing and the other has the flat lens. Staff
39 recommends the flat lens. A lighting distribution plan shows that the foot candles at the property line would
40 meet the restrictions in the zoning ordinance. There are only two parking lot lights – one in front and one in
41 back. They are shown as metal halide. Sometimes underneath canopies they have allowed metal halide,
42 such as at gas stations, because it is outside sales. This is also an outside sales area so it might be that the
43 canopy lights could be metal halide. The building lights are to be high pressure sodium, although when
44 someone wants to accent the building, the Commission has allowed metal halide, but these fixtures appear
45 to be for site lighting rather than building accent lighting. The main goal is to have the parking lot lights be
46 high pressure sodium. He presented two lights that would be under the canopy to light the patio area.

47
48 Rooftop mechanicals would be fully screened by the parapets. They propose a sign at the street in the
49 corner of the site. The pylon sign is about eight feet high and shown as about 15 feet back from the lot line,
50 which conforms to the requirements of the sign ordinance, but it would need to be reviewed by the Sign
51 Review Board. There are about four smaller signs shown. The pylon sign has a base that matches the

1 material of the building. A wall sign will be on the side of the tower feature. They might want to have it on
2 the side that faces Heritage Drive as well.

3
4 Most comments from the preliminary review have been addressed, but Mr. Hoeft presented a new list. Plans
5 show that all paved areas will be fully curbed. The entry drives need to be designed with drive approaches
6 rather than curb returns. They still need variances from the Board of Zoning Appeals for the canopy and the
7 dumpster enclosure. (They are too close to the Heritage Drive right-of-way). Staff suggests the pole lights
8 be high pressure sodium, but the others could be metal halide if they are for building accent lighting. Light
9 poles are to be no higher than 20 feet. They also should use the flat lens lighting on the parking lot lights.
10 Shrubs should be added to the top of the retaining wall, add ornamental trees along the neighboring building,
11 and also there are some ground-mounted utility boxes that should be screened. They will need to present
12 their signs to the Sign Review Board for approval, and there are other department comments, which are
13 minimal, that must be addressed. ***(Please see Department Comments at the end of the minutes.)*** With
14 these comments, Staff recommends final approval.

15
16 Mr. Otto asked about the photograph that shows the drive between the two buildings. Where is the property
17 line? Mr. Hoeft said the property line is roughly at the edge of the pavement. He pointed out where the new
18 canopy would be located. They will be cutting it down about four feet, so the parking area would be down, a
19 little bit lower than the existing pavement.

20
21 **Mr. Keller made the motion for approval of the final plans subject to Staff's comments and Ms.**
22 **DeMars offered the second.**

23
24 Ald. Francoeur said she had driven to the property and is aware of the public comments and the media about
25 the Plan Commission's activity with regard to Sonic. Her concern was the traffic patterns on Heritage,
26 especially as it approached Springdale. She is pleased that the adjustment to the driveway has been made.
27 It cannot be a perfect situation but it is zoned appropriately and the developer has chosen this site. They
28 have done everything they can to make it safe and accessible. There are three different entry and exit
29 points. In regard to the signage, she is pleased to see that the materials on the base of the sign reflect the
30 building and the building reflects an upgraded quality in terms of the materials and design. The signage
31 alerts people that there is a Sonic there. It has its national logo and colors, but it is not so distracting to the
32 traffic on the road and it does not have so many elements to it that it becomes cluttered in terms of the visual
33 impact of driving down that area and trying to access that business.

34
35 **The motion passed unanimously.**

36
37
38 **REZONING – LA CASA DE ESPERANZA** – A request from La Casa de Esperanza and Uihlein Wilson to
39 consider rezoning 931 Caroline Street. The parcel concerned contains 0.21 acres of land. Its location is on
40 the east side of Caroline Street, south of Concordia Avenue. If the request is approved, the existing zoning
41 would move from Rm-3 Multi-Family Residential zoning to I-1 Institutional zoning.

42
43 Mr. David Kopp said La Casa is a major cultural institution in Waukesha. They are somewhat landlocked,
44 with their site hemmed in by the residential character of the neighborhood surrounding and the other
45 industrial areas nearby them. They don't have a lot of room to expand and they are usually looking for to
46 pick up more land and some other places to use for some expansion. In the past not very long ago they had
47 acquired the 3 (three) other lots next to this one as future room for expansion. They now would like to add
48 another parcel this to their holdings. This parcel at 931 Caroline St. was offered to them and they have
49 purchased it. The main La Casa site is adjacent to this land is already zoned as I-1 Institutional. Arcadian
50 Avenue is to the south. Caroline Street is to the north, and Concordia runs east and west away from it. He
51 pointed out the area they are purchasing. Since, they already own the parcels below it, now they want to

1 add this land to them. This area will likely be used for parking. Mr. Kopp pointed out the existing small
2 parking lot just to the north that has been added, with the sidewalk and curb as well as landscaping. They
3 will need to blend this all together into the neighborhood and provide additional screening. Because they are
4 I-1 zoning, they now have to rezone from Rm-3. Once they are granted the rezoning, they will have to bring
5 a plan back to this Commission with a plan showing how the parking lot will look and be screened. Staff
6 finished by stating that they are in favor of the rezoning.

7
8 Mr. Mark Paschke with Uihlein Wilson Architects in Milwaukee was present on behalf of La Casa De
9 Esperanza to answers any question the Commission might have, but there were none.

10
11 **Ald. Francoeur made the motion to approve the rezoning of 931 Caroline Street and Mr. Otto offered**
12 **the second. The motion passed unanimously.**

13
14
15 **REZONING – BRYCE COMMERCE CENTER** – A request from Fleetfoot Development, Inc. and Main Street
16 Holdings LLC. to consider rezoning 1.92 acres of land on the east side of Fleetfoot Drive south of Racine
17 Avenue from T-1 Temporary zoning to Rm-2 Multi-Family Residential zoning, and 0.16 acres of land on the
18 west side of Fleetfoot Drive from T -1 Temporary zoning to B-5 Community Business zoning.

19
20 Mr. Mike Hoefft said the property is south of Racine Avenue, east of Les Paul Parkway, with the Fleetfoot
21 Drive extension going through it. Waukesha State Bank proposal and Kwik Trip are in the same area. There
22 are still two areas that are undeveloped that are zoned for business. The Commission recently
23 recommended against a proposal for two apartment buildings on this property by Ken Miller. It was
24 proposed to be an Rm-2 Planned Unit Development, but those plans were denied. The owner of this land
25 decided that she wants to request a plain Rm-2 zoning for the land without any PUD, which means that no
26 plans are required and it would simply be zoned Rm-2, multi-family. The area to the east is land that is in the
27 Town of Waukesha, so it does not have any City zoning. To the south of that is single-family zoning. The
28 area to the south and southwest are Rm-2 PUD. There is a lot of Rm-2 PUD zoning in the area. To the west
29 is more PUD type zoning. It is typical that when someone asks for multi-family zoning to have a PUD
30 overlay. He did not recall too many cases where they have approved zoning for new areas that did not have
31 the PUD overlay.

