MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF PEWAUKEE PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
FEBRUARY 19, 2015

Members present were Chairman Scott Klein, Secretary Michael Hasslinger, Craig Coursin, Dave Linsmeier, Sean Sullivan and Christine Wunder. Also present were Jeff Weigel, City Engineer, Kelley Woldanski, Director of Parks, Recreation and Community Services, Ami Hurd, Deputy Clerk and City Planner, H.E. Clinkenbeard.

Chairman Klein opened the meeting at 7:00 PM noting that there was a quorum present. He then asked everyone to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Klein asked if there were any changes or corrections to the minutes of the January 15th, 2015 meeting. There being none, a motion was made by Mr. Hasslinger, seconded by Ms. Wunder to approve the minutes of the January 15th, 2015 meeting as transmitted. The motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION & ACTION REGARDING A PETITION FOR A REZONING PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE LAZYNSKI/MORRIS CORPORATION PROPERTY ON LINDSAY ROAD AT STH 74 FROM M-1 WHOLESALE/WAREHOUSING, LC LOWLAND CONSERVANCY & F-1 FLOODPLAIN TO RS-6 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL, RM-3 MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL, LC LOWLAND CONSERVANCY & F-1 FLOODPLAIN AND A PRELIMINARY PLAT AND A SITE & BUILDING PLAN (PWC 0869996 & PWC 0872996)

A representative of the Neumann Corporation came forward and gave a general overview of the development. He noted that the berms along Highway 74 would remain as they are today. The trees along the eastern property line would also remain. He noted that there would be a public street on the property that would serve all of the 27 single-family residences shown. They were proposing luxury multi-family buildings ranging from 18 units per building to 24 units per building with a total of 120 multi-family units. They would have a master association that would take care of the property as well as monitor and take care of the recreation building that would be a part of the development. He noted that the multi-family buildings would setback a fairly good distance away from Lindsay Road. He noted that there was approximately 60 foot separation between the multi-family buildings.

Mr. Matt Neumann came forward and talked a little bit about development in the area from 2013 and philosophically about the changes in residential development in the metropolitan area over the last three to five years.

Chairman Klein then asked if there were any questions at that time by the Plan Commission. There being none, he then opened the public hearing at 7:24 PM.

Ms. Janice Perkins (N45W22955 Lindsay Road) came forward and asked some questions along Lindsay Road. Mr. Weigel pointed out that part of that would be answered by the rebuilding of Lindsay Road that had been scheduled for some time by the City to be accomplished this year and would not be a part of this proposed development.

Mr. Jerome Garrett (N44W22925 Bridge Street) came forward and was concerned about the value of the new development and how it would affect the values of the properties in Victoria Station Subdivision. Mr. Neumann indicated that the single-family properties would be valued at somewhere in the neighborhood of $325,000 to $425,000 and very similar to the houses in Victoria Station. Some of the units along Highway 74 would be valued less than the other single-family residential units. He noted that the apartments themselves would rent between $1,100 and $1,500 per month, depending upon the type. They were proposing to have one and two bedroom apartments. He noted that this was not assisted living and there were no federal or state monies involved in this project. It was his view that values in the area would actually increase because of this development versus what is located on the property today.

Mr. Fred Honkamp (N43W23200 Beaver Court) indicated that he was concerned about the loss of property value on their properties across Highway 74. He wanted to know if there would be signalization at the intersection of Highway 74 and Lindsay Road because there was going to be a lot more traffic coming from this development in that area. He pointed out that it was difficult to get through that area at rush hour times now. He asked if a traffic study had been done. Mr. Weigel indicated that there is a traffic study being done by the City as a part of the rebuilding of Lindsay Road and Weyer Road in that area this year. Mr. Honkamp indicated that he would prefer seeing the property kept single-family with no multi-family.

Ms. Tracie Skindzier (N42W22753 London Court) indicated that she lived in Victoria Station and she indicated that 80 percent of the residents are against this and she has a copy of her survey for the City (See files).

Mr. Robert Ertl (N42W22630 Cabot Court) indicated that he and most of his neighbors were opposed to multi-family because he was convinced it would lower the values of property in the area.

Ms. Jennifer Wall (W229N4375 Baker Court) indicated that she agreed with everyone that spoke before her. She was concerned about losing all of the trees and the berms in the area. It was again stated that neither the berms nor the trees would be removed.

Mr. Aaron Busche (N44W22990 Bridge Street) was concerned with the density. He did not want anything on the property behind him.

Ms. Angela Johnson (N43W22674 Bridge Street) was concerned about multi-family. She asked if it would be managed by a homeowner's association. Mr. Neumann said the Neumann Company would actually manage the property but there would be a homeowner's association for the property as well.

There was a question about what school district the property was in. Mr. Clinkenbeard indicated that this property would be located in the Sussex/Hamilton school district.

There was some question as to what would happen to the vacant property on the north side of Lindsay Road if this is approved. Mr. Clinkenbeard pointed out that immediately north, about half of that property was in the floodplain, but the rest of the land could be developed for residential or even industrial due to the fact that the property in the Town of Lisbon to the north is an industrial park.

