

In attendance:

Mayor S. Bierce, Alderwoman C. Brown, D. Kiser, and A. Schoenemann.

Also in attendance:

City Planner & Community Development Director N. Fuchs, Administrator S. Klein, Department of Public Works Director M. Wagner, and Deputy Clerk/Community Development Coordinator A. Hurd.

1.0 Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Bierce called the meeting to order at 6:00pm and requested everyone stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

2.0 Peter Amenda Property Located at N39 W27421 Hillside Grove Road (PWC 0889016001)

2.1 Discussion and Action Regarding a Certified Survey Map to Create Lot 1 and Outlot 1 for the Subject Property, Consistent with Deeds Recorded for Said Property and Property Located at N39 W27402 Hillside Grove Road

Mr. Fuchs stated the CSM included one lot and one outlot and was being proposed to clean up an ownership situation. In 2001, 40 feet of the outlot adjacent to the lake was deeded to a property on the north side of Hillside Grove Road. It resulted in the applicant's property showing dual ownership, but it should just be the single ownership. The CSM will show the applicant's lot and his portion of the outlot on the lake. The 40-foot portion would be deeded to the property on the north side of Hillside Grove Road.

A motion was made and seconded (D. Kiser, C. Brown) to recommend approval of the Certified Survey Map for the Peter Amenda property. Motion Passed: 4-For, 0-Against.

3.0 Spring City Family Dental Request for a Dental Office Located at N7 W23825 Bluemound Road (PWC 0966987)

3.1 Discussion and Action and Public Hearing to Rezone the Subject Property from B-1 Neighborhood Business to B-3 General Business

3.2 Discussion and Action Regarding a Recommendation to the Common Council for a Conditional Use Permit to Allow for a Dental Office Use on the Subject Property

3.3 Discussion and Action Regarding the Site and Building Plan Review for Approval of Improvements for a Proposed Dental Office on the Subject Property

Mr. Fuchs stated the building was 4,674 square feet with 30 parking spaces. The applicant was exceeding the 40 percent greenspace ratio. The only conditions of approval were for Engineering

Department approval of the grading, erosion control and utility plans, hookup to sewer if it becomes available, and the sign code must be met and permits issued prior to sign installation.

Chairman Bierce opened the public hearing at 6:06pm. After hearing no requests to speak, he closed the public hearing at 6:06pm.

Commissioner Brown stated she was glad to see the building would be rebuilt with something nice. She questioned if the westerly exit would be completely removed and made into greenspace, and the applicant noted that the area would all be turf.

Discussion took place regarding the building materials, as relates to the guidelines in the Zoning Code.

Bud Bessler, architect with Oliver Construction, discussed the renderings of the building and noted there would be a three-color panel blend with softer tones and a few accents from the owner's logo. He explained the various materials they were planning to use in the project.

Commissioner Schoenemann referred to the illuminated logo and questioned if it was all considered signage. Mr. Fuchs confirmed that the logos would be considered signage and would be added up per elevation and would have to be under the allowed square footage.

Commissioner Schoenemann referred to the photometrics and felt it seemed rather dark for anyone who parked on the south end of the building by the ADA parking stall. She felt there were not enough footcandles. Mr. Bessler noted that there would be a security light at each door, but he confirmed they would take a look at it.

Mr. Bessler then discussed the west driveway and mentioned that it would be all grass with a six-inch-high curb. He noted that they can't put any landscaping in the area because it is part of the right-of-way.

Chairman Bierce questioned the removal of the holding tank, and Mr. Bessler stated they would be replacing it and putting in two new, smaller tanks.

A motion was made and seconded (D. Kiser, A. Schoenemann) to concur with staff recommendations for approval, lights added to the south elevation, and the disturbance to the tree line to the south would have to be added back if anything was disrupted. Motion Passed: 4-For, 0-Against.

- 4.0 Pewaukee Golf Club Single- and Multi-Family Development Located at N12 W236506 Golf Road as Requested by Land by Label (PWC 0941988104 & PWC 0944994)
- 4.1 Discussion and Action Regarding a Recommendation to the Common Council for a Comprehensive Master Plan Amendment to Change the Year 2050 Land Use/Transportation Plan Use Designation for the City of Pewaukee from High Density Residential (< 6,500 Sq. Ft. / d.u.) and Floodplains, Lowland & Upland Conservancy and Other Natural Areas to Medium Density Residential (6,500 sq. ft. – 1/2 ac. / d.u.) and Floodplains, Lowland, & Upland Conservancy and

Other Natural Areas (PWC 0941988104)

- 4.2 Discussion and Action and Public Hearing to Rezone the Subject Property from Rm-3 Multi-Family Residential Planned Unit Development to Rs-6 Single-Family Residential and LC Lowland Conservancy (PWC 0941988104)
- 4.3 Discussion and Action Regarding a Recommendation to the Common Council for a Comprehensive Master Plan Amendment to Change the Year 2050 Land Use/Transportation Plan Use Designation for the City of Pewaukee from Public or Private Park and Recreation, Floodplains, Lowland, & Upland Conservancy and Other Natural Areas, and Water to High Density Residential (< 6,500 sq. ft. / d.u.), Medium Density Residential (6,500 sq. ft. – 1/2 ac. / d.u.), Public or Private Park and Recreation, and Floodplains, Lowland, & Upland Conservancy and Other Natural Areas (PWC 0944994)
- 4.4 Discussion and Action and Public Hearing to Rezone the Subject Property from P-1 Park and Open Space, F-1 Floodplain, and LC Lowland Conservancy to Rm-3 Multi-Family Residential Planned Unit Development, P-1 Park and Open Space, and LC Lowland Conservancy (PWC0944994)
- 4.5 Discussion and Action Regarding a Recommendation to the Common Council for a Conditional Use Residential Planned Unit Development to Allow for a Multi-Family Residential Development Upon a Portion of the Subject Property (PWC 0944994)
- 4.6 Discussion and Action Regarding a Recommendation to the Common Council for a Conditional Use Residential Planned Unit Development to Allow for a Single-Family and Condominium Residential Development Upon the Subject Property (PWC 0941988104 & PWC 0944994)
- 4.7 Discussion and Action Regarding a Certified Survey Map for the Purpose of Subdividing the Subject Properties Into Three Lots and One Outlot (PWC 0941988104 & PWC 0944944)
- 4.8 Discussion and Action Regarding a Certified Survey Map for the Purpose of Subdividing the Subject Property Bearing Tax Key 0941988104 and a Portion of Subject Property Bearing Tax Key 0944994 Into Three Lots and One Outlot (PWC 0941988104 & PWC 0944994)
- 4.9 Discussion and Action Regarding the Site and Building Plans for a Condominium Development Upon the Subject Property (PWC 0941988104 & PWC 0944994)
- 4.10 Discussion and Action Regarding the Site and Building Plans for a Multi-Family Residential Development Upon a Portion of the Subject Property Located at N12 W26506 Golf Road (PWC 0944994)

Mr. Fuchs stated this request was for a mixed-use residential development including multi-family apartments and condominiums, single-family residential housing, and a privately owned park. The two properties included in the request were a 19-acre vacant property, and the other was the 142-acre Pewaukee Golf Club property. Mr. Fuchs noted that both rezonings proposed to utilize the Conditional Use Planned Unit Development option. For the single-family and condominium portion of the development, it would allow for 9,000 square-foot lots and a 70-foot width. For the multi-family, the PUD option would allow for four 19-unit buildings and nine 23-unit buildings,

and would also include 12 detached garages, a clubhouse, and a swimming pool, for a total of 283 units.

Mr. Fuchs referred