32
33 One of the problems with this is that Staff has no idea what might be built there. When the zoning code was
34 redone in 2001, some protections were put in so that the City could possibly allow the straight Rm-2 zoning
35 without the PUD. The Rm-2 zoning would allow single-family dwellings, two-family dwellings, or multi-family
36 dwellings. In other words, any type of residential could be built to the Rm-2 zoning. The City has nothing to
37 say about the single-family or two-family homes that might be built in the Rm-2. A developer would have to
38 sub-divide the land into lots, but then they could build whatever they want as far as single-family homes or
39 two-family homes. Anything more than a two-family home, plans would have to be submitted for the Plan
40 Commission to review, but they wouldn't go to the Common Council. In the Rm-2 zoning, a single-family
41 dwelling has to have an 8,000 sq. ft. lot. A two-family dwelling has to have basically a 9,000 sq. ft. lot, 4,500
42 sq. ft. per unit. If it is an apartment building, they would have to have 2,500 sq. ft. of lot area per unit for an
43 efficiency, 3,000 sq. ft. for a one bedroom, 3,500 sq. ft. for a two bedroom, or 4,000 sq. ft. for a three
44 bedroom. No lot can be narrower than 70 feet. If you take that criteria and apply it to the property in
45 question, the property in question is 83,621 sq. ft., which is 1.92 acres. It has a street frontage of 446.13
46 feet. If it were to be divided into six lots, with a minimum of being 70 feet, dividing it evenly they could get six
47 lots at 74.3 feet wide. They could be six one-family lots or six two-family lots. So if it were to be zoned Rm-
48 2, the lot could be divided into six two-family lots with no Plan Commission review other than approval of the
49 plat. It could also be divided into six four-family lots; again each lot being 74.3 feet wide. In this case, plans
50 would need to be submitted to the Plan Commission for review, but would not go on to Common Council.
51 The same would apply with one 27-unit building which had all one-bedroom units. If it were two-bedroom

1 units, then they could get a maximum of 23 units in the one single building on that parcel. Plan Commission
2 would have to review that. The point is that they do not know what will be built there, and that is why they
3 require the PUD. He presented a slide that shows what it might look like if it were divided into six lots. There
4 are five single-family lots on Guthrie Road that back up to this area that would have six lots, if it were divided
5 into lots on this property in question. The uncertainty of the whole situation, not knowing what is likely to go
6 in there, single-family homes border it on the east and the south, and those people would like indication of
7 what might go there before they would want to sign off on it. Mr. Hoefft said he did not recall ever approving
8 a multi-family zoning of this size that wasn't a PUD. Therefore, Staff is recommending denial of the Rm-2
9 zoning.

10
11 Ms. DeMars said that most of the discussion Mr. Hoefft has given them has to do with Rm -2 zoning. She was
12 concerned in questioning the business part of this request. Mr. Hoefft said he would briefly discuss that
13 because it is really a non issue. On the drawing, when the original proposal for this development came in, it
14 had a cul de sac. The area to the east was set aside for multi-family and the rest was zoned for business.
15 When they put the street through, it had a slightly different alignment than the cil-de-sac and it left a little
16 sliver of area that was not zoned for business on the west side of the street. When the development plan
17 was brought in, the Ken Miller proposal, at the Council level, although they voted against the apartment
18 rezoning, they split the zoning into two votes and they approved the sliver of B-5 zoning on the west side of
19 the street. Apparently the owner has forgotten that the land is already zoned B-5. It is a non issue at this
20 point.

21
22 Mr. Rich Liskowitz of 1016 Guthrie Road said he is 72 years old. He has been in Waukesha for his entire life
23 with the exception of the years he served as a Marine in the Marine Corps. His father started four
24 businesses in the City of Waukesha and he was elected two terms as Sheriff of Waukesha County. He
25 thinks he can say that he is a pretty good figure of somebody who has real roots in Waukesha. He owns
26 property immediately south of this property in discussion. He spoke before the Commission before. The
27 only thing he wants to say now is that he is very impressed with this meeting tonight and the findings of the
28 Ad Hoc Commission. He has heard more from the City than he has ever heard and he is impressed. The
29 City of Waukesha is a good place to live. He is glad to be here this evening. Being a property owner
30 adjacent to this, he can speak for the rest of the single-family property owners around this property and as
31 he heard tonight in review of the Commission that the main point was quality. They talked about quality
32 development. They are also talking about quality of life in the single-family homes around this area. The last
33 time a plan for this location came before this Commission it was for large apartment buildings and it was
34 voted down. He is glad the Commission recognized the desire for quality for the adjoining properties. The
35 other thing is density. That is something the City is becoming very aware of and they are very concerned
36 with it as are the single-family property owners around this site. He appreciates the hard work that the City
37 does and he hopes they will keep him, his wife, and the rest of the neighbors in mind when they make any
38 decisions on the development of this piece of property. He has no problem whatsoever with Judy Fuller
39 developing this property. She has all the rights in the world and he is not and does not want to stand in the
40 way. However, they are talking about quality and density in this area.

41
42 Mr. George Forish of 1108 Fleetfoot Drive said whatever gets put into that property should be vetted in the
43 normal manner by the Plan Commission and the Council. He has faith that Judy Fuller will put something
44 that will meet with everyone's approval. She should be encouraged do so. He hopes for denial and
45 encourages her to come back with a proposal that will be vetted by this group and the Council.

46
47 Ms. Barb Liskowitz of 1016 Guthrie Road said when TIF money was given, the paperwork said it would be a
48 Kwik Trip, a new bank, two additional commercial office facilities, and five residential duplexes. It was stated
49 many times and they were promised five units or single-family homes. With this still coming into the south
50 portion of the property, it still backs right up to her lot line. The slope is not correct. They have trees that
51 they bought, planted, and nurtured to a point that they are huge and beautiful. Anything butting back up into

1 this is going to infringe upon her quality of life because they have a 75-foot wide piece of land in the back
2 and it runs 200 feet. It is a long, narrow lot. The bulk of whatever is put in here is still in her backyard. She
3 thought it was nice the way the Council challenged Ms. Fuller and that they knew she would be able to come
4 up with a plan that would be attractive to the neighbors and still fulfill the developer's needs. She has to
5 develop and she has to zone the land in order to sell it. But density is still the issue. As mentioned tonight,
6 developers come in with a huge humongous plan and they want large buildings. They know Council will
7 knock them down a little bit to smaller units and it would be nice to see someone come in with the way it
8 really is supposed to be – not as dense and give some greenspace and duplexes with enough land that the
9 people can enjoy and it would be off her lot line. Personally she feels five duplexes rather than six would be
10 better, and just make the lots a little bit bigger.

11
12 Dick Patarius of 1825 E. Racine, Unit 6, said as he looks at this layout, he wanted to make some comments.
13 First of all the retention pond is not shown on any of the prints, and he wonders why that is. Is there a
14 possibility that the retention pond will be eliminated and put in storm sewer to make the property bigger? As
15 far as Council and Plan Commission is concerned, given the possibility of an okay for that property to be
16 zoned for multi family, he thinks it would be good for the developer not to hide anything. He would like to see
17 plans and ideas.

18
19 Mr. Hoeft said regarding the retention pond, they are only talking about rezoning tonight and not a
20 development. When a plan comes in for this site, they would have to address retention. But he thought the
21 retention is handled by a pond on the western portion.