Ms. Jana McBride (N43W23225 Beaver Court) indicated that she did not agree with the Neumann philosophy of development here and she thought it should be single-family.

Mr. Thomas Neary (N43W23216 Beaver Court) indicated that these kind of multi-family units in Florida devalued the property down there and will probably do the same thing in this area.

Mr. Jason Majdecki (N42W22668 Brighton Court) indicated that he agreed with the rezoning of the property. He was concerned, however, with what would happen with the multi-family in 15, 20 or 25 years and if it would deteriorate. Mr. Neumann indicated that is one of the reasons they manage the property so it is maintained in some way every year during its life. He noted that they would have professionals actually managing the property on a day to day basis. He also indicated that this was a long term investment for his family, and it was not a situation where they intended to build it and sell it. He noted also that the property would be built in phases and it would probably be 2016 before the multi-family units would be erected.

Mr. Timothy Keller (N43W22945 Victoria Street) indicated that he was a policeman in the City of Milwaukee and noted that crime is 86 percent higher in rental units as well as are the use of drugs and liquor. He noted that crime was a major problem in apartment units.

Ms. Faith Honkamp (N43W23200 Beaver Court) indicated she was against multi-family and noted that the owners of the single-family homes have pride and the people that live in apartments would not take care of the property. It was again pointed out that the property would be taken care of by the owners of the property.

Mr. Kurt Spitzner (N42W22752 London Court) asked what the other options were. It was pointed out that for this property, the other options are to leave it like it is with the old metal buildings there, or to have someone come along and want to develop it for industrial use and that was a possibility to have some large industrial buildings on the property because it was already zoned industrial. Mr. Neumann indicated that they thought that this was a better use for this property than either the existing use or any other use that might be considered. They had looked at other possibilities but there are no alternative plans for this site except for what they are proposing as a mixed single-family, multi-family property.

Mr. John Armbrecht (N41W22834 Sunder Creek Drive) indicated that he agreed with everyone and asked if we could take a vote. He said this project is right in the back yard of most

of the people in this room. He indicated that they had earned the right to live in this area and not have to deal with people who don't own their property.

Ms. Michelle Martin indicated that she was an attorney from Waukesha and was representing the current owners of the property. She noted that the current use is a non-conforming use and what is being asked is to rezone this industrial property to a residential property, not just a multi-family property.

Ms. Jana McBride (N43W23225 Beaver Court) asked if it could be industrial. Mr. Clinkenbeard indicated that yes, this property could also be industrial seeing as that was what was basically there now, because what was there was primarily warehousing.

Mr. Jerome Garrett (N44W22925 Bridge Street) indicated that the "young professionals" that the developers talked about moving into these units are a rowdy bunch in his estimation and he's lived in areas where such people live in the past. He indicated that he would like to see it single-family. He also asked why it couldn't be senior living units.

Chairman Klein noted that it appeared that most were opposed, but he asked if there was anyone here (except Mr. Majdecki) who was in favor of the proposal and no one raised their hands. He asked if there was anything else.

Mr. Robert Ertl (N42W22630 Cabot Court) asked a question. Chairman Klein noted that the staff had received several emails during the last few days and he read off the individual names of the people from the neighborhood who sent in emails. (See file).

Mr. Neumann indicated if they want industrial there, they would not get a chance to say no because it is already zoned for that purpose, whereas here they've had the opportunity to talk about it.

Mr. John Armbrecht (N41W22834 Sunder Creek Drive) asked that if it is nonconforming, could it be restricted to something else? The indication was yes, there is a possibility that it could be restricted but that was a legal question.

At that point, no one else having any questions or comments, Chairman Klein closed the public hearing at 8:37 PM. He then asked the members of the Plan Commission their views of the proposal.

Mr. Sullivan indicated that basically he was against it. It was too dense of a development. He was concerned about the intersection and possible signaling of the intersection. He thought that there would be a great deal of traffic generated by this development. He indicated that in his view, it would make great industrial development property, but we need to be careful what is done on this corner because of the potential of an unsafe intersection with the sports complex going in across the highway.

Mr. Linsmeier was also concerned about the density but he was more in favor of this development than industrial development in this area.

Mr. Coursin indicated that what was being proposed was certainly better than what is there now. He thought that the density could be reduced on the property and you do that by eliminating some of the multi-family units.

It was indicated that there did not seem to be a lot of alternatives for this property.

Mr. Clinkenbeard indicated that one alternative is to put in a small lot development with small houses, perhaps 10,000 square foot lots under a PUD.

Mr. Hasslinger indicated that he was not opposed to the proposal but there needs to be a traffic control at the intersection of STH 74 and Lindsay Road because of the other development in the area.

There was some general discussion on the matter, after which a motion was made by Mr. Hasslinger to approve the rezoning and preliminary plat as submitted. Chairman Klein asked for a second to the motion and the motion died for lack of a second.

Chairman Klein asked if anyone else had any comments. Mr. Weigel indicated that it should be recognized that whatever happens on this site, there is need to extend the water mains in this area to form a loop, otherwise you would be putting a very large number of homes on a dead end water main, which is not very smart for the City. There will be a need to extend the water main in this area no matter what goes on this site.