22
23 Ms. Judy Fuller of 640 Lawndale Avenue said the retention pond that serves this entire development is going
24 to be sold with the business zoning on the west side, simply because she has made one property
25 responsible for the maintenance of that vs. trying to get money out of five, six, seven, eight properties. It is
26 being sold with that and is on a separate lot. They are not dealing with that part tonight, but she wanted
27 them to know what is going on. It handles not only her water for the subdivision, but it handles the Town's
28 water and the water along Racine Avenue. Therefore, it cannot be eliminated. It is also under DNR control.
29 She said that she had previously brought in plans with an Rm -2 PUD zoning. The reason she brought the
30 plans in, which were Ken Miller's plans, were simply to get rezoned to Rm-2. Whether it is Ken Miller
31 building or someone else, the submittal process to get the zoning, Rm -2 PUD, was submitting plans. It
32 doesn't say the plans need to be approved, just submitted, which was done but never came to fruition.
33 When she originally came in for the B-5 with some Rm-3 zoning, this Commission suggested she go to the
34 Rm-2 zoning, which she is doing. She has no buyer in mind because she has listed those in the MLS as
35 duplex lots. It has been four or five months and she has received one call. She has listed all six of them.
36 That tells you how strong the duplex market is in Waukesha.

37
38 Ms. Fuller said that she is almost 52 and the fifth generation in this neighborhood alone. She owns two of
39 the properties and is working on the third property of the single families that are adjacent to this. She, too,
40 like Mr. Liskowitz, has an extreme vested interest. Her grandmother's house is still there next to the
41 Liskowitz's property. This Commission requested Rm -2 when she first brought it in. She has no plan for the
42 land yet, but she needs to get it zoned so she can sell it. Rm -2 PUD gets shot down. Everyone is hesitant
43 to approve anything other than duplexes, but there is no market for them. It is not ideal for condominium like
44 the one she did to the south because it doesn't have the similar depth. It ends up being an odd-shaped
45 piece of property. T-1 zoning is temporary zoning, and within a year it is supposed to be rezoned. This has
46 been 25 or 30 years now and it is still T-1 zoning. She respectfully requests that they at least give her the
47 Rm-2 so she can market this and people have an idea of the base zoning on this. If it is duplexes, she
48 doesn't have to bring them in. Anything more than that, they will see anyhow.

49
50 Ms. Roeker made the motion to deny the proposed rezoning in accordance with Staff's
51 recommendation and Ms. DeMars offered the second.

1
2 Mr. Keller asked if staff had asked Ms. Fuller to go with duplexes. Mr. Hoefft said no. She mentioned that
3 they asked her to go to Rm-2, which isn't exactly correct. It goes back to the Ad Hoc Committee report
4 where they want to have zoning districts that had lower densities. That is what the Rm-2 is. The Rm-3
5 densities are what had been in the zoning code previously and had higher densities. When the zoning code
6 was rewritten, the Rm-2 district was added. It was put in there as a district that had lower densities to be
7 used in the newer areas of the City. When the Ken Miller plan was brought in they had initially requested the
8 Rm-3 PUD overlay and it was suggested that they go to the Rm-2 PUD overlay, because the densities were
9 in keeping with what staff felt new areas should be and that is what all the area around it is zoned. Mr. Keller
10 asked if he could explain the difference in limitations on development between RM-3 and RM-2 as it relates
11 to a development. Mr. Hoefft said for example efficiency apartments need 2,000 sq. ft. of lot area per unit in
12 the Rm-2, but only needs 1,500 sq. ft. in the Rm-3. Two bedrooms require 3,000 sq. ft. in the Rm-3 and
13 3,500 sq. ft. in the Rm-2. You have to have more land area per unit in the Rm-2 than in the Rm-3. The
14 PUD overlay requires plans to be approved by Common Council. If it does not have the PUD overlay, any
15 plans over one or two family have to be approved by only the Plan Commission. One or two family does not
16 get approved by anybody. If it is a PUD, the two-family development would still be reviewed by the Plan
17 Commission and the Common Council. Addressing the comment about the fact that it is T-1 and the
18 Commission needs to recommend a zoning, historically they have seen plans for say a multi-family
19 development before rezoning. If they were forced to give a zoning, it would be a base zoning. Everything
20 around it is Rs-3 so the City could just zone it Rs-3. Then if there is a plan for a multi family with a PUD, they
21 could rezone it to something else. That wouldn't accomplish anything, forcing a zoning on land the owner
22 doesn't really want, but they could do it.

23
24 Ms. Fuller said she did not mean when Ken Miller came in, which is when she asked for the Rm-2 PUD. She
25 meant originally when she brought the whole plot and she went for the B-5, she also asked for the Rm-3.
26 That is when this Commission suggested she go for an Rm-2 zoning. That was about two years ago, when
27 she brought in the CSM.

28
29 Ald. Francoeur said she tries to support Staff whenever possible or whenever there is no overpowering
30 reason not to. In the time she has served on the Commission she has finally come to the conclusion that
31 preliminary approval was one of the most critical steps in the process that they participate in. Because of
32 some recent things she has had an occasion to seek advice of the City Attorney's office. In that
33 conversation she said that when she wants to articulate a position and wants to be clear and wants to have
34 that position be understood by the applicant in terms of what it is that she is comfortable with and not, the
35 first thing she was told was that the most critical thing you do is approve zoning. Once zoning is approved,
36 then the zoning code comes into play. What that says is now that property has been rezoned, all of the
37 permitted uses and probably a lot of the conditional uses are now in affect the right of the applicant unless
38 there is some overriding reason to not approve. The zoning has now become even more critical than
39 preliminary approval. Not knowing what is going to be put on this property adds a layer of difficulty for her.
40 In addition to which what is happening is because they have dealt with this property so often and so many
41 different configurations and proposals, and now they are becoming very cautious about what is it that the
42 property is going to be used for. In addition to which, she thought she heard Ms. Fuller say she brought in a
43 PUD with a particular developer, but that doesn't necessarily mean she was going to do that. That is another
44 layer of caution. They are talking about having less and less land that is developable and they have a
45 concern about how it is going to be used. Ms. Fuller has a long history and the Commission has a long
46 history of talking and talking about what is the best use of this whole property. The City participated with
47 money and she feels they have an even stronger responsibility to understand what is going there. She
48 would support a motion to deny the rezoning.

49
50 Ms. DeMars stated that she also feels a strong reluctance to rezone prior to knowing how the property would
51 be used. In addition to that, she has concerns because it is almost the opposite of what they dealt with at

1 the last meeting. Mr. Keller had said that any time residential touches commercial they have these ideas. At
2 this point they have commercial that has already been approved and they are pretty optimistic it is going to
3 touch residential. It is also new residential that is touching older residential that is established. Because of
4 the issues Ald. Francoeur brought up as well as others, she feels that for her to be comfortable in making a
5 zoning decision, she needs to know how that property is going to be used and she needs to know what the
6 neighbor's feel about that proposed use. She would also support the denial.

7
8 **The motion passed unanimously.**

9
10
11 **REZONING – 1130 E. MAIN STREET –** A request from Site Work Inc. to consider rezoning 0.29 acres of
12 land on the northwest corner of the intersection of E. Main Street and Perkins Avenue from M-1 Light
13 Manufacturing zoning to Rm -1 Multi-Family Residential zoning.

14
15 Mr. Mike Hoefl said that he had just talked about how staff normally doesn't recommend multi-family zoning
16 without the PUD overlay, but in this case they are going to recommend the multi-family zoning. He will try to
17 explain the difference. This is a property that exists on the corner of Main Street and either Perkins. The
18 photograph shows a parking lot that was originally built for International Harvester, which is now called
19 International Truck and Engine. This whole block was zoned as manufacturing at one point, because the
20 idea was that the area would eventually expand and there are some older houses that could be bought up
21 for industrial expansion. That hasn't happened. In fact, the opposite has happened – people have come in
22 and asked that some of those lots be rezoned to residential. That has been going on over the past few
23 years. The particular lot on the corner hasn't developed. The block in question is almost entirely residential.
24 There is still a little industrial building that hasn't been rezoned to residential along with another one across
25 from that. Otherwise the whole neighborhood has been rezoning to residential. This one did not get
26 rezoned the last time because it was still being used as a parking lot. Judy Fuller has bought it and wants to
27 rezone it for residential. The zoning in the neighborhood is already Rm-1. Rm-1 is technically a multi-family
28 zoning, but it has a maximum of a four-family building. In the old zoning code they called it 1-4 family zoning
29 district. It doesn't allow larger apartment buildings but a maximum of a four-family building. There is also
30 some unique situations about this property as compared to the previous one because this is in an older part
31 of town, it is on a block that is already all Rm-1, there is no Rm-1 PUD in that area. It is a single lot. It is
32 about 13,600 sq. ft., and a single-family lot or duplex lot needs to be 8,000 sq. ft. It cannot be divided into
33 two lots. It could accommodate a maximum of a four-family building, which would have three two-bedroom
34 units and one one-bedroom unit, based on those unit breakdowns that the Commission has seen before. If it
35 were a four-family building the plans would have to be reviewed by the Plan Commission. It could also be
36 used for one single-family home or one duplex. In looking at this proposal, staff looked at some of the mixed
37 uses in the neighborhood. There is manufacturing to the north and immediately to the north across the alley
38 is actually a new single-family home that has been built by Habitat for Humanity. Another single-family home
39 is next to that. On Main Street there is a mixture of uses – three family, two family, and a single-family
40 home, then a vacant lot. Across the street are three single-family homes and a duplex. Immediately across
41 the street is the old Schoenewalter plumbing building. Kitty-corner from there is another industrial building.
42 To the east it is zoned M-1 but it is a vacant piece of land owned by the City. Mr. Hoefl received a call from
43 a Plan Commissioner who said there is a sign going up for some condominiums to the east. He presented
44 the plan that was approved a few years back for those condominiums. There are eight four-unit
45 condominium buildings. There are office buildings proposed on Main Street. So there are four-family
46 buildings not very far away. They happen to be PUD zoning because of the clustering of the buildings on a
47 single parcel of land. There is quite a mix of uses in the neighborhood. Because they know pretty much
48 what can be built on the lots, it is pretty restricted to either a single-family, two-family, three-family, or four-
49 family. If it is a three or four family, the plans need to come to the Plan Commission. So there is minimal
50 risk. If it is a two-family, it is only one two-family. It is a minimal risk as far as what might happen there

1 without Plan Commission intervention. Staff feels comfortable in recommending approval of the Rm-1
2 zoning for this parcel.

3
4 Ald. Francoeur said she drove through the area. She drove in on Perkins. It is kind of a mix, when you go
5 west on Main Street, and you are kind of entering a more mature, single-family and three-family area. When
6 you look around the property itself, there are businesses, then a vacant lot, then a PUD with an existing
7 building there. If this gets rezoned, what is the priority in terms of what Ms. Fuller might try to develop there?
8

9 Ms. Judy Fuller said the parking lot was designed for Alloy Products, which is the business on Perkins. It
10 was not a parking lot for Navistar. Schoenewalter's owned it for a long time. She bought it several years
11 ago and has been sitting on it. It is also in a City redevelopment district (the last lot). All of Main Street is
12 supposed to get redeveloped and get a new "face" for our entrance into Waukesha at some future date.
13 Talking with the Planning Department and trying to get what their vision of Main Street is, nobody has a clear
14 vision. She is selling the lot and she does not know what the buyer's intent is. She assumes that they are
15 thinking of trying to cut it into two single families or do a PUD or something. First when the particular agency
16 was talking to her, they were looking at it for a four-unit building. It is the City Housing Authority, and they
17 work with WCTC's Training Program, and they are looking at it for two single-families. A condition is that she
18 gets the approved zoning of Rm-1 vs. M-1. She has a handshake deal with the neighbors, the two-toned
19 brown house with a handicap ramp and the vacant lot. She has always planned on keeping that existing
20 house and building three single-family homes. She has an agreement that she will eventually acquire that
21 house. She is not willing to invest on Main Street with no clear vision from the Planning Staff of what they
22 want Main Street to look like. So she has decided to sell the lot. She wants to have this rezoned so it can
23 be sold.
24

25 Ald. Francoeur said her view of this is that it would be wonderful to continue the single-family identity on
26 Main Street, and now going around Perkins is a new home. She did not know that it was Habitat for
27 Humanity. But it is looking right into a fence and into a manufacturing site. She did not think it has an
28 appeal to everybody in the real estate market, but it is a very nice home. Across the way, the PUD multi-
29 family that Mr. Hoef pointed out has one building there that, although it is a four family, it is very interesting
30 architecture. It adds to the neighborhood. That is her major focus, since this is a corner lot, and when you
31 come in on Main Street, that is what is seen. It looks like the neighborhood is revitalizing across the street.
32 The business has a For Sale sign. She felt a little torn here. She wants to support the request for rezoning
33 so it can be developed and it appears that, depending upon your point of view, the best case scenario is that
34 two single-family homes would be built and a third party would build them.
35

36 Ms. Fuller said it is actually a lot of record on the exhibit and another parcel. It cannot be split, but that is a
37 technicality that hasn't yet arose. She will request two separate tax keys, which will need to be approved.
38 That isn't up to her, and that is for a later comment. She had already designed two houses for her parking
39 lot, but she does not want to do them and is selling the parcel. If it would be two single families, it would
40 need to be approved by this Commission because it would probably come in as a PUD to be able to do it. If
41 it is a four family, it has to come in because anything over a two family has to come to Plan Commission.
42 The zoning is kind of immaterial right now, other than she has to get it zoned something from M-1 to an Rm-
43 1 in order for it to be sold and developed on Main Street. It is going to take a lot of work to get Main Street
44 redeveloped with all the rooming houses and the two and three-family houses. She commends them for
45 even thinking about putting single-family homes on that corner in that area.
46

47 Ald. Francoeur said she is concerned about the residential profile of the current neighborhood and the fact
48 that if someone came in, because Ms. Fuller will no longer be involved, and said now that they own the
49 property, they are going to put in a four family or a two or three-story building, and it would not fit in with the
50 neighborhood. What she is asking for is for them to rezone this so Ms. Fuller can dispose of it and trust that
51 it will be developed in a way that the Commission might have some say so in, or that would be something

1 that doesn't come before the Commission but would be acceptable. Ms. Fuller said if she were to keep it,
2 she would keep the M-1 zoning and move her construction company here, because she is downsizing and
3 doesn't need all the big construction equipment anymore. This is where she was going to build a very funky
4 building with a shop on the first floor and maybe housing upstairs, but she cannot do that because her father
5 is going to retire.