After another brief discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Coursin, seconded by Mr. Linsmeier to table this matter until the March meeting as long as the developer would be okay with an extension of the preliminary plat. Mr. Neumann indicated that if this was tabled, they would grant an extension until after the March meeting for the preliminary plat. There was no discussion regarding this item and the motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Coursin, seconded by Ms. Wunder to table but extend the plat until the March meeting. There was no discussion regarding this item and the motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION & ACTION REGARDING A PETITION FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PUBLIC HEARING FOR WISCONSIN ADULT CENTER LLC TO PLACE AN ADULT DAYCARE CENTER IN A MULTI-TENANT INDUSTRIAL BUILDING LOCATED AT W227N880 WESTMOUND DRIVE (PWC 0963999022)

Mr. Clinkenbeard pointed out that this was a proposal to put an adult daycare center, much like a children daycare center, in a multi-tenant industrial zoned building in the City. Ms. Michelle Nehls came forward and indicated that she was representing the adult daycare center operators. Mr. Clinkenbeard pointed out that the reason for the conditional use is that we don't normally allow these kinds of uses on an industrial zoned parcel. Chairman Klein asked why this was different than the children's daycare center on Eastmound. Mr. Clinkenbeard pointed out that the zoning in that particular case is commercial zoning, not industrial.

In answer to a question, Ms. Nehls indicated that they probably would have no more than ten vehicles per day. Many of the people would be brought to the center by van, some would come in a private car, but ten vehicles would be the maximum and that included their staff cars. The people would be dropped off in the morning and picked up in the afternoon, much like a children's daycare center.

At that point (9:15 PM) Chairman Klein opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak either in favor of or in opposition to the proposal. There being none, Chairman Klein closed the public hearing at 9:15 PM.

After a brief discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Coursin, seconded by Ms. Wunder to recommend approval of the conditional use for the adult daycare center at the location noted and to also approve the Business Plan of Operation. There was no discussion regarding this item and the motion passed unanimously.

SITE, BUILDING & PLAN OF OPERATIONS FOR SUNBELT RENTAL ON THE OLD HARRIS LUMBER SITE AT CTH F & I-94 (PWC 0965999002)

Mr. Rodenbeck, representing Sunbelt Rental, came forward noting that they had made several changes based on the comments they heard at the previous Plan Commission meetings. They had relocated much of the outdoor storage to the western part of the site and took it away from the highway and out of the floodplain areas. They also moved some of the frames that they had proposed to locate where the floodplain is in that area. Mr. Clinkenbeard indicated that now we know that there is a floodplain there, one of the things they'll have to do is eliminate the proposed ramp from where you have it shown now. It cannot be built either in the floodplain or within 75 feet of the floodplain. Mr. Clinkenbeard suggested that they move the ramp either to the north side of the building or to the west end of the building.

Chairman Klein asked about the lights. It was pointed out that there would be a few additional lights, none of which would be over 20 feet tall and they would be 'down' lights to light only the property in the area.

Mr. Coursin asked about the roof. They indicated that yes, they were going to address the roof with the owner. They said they were only leasing the property but they were working with the owner to get the roof maintained or replaced.

After a few brief comments, a motion was made by Mr. Hasslinger, seconded by Ms. Wunder to approve the proposed operation of Sunbelt Rentals in this location as shown on their business plan of operation and their plan with the understanding that the matters that had been discussed regarding staying out of the floodplain and not building anything within 75 feet of the floodplain would be adhered to. There was no discussion regarding this item and the motion passed unanimously.

CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR THE 144 UNIT BLUE HILL MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED TO BE LOCATED ON 16+ ACRES LYING BETWEEN STH 16 & CTH JJ (PWC 0928980)

The developer of the property was not in the audience so the matter could not be addressed in detail. Mr. Clinkenbeard indicated that this was not what he had told the developer was a possibility here. He had indicated that if there was multi-family, it would have to be mixed use and there would have to be single-family along Bluemound Road because there was single family development on three sides of the property.

Mr. Weigel indicated that there is a problem with placing too much development in this area. He noted that the City owns only a specific amount of sewer capacity that they bought from the Village in this area and it was under strict contract to not exceed the amount in the contract. He indicated that a development such as the Blue Hill development would probably use up most of the capacity that the City has purchased, which meant that no one else in the area would be able to access sewer or the City would have to go back to the Village and try to obtain additional sewer capacity.

There was some discussion by the Plan Commission. The general consensus was that they did not want to see any multi-family in this area at all. Single-family would have to suffice. They indicated that they would add it to a future agenda if the developer wished to return.

One of the neighbors asked if he could speak. He said there was just too much traffic on Bluemound Road now and this would add a great deal more. He did not want to see anything like what was proposed. There were 12 or 13 people in the audience from the area on Bluemound Road who had heard of this proposal by 'word of mouth'.

At that point, there being no other business for the Plan Commission, a motion was made by Mr. Coursin, seconded by Ms. Wunder to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 9:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Harlan E. Clinkenbeard,
City Planner