6
7 Mr. Steve Crandell pointed out that this is in a redevelopment district but every development plan brought
8 forward will need to be approved by the Redevelopment Authority, whether or not it comes to this
9 Commission. Ald. Francoeur said what that means is that if this Commission rezones this, there will still be
10 other approval processes that will probably not support something that is terribly out of character with the
11 established neighborhood. Mr. Crandell said that is correct.

12
13 **Ms. Roeker made the motion to approve the rezoning, subject to Staff's comments, and Ald.**
14 **Francoeur offered the second. The motion passed unanimously.**

15
16
17 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – INTERNATIONAL MASERATI** – A request from Erik
18 Madisen and International Autos of Milwaukee to consider approving final plans for architectural changes to
19 the existing multiple auto dealerships at 2230 E. Moreland Blvd.

20
21 Mr. David Kopp said the site's location is north of E. Moreland Blvd. (U.S.H. "18" and W. of Parklawn Dr.
22 They have seen this building a number of times in the last few years. Hwy. 18 lies to the south and Parklawn
23 runs N/S along this area to the east. It is zoned B-5, Highway Business, and the owner of the site has
24 brought in a plan for what essentially is now a multi-tenant car dealership building. It is nice to see this
25 taking place. This building was primarily a combined Mercedes-Benz and Infiniti dealership. One other
26 dealership is also represented on the site: Porsches. Now they have asked to be allowed to bring in another
27 "upper end" car dealership to joins those exclusive autos on the same site. The proposal is to continue
28 adding to the car dealers that are currently there. These smaller dealerships are not intended to become
29 large-scale activities there, though if that would happen, we doubt they would object. Obviously a Maserati
30 is a very expensive and exotic car. The dealers don't require a lot of space for parts and maintenance, and
31 even they probably won't sell a lot at any one time, this will give that brand a new home. They will provide
32 for on-site service, so there will be 5 or 6 bays on the site to for maintenance of the cars. It sounds that this
33 will be a good idea. The number of physical changes that will have to be made to the existing building in
34 order to accommodate this proposal will be minute. Architecturally, the building is already very interesting,
35 with concrete masonry columns; and in between of those columns are large size panes of glass, but these
36 are not windows. Configurations of those glass panels on this site are mostly found in 3 X 5 "squares". For
37 the Maserati portion they are planning on doing a pattern of glass panels that are more along the nature of a
38 square with a proportion of 3 X 4 on one end, and then they want to convert one of the other glass openings
39 to a doorway so that customers and people have access. The pattern is consistent across the rest of the
40 building. The Maserati dealership will be just to the right of the major entrance to the other dealerships. No
41 changes are being proposed on the rest of the building. Then there are other glass panels that will help to
42 define their intended area for maintenance. There are really no other changes, other than the addition of a
43 dealership sign. The modern metallic panels that decorate and complete the upper portion of the building
44 will remain as it presently exists. Essentially the exterior stays the same but will have modifications for
45 customers and the entrances. Mr. Kopp presented the overall site plan, with parking around the site. A
46 small area will be designated for customer parking nearby the new Maserati entrance. All proposed signage
47 will need to go before the Sign Review Board for approval. The Plan Commission's Staff had no other
48 comments on this proposal, and recommends in favor of the proposal.

49
50 **Ald. Francoeur made the motion to approve final plans for the architectural changes and Mr. Otto**
51 **offered the second. The motion passed unanimously.**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – WILDE CHRYSLER/SUBARU – 1710 HWY 164 – A
request from Architects/Planners and Wilde Automotive to consider approving preliminary plans for a 5,161
sq. ft. addition to the auto dealership at 1710 Hwy 164. *Previously discussed November 12, 2008*

Mr. Doug Koehler presented an exhibit with the parcel in question, located south of Moreland Blvd. Les Paul
Parkway was beside it. This was discussed in November as solely a Chrysler dealership, and they were
going to be doing a small addition off to the north side of the building. They now have a new proposal,
adding Subaru to the site. Subaru would like a larger addition. It would be an additional 5,100+ sq. ft. A
small area was approved for Chrysler, and there is a larger area behind that to be the Subaru proposal.
There will also be a 630 width addition just south of the proposed Subaru addition, for access and storage for
the Chrysler dealership. The Subaru dealership will be a separate building from the Chrysler dealership,
which is offset from the Chrysler building by one foot. The State building code does allow it to be done this
way. There are a few details with the Fire Department that can be worked out. The floor plan shows room
for a showroom along with an area to bring in service vehicles on the far north end, and then some office
space as well. There are windows off the Chrysler addition and then there are windows on the Subaru
addition looking into the two different showrooms.

The Subaru building will use the same base block that is around the exterior of the Chrysler building. There
is banding running along the entire bottom of that building. That same block will be at the bottom of the
Subaru building as well. The upper part of the Chrysler building is done with EIFS panels, gray in color. The
Subaru building is going to be done with aluminum composite panel, but will be a different gray in color with
maybe a little more sheen to it than the EIFS will have. It will be done in a similar style. There will be vertical
accents on the windows, and there is a large column piece done in a darker aluminum panel, which is a
signature piece for Subaru. At the rear of the building, the Subaru building will be done with a striated block
and that matches the existing block that is on the backside of the Chrysler dealership. Mr. Koehler
presented pictures to the Commission. The elevations did not show any rooftop mechanicals. For final
approval, those need to be shown and they also need to be properly screened. The work proposed is on the
north side between the existing Chrysler building and the Honda building. There will need to be some
regarding done in this area. They are proposing six parking spaces and then there will be a curb cut to allow
for traffic to flow behind the two buildings and still have access around all sides of the site. The grading plan
also shows details of the new dumpster enclosure. It will be a shared enclosure between the two buildings.
It will be a block building with wooden gates. The height needs to be seven feet tall. The landscape plan
shows shrubs on a curbed island. The peninsula near the new addition will be landscaped with an
ornamental crab tree and foundation plantings. The entire site of the Chrysler dealership around the
perimeters has all been re-landscaped and it will all tie in nicely together. With this plan, they will need a
new CSM. Currently the property line goes straight through. They are putting a jog in it so they can meet all
the setbacks for this addition. *(Please see Department Comments at the end of the minutes.)* With
these comments, Staff is in favor of the addition.

**Ms. DeMars made the motion for preliminary approval subject to Staff's comments and Mr. Otto
offered the second. The motion passed unanimously.**

**SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – GOODWILL STORE AND DONATION CENTER –
MEADOW LANE – A request from Perspective Design, Inc. and Goodwill Industries of SE Wisconsin, Inc. to
consider approving preliminary plans for a 17,883 square foot retail store and donation center on the south
side of Meadow Lane east of Marshview Street.**

1 Mr. Doug Koehler presented an aerial photograph of the parcel. This will be a new store proposed on the
2 north side of the City, just south of Silvernail Road. Grandview is to the east. The proposal is for a 17,800
3 sq. ft. retail store and donation center. Of that, 10,400 sq. ft. will be retail space and the remaining 7,400 sq.
4 ft. will be for donations and storage space. All the donation and storage will be on the west side of the
5 building as well as support offices. The architecture is masonry building on all four sides using split-faced
6 block in a couple different colors, and accented with smooth-faced banding. On the front of the building they
7 will use a standing-seam awning. On the west side of the building there is a canopy over the drop-off area.
8 They show screening for the rooftop mechanicals. It needs to surround all four sides of the rooftop
9 mechanicals, and the silhouettes of the mechanicals need to be shown on the elevation as well, just to make
10 sure the screening does go higher than the mechanicals themselves. Proposed signage is also shown. It is
11 on the side facing Meadow Lane. On the east elevation the Goodwill logo was also shown. They also
12 showed the proposed pylon sign. Signage will need to go before the Sign Review Board.

13
14 The overall site plan shows that the stormwater retention pond located at the front of the site along Meadow
15 Lane, eliminating the massive sea of asphalt. It is a nice feature to have and it softens the approach off of
16 Meadow Lane. There are two access points on either side of the pond onto Meadow Lane. Parking is
17 behind the pond and in front of the store, and it extends out to the sides of the lots. Traffic flow would come
18 down the west side to get to the drop-off center. At the rear of the building are truck docks. There is
19 additional parking on the east side of the building as well. They proposed 88 parking stalls. The zoning
20 code would calculate out to 120 stalls. They have done several stores similar to this size and they have
21 never needed that many stalls. They feel 88 will be more than enough.

22
23 There is very heavy landscaping around the perimeter of the site on the north side along Meadow Lane, and
24 they continue with the same type of plantings along the east side and wrapping that around to the south side
25 of the building. They also have extensive foundation plantings along the front as well as the two sides of the
26 building. They have extended foundation plantings along the south on a peninsula across the truck docking
27 area to help screen the trucking activities. There is an existing tree line on the outside of the property. That
28 tree line is not very heavy, so Staff would like to see the same landscaping treatment be carried through on
29 the western side of the lot as well. When the lot to the west develops in the future, some of those trees may
30 also be removed. There are several large trees on this site. Most of them will need to be removed;
31 however, they are adding quite a few different trees around the perimeter of the site, at the front and the
32 rear, to make up for that. A detailed planting schedule will need to be provided. It is currently three lots, so a
33 CSM will need to be provided to combine the three lots into one.

34
35 The overall site plan did not show a dumpster enclosure. If there is to be a dumpster kept outside, they will
36 need to have a proper enclosure. ***(Please see Department Comments at the end of the minutes.)*** With
37 these comments, Staff is in favor of preliminary approval for the Goodwill Store.

38
39 Mr. Peter Ogorek, architect with Perspective Design from Wauwatosa, introduced himself along with two
40 representatives from Goodwill.

41
42 Ald. Francoeur said the pond in the front is very attractive and is pleased to see plantings around the building
43 and that the asphalt does not go up to the building as well. What looks like a break in the road to the north of
44 the pond, is that a real break in the road? Is that the entry to McDonald's? Mr. Koehler said that is
45 McDonald's. She said regardless of what is permitted, why would there be signage on the building and a
46 pylon sign in addition. Is it a function of the space between the building and the entry? People will be able
47 to read that this is Goodwill. Mr. Koehler said it is allowed in the code and people seem to want to have a
48 pylon sign in front to announce their business and where the entrance clearly is.

49
50 Mr. Ogorek said they actually looked at the entrance off of Silvernail and the visibility of the building back
51 behind McDonald's. McDonald's has an extensive landscape plan that runs along the edge of Meadow Lane

1 as it comes from Silvernail. You actually wouldn't be able to see the signage on the front of Goodwill
2 between McDonald's landscape plan and the Goodwill's proposed landscape plan. So the positioning of the
3 pylon sign is actually placed so you can get visibility from Silvernail, down Meadow Lane.
4

5 Ald. Francoeur asked if Mr. Keller has any comments about the architecture. She has been visiting areas
6 outside of Waukesha, and the area she was just in had two, three, and four Goodwill stores in one
7 community. She was really surprised. They all seemed to have individual architecture to blend in with the
8 community. It was a different locale, and it was a southern locale, so it didn't have an industrial northern
9 building look to it. Can Mr. Keller comment on the architecture? Mr. Keller said this is sort of a northern
10 Illinois, southern Wisconsin prototype. The one on Main Street is probably a little bit different because it was
11 built a while ago. But all the buildings are roughly 20,000 sq. ft. Do they look to break the prototype and ask
12 for something different on the building? Ald. Francoeur said what suggestions would accomplish that? She
13 understands that there must be a financial consideration here, given the purpose of the building. However,
14 given the work that they have been doing in the community to make sure all buildings contribute to the
15 ambiance of the City and to be as high quality as they can be for what their purpose is, are there some
16 adjustments that can be made here? Mr. Keller thought this building was nicer than the buildings Goodwill
17 used to produce about 10-15 years ago. It depends upon what you want to measure it to. Ald. Francoeur
18 said the best it can be.
19

20 Mr. Hoefft said they have design guidelines. This building does not comply with them. They are guidelines
21 and they are not requirements, but it might help the Plan Commission to know that one of the guidelines
22 says there has to be a break-up in the roofline, which other than a small parapet over the entryway, there is
23 no break-up in the roofline. There certainly aren't any windows, as the design guidelines encourage, and the
24 break-up in the wall planes have little pilasters, but they don't break-up the wall plane very much. There is
25 no break-up in the wall plane really. They are falling quite a bit short of our design guidelines. How far this
26 Commission would like them to go to meet the guidelines is up to them.
27

28 Ms. Roeker agrees with Ald. Francoeur and also with Mr. Hoefft's comments. Her first impression of this
29 architecture was that she also would like to see a break-up in the roofline and a variation on all four sides of
30 the architecture. That has been a consistent request of this Plan Commission in buildings of this type. She
31 understands and appreciates the nature of the business, but they need to be consistent in what they are
32 asking for in buildings of this type.
33

34 Mr. Keller said the building backs up to a residential area, although it is quite a ways away. The backs of
35 buildings always have the potential to be something more than they are, but nobody wants to spend money
36 on them because they don't face anything. His concern is that the rear of the building should have some
37 windows on it. They look for a "higher model" with maybe parapet walls that aren't one constant height, or
38 cornices, or something like that. He thinks they are requesting to take one step beyond this building and
39 develop a better building. While he doesn't necessarily mind the architecture, and this is better than some of
40 the Goodwill buildings they have built in the past, this may not meet the standard that Waukesha is trying to
41 develop for this kind of facility. He recommends looking into some alternations in the elevations within the
42 confines that what Goodwill would allow.
43

44 Mr. Ogorek said in regard to traveling south, Goodwill operates on a franchise basis, so the comment about
45 the particular Goodwill that they are working with here is a southern Wisconsin Goodwill. Each one of them
46 works independently as to what their building and architecture will be. This is the prototype that Goodwill is
47 trying to use in the southern Wisconsin market. Comments are well taken on the parapet and the desire to
48 break that up. He feels they can do a better job of breaking up the horizontality of the top of the building.
49 One comment in regard to the windows, particularly on the west elevation, which is the longest expanse of
50 building without windows on it, that happens to be the storage portion of the building. They store plastic

1 containers up to 12 feet high in that location. If they were to do windows, they would obviously have to be
2 spandrel glass or something of that nature so you could not see inside.

3
4 Ald. Francoeur asked what the planned use of the property is, located southwest of this proposed building.
5 Mr. Koehler said there already are condos. There is a large conservancy area and nothing will happen to the
6 southwest. In the front and to the west is more B-5 zoning, which runs along Meadow Lane. There are no
7 plans for anything at this time. The property to the south is currently under T-1 zoning. The long range land
8 use plan has looked at that as an extension of residential coming from the south up into that. Ald. Francoeur
9 said that makes that elevation even more important. She understands the comment about the windows.

10
11 Mr. Hoeft said Bielinski's own that property and they have brought in conceptual plans for housing for the
12 elderly on that site. Nothing has been brought forward, but that is what they have been thinking of.

13
14 Ald. Francoeur said she is very familiar with this part of the City. There is a lot of commercial and retail
15 development, so she understands why Goodwill chose this spot. She encouraged them and the franchiser
16 to make that building as attractive as possible to be something that will be there for a long time and that
17 would encourage the residents on the west side of the City to want to visit the building and not just think of it
18 as a big building that looks like a cement block. She understands there are architectural details on the plan
19 and she appreciates all the other things they have done so far. But for her, she cannot even vote for
20 preliminary tonight for this proposal.

21
22 Mr. Jay Peirick of 100 E. Wisconsin Avenue, said he is representing Goodwill. This is their newer prototype
23 that they wanted to unveil to the northern Illinois, southern Wisconsin areas. They just completed a Goodwill
24 in Beaver Dam. He did not think the rendering did justice to the pilasters that bumped in and out, the
25 canopies, and all the landscaping. Goodwill does a great job in maintaining their buildings and tries to make
26 them as inviting as possible. He encourages them to visit the Beaver Dam location, which is pretty much the
27 exact same architecture as this. It will give them a good idea.

28
29 Mr. Keller asked if he could e-mail the Commission photographs of that building. Mr. Peirick said he can do
30 that. Mr. Keller said if they ask them to go beyond this design, is that a hardship for Goodwill in terms of
31 breaking the prototype? Mr. Peirick said every municipality has a different feel for what they want to get.
32 Goodwill would like to stay as close to the prototype as they can, but there is a little give and take. The
33 pilasters can extend off the roofline a little bit, and they could add a few more windows here and there. The
34 general things they want to maintain are the blue awnings, the signage, and the general feel of it. But he
35 thought there are modifications that they can make that would go a long ways.

36
37 Mr. David Kopp said if this is going to be prototypical Goodwill building; does that mean that they are going
38 to do more of these in southeast Wisconsin and northern Illinois? The answer was yes. If that was the case,
39 he wondered if that also meant that this is going to be a "green" building; therefore, more energy conscious
40 and efficient? If they are going back to the drawing board with some of the architectural elements, they
41 could go back and look at that element too in a couple different ways. Mr. Peirick said it is already a Silver
42 level LEED Certified building. This would be the forth LEED certified one that they have completed. They
43 did three last year. The one in Beaver Dam is being certified as well. In addition to the windows, there are
44 skylights and clear story windows in the back, which lets natural light in.

45
46 Mr. Keller asked if they could approve the site plan, but not the elevations. At least they could give the
47 preliminary sense that they are accepting the use and the site plan, and have them come back with revised
48 elevations. Is this acceptable? Mr. Hoeft said that has been done before.

49
50 **Mr. Keller made the motion to approve the building concept site plan, subject to Staff's comments,**
51 **with a request that the elevations come back for review. Ms. DeMars offered the second.**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

Ms. DeMars said there are a lot of things to be excited about with this plan. The landscaping being placed look very attractive. She agrees with some of the other comments made. She thinks they would like to see something a little bit more memorable. She encourages them to bring elevations for this Commission to get excited about.

Ald. Francoeur concurred with what Ms. DeMars said and she strongly encourages the developers to get a copy of the Plan Commission's guidelines.

Mayor Nelson thought the City would be excited about having a second location Goodwill in the City. He has toured the other facility and the Commission would like to see the design taken up a notch. He looks forward to seeing modifications.

The motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Otto made the motion to adjourn the meeting and Ms. DeMars offered the second. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Hoeft, P.E.
Secretary to the Commission

m090311

FIRE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

MONTHLY REVIEW – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – ST. MATTHIAS CHURCH – DROP-IN SHELTER

No Concerns/Issues Noted

PRELIMINARY PLAT – ROLLING RIDGE SOUTH #9

No Concerns/Issues Noted

SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SONIC DRIVE-IN – E. MORELAND BLVD.

No Concerns/Issues Noted

REZONING – LA CASA DE ESPERANZA

No Concerns/Issues Noted

REZONING – BRYCE COMMERCE CENTER

No Concerns/Issues Noted

REZONING – 1130 E. MAIN STREET

No Concerns/Issues Noted

SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – INTERNATIONAL MASERATI

1 No Concerns/Issues Noted

2
3 **SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – WILDE CHRYSLER/SUBARU – 1710 HWY. 164**

4 The City of Waukesha Fire Department has reviewed these plans in accordance with International Building Code
5 Section 704.3. This section does allow these two buildings to be built in close proximity to each other, as long as they
6 are treated as one building with respect to Building & Fire Code compliance. Based on this section, automatic fire
7 sprinkler protection will need to be extended into this addition. The sprinkler system will also be required to be
8 monitored by an automatic fire alarm panel in accordance with International Fire Code Section 903.4. The Fire
9 Department connection to this sprinkler system is also shown inside this addition. The Fire Department connection
10 will need to be relocated in accordance with International Fire Code Section 903.3.7 to a location that is acceptable to
11 the Fire Department.

12
13 **SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – GOODWILL STORE & DONATION CENTER – MEADOW LANE**

14 Per City of Waukesha Municipal Ordinance 21.07 and the State of Wisconsin Building Codes, this building will be
15 required to be fully protected by an automatic fire sprinkler system. This sprinkler system will also need to be
16 monitored by an automatic fire alarm panel in accordance with International Fire Code Section 903.4.

17
18 **POLICE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

19
20 For the projects that have dumpster enclosures, I have noticed that the gates tend to have wooden slats that appear to
21 abut each others sides. I would ask if it would be possible to open the distance between each slat to allow natural
22 surveillance into the enclosure especially if gates are closed. This covers all submitted plans for tonight's meeting.

23
24 **SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SONIC DRIVE-IN – E. MORELAND BLVD.**

25 There wasn't a lighting plan submitted, so I am not able to make any recommendations that would reduce the
26 opportunity for crimes to occur. The landscaping plan omitted a key to determine type of plants at their locations that
27 would aid in recognizing CPTED (crime prevention thru environmental design) principles. I can only assume that
28 planting materials do not create areas that increase the opportunity for crime to occur by design. Also will there be any
29 lighting on the site beyond, say for instance, the overhead/awning structure? Also I did not see the dumpster enclosure
30 on the site plan in which a recommendation of placement or lighting would be appropriate.

31
32 **SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – WILDE CHRYSLER/SUBARU – 1710 HWY. 164**

33 The same information for the dumpster enclosure applies for this project as well.

34
35 **SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – GOODWILL STORE & DONATION CENTER – MEADOW LANE**

36 A landscaping key was included in the submitted plans; therefore I couldn't comment on the planting materials in
37 relation to CPTED principles.

38
39
40 **WATER UTILITY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

41
42 **MONTHLY REVIEW – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – ST. MATTHIAS CHURCH – DROP IN SHELTER – No**
43 **comment.**

44 **PRELIMINARY PLAT – ROLLING RIDGE SOUTH #9 – All three (3) lots were stub with water laterals, during the water**
45 **main installation.**

46 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SONIC DRIVE-IN – E. MORELAND BOULEVARD – The existing**
47 **property has a 4" D.I. water lateral installed in 1992 – the Waukesha Water Utility would prefer that the new water**
48 **lateral be connected to this existing service within the property. If the new water service is connected to the water main,**
49 **the existing service would need to have the valve turned off at the water main and the valve would need to be plugged.**
50 **There would also be a tapping fee for the new service connection at the water main and the WWU would tap the**
51 **existing water main. The Developers contractor would need to provide the trench and shield for the tap. Contact the**
52 **Waukesha Water Utility for water service to this property; a water lateral application form must be completed to**
53 **determine the appropriate water lateral and meter size for the proposed building.**

1 **REZONING – LA CASA DE ESPERANZA** – No comment.

2 **REZONING – BRYCE COMMERCE CENTER** – No comment.

3 **REZONING – 1130 E. MAIN STREET** – This lot does not have an existing water service lateral, the Waukesha Water
4 Utility would be tapping all existing water mains at the owners cost. Contact the Waukesha Water Utility for water
5 service to this property; a water lateral application form must be completed to determine the appropriate water lateral
6 and meter size, which should include the State approved plumbing plans and the plumbers’ calculations for meter size.
7 If a sprinkler system is required, the water lateral would need to be either 6” PVC, DR-14, AWWA C900, Pressure Class
8 of 200 PSI or 6” Ductile Iron Pipe, Thickness Class 52.

9 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – INTERNATIONAL MASERATI** – No comment.

10 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – WILDE CHRYSLER/SUBARU – 1710 HWY 164** – Please check the
11 water lateral location – the Water Utility does not have a record of the lateral location, but it appears to run along the
12 north side of the building. This would be in the area of the proposed addition on the north side of the building. There is
13 also a fire connection with a missing cap that would need to be relocated or removed as there is also a fire connection
14 on the south side of the building. The fire connection on the south side of the building would need to be relocated
15 because it is in the area of the proposed addition on the south side of the building.

16 It appears that the car wash water service has been connected to the Dodge Dealership and the car wash is on the
17 parcel of the Honda Dealership. The Waukesha Water Utility policies do not allow for connection of water services
18 between two separate parcels. The two parcels may need to be joined or the car wash may need to be reconnected to
19 the Honda Dealership. A cross connection inspection will be required for the Dodge Dealership and the car wash.

20 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – GOODWILL STORE AND DONATION CENTER – MEADOW LANE**
21 – There is an existing 6” lateral stubbed into the lot, it would be preferred if this stub would be used. If this stub is not
22 used, the Waukesha Water Utility will require the stub to be plugged at the valve and the valve box be removed. If a
23 new tap is required, the Waukesha Water Utility would be tapping all existing water mains at the owners cost. If a fire
24 hydrant is required to be within 150’ of the building, a Developers Agreement will need to be drafted by the WWU,
25 because the WWU does not allow private fire hydrants. The Developer/Owner shall send a letter to the General
26 Manager of the Waukesha Water Utility requesting the public water system extension and identifying any easements
27 necessary for the installation of water infrastructure associated with this plat. Design and construction of the water main
28 will need to be coordinated with the Waukesha Water Utility and the design review will not be started until the letter to
29 the GM at the WWU is received. All aspects of the water main plans will need to follow the Utility’s specifications as
30 on file with the DNR which includes the plans to be on 22”x34” sheets. Contact the Waukesha Water Utility for water
31 service to this property; a water lateral application form must be completed to determine the appropriate water lateral
32 and meter size, which should include the State approved plumbing plans and the plumbers’ calculations for meter size.
33 If a sprinkler system is required, the water lateral would need to be either 6” PVC, DR-14, AWWA C900, Pressure Class
34 of 200 PSI or 6” Ductile Iron Pipe, Thickness Class 52.

35

36

37 **ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

38

39 **MONTHLY REVIEW – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – ST. MATTHIAS CHURCH – DROP-IN SHELTER –**

40 ? No comment.

41

42 **PRELIMINARY PLAT – ROLLING RIDGE SOUTH #9 –**

43 ? Engineering Department requires a photo-graphic reproducible tracing on mylar (4 mill/matt Surface both
44 sides) of each sheet of plat along with any Bonds or Agreements required by Plan Commission and Council.

45 ? Show existing sidewalk easements on Lots 432 and 433 from CSM #10,541.

46 ? Portions of Lot 433 are on a steep slope that drops down to a retaining wall, sidewalk and private roadway to
47 the Lodge Apartment project. The building envelope shown for Lot 433 may not all be practical to build on.

48 ? An additional vision corner easement should be placed on Lot 431 for sight clearance to the existing bike trail
49 and any future widening of Meadowbrook Road. A 25’ triangle is suggested.

50 ? Two additional sets of sewer and water laterals will be needed to serve this subdivision.

51 ? Note #3 is not relevant to this plat

- 1 ? The existing utility easement along the west edge of Lot 431 should indicate it was from the previous CSM for
- 2 this property.
- 3 ? The legal can indicate the plat is a re-division of Lot 1 of CSM #10541; the legal doesn't have to mention the
- 4 lots in Rolling Ridge South Add. No. 8.

SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SONIC DRIVE-IN – E. MORELAND BOULEVARD –

- 7 ? Engineering Department requires any Bonds or Agreements required by Plan Commission and Council.
- 8 ? Grading plan should be revised to match the latest plan with pedestrian access along the west side of the
- 9 parking lot and drive.
- 10 ? Handicap ramps should be placed where the new walk along the west side of the parking lot meets
- 11 crosswalks in paved areas.
- 12 ? Curb along the driveway out to Heritage lane should end at the back of the city sidewalk in the drive
- 13 approach.
- 14 ? Water service connection into U.S.H. 18 right of way will require a state permit.

REZONING – LA CASA DE ESPERANZA –

- 17 ? No comment.

REZONING – BRYCE COMMERCE CENTER –

- 20 ? No comment.

REZONING – 1130 E. MAIN STREET –

- 23 ? No comment.

SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – INTERNATIONAL MASERATI –

- 26 ? No comment.

SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – WILDE CHRYSLER/SUBARU – 1710 HWY 164 –

- 29 ? Engineering Department requires a photo-graphic reproducible tracing on mylar (4 mill/matt surface both
- 30 sides) of each sheet certified survey map along with any Bonds or Agreements required by Plan Commission
- 31 and Council.
- 32 ? The existing certified survey map will have to be revised to show the new lot line.
- 33 ? Storm sewer design was not provided for review.
- 34 ? How will rear of Culver's property drain? This proposal appears to be filling two feet adjacent to Culver's rear
- 35 lot line, effectively blocking their drainage.
- 36 ? Proposed contours in lot do not reflect any curb heights. Curbs will block drainage in some areas.

SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – GOODWILL STORE AND DONATION CENTER – MEADOW LANE

- 39 ? Engineering Department requires a photographic reproducible tracing on mylar (4mill/matt surface both
- 40 sides) of each sheet of Certified Survey Map along with any Bonds or Agreements requires by Plan
- 41 Commission and Council.
- 42 ? A certified survey map will be required for this development.
- 43 ? A utility plan for the most recent layout of this development was not submitted for review.
- 44 ? City requires that all storm sewers that accept surface drainage be a minimum 10" diameter to resist
- 45 clogging with debris.
- 46 ? Portions of the parking lot curbs will need to be inverted pan.
- 47 ? What will happen to the existing pole line across the front of his development? Will the overhead lines be
- 48 buried?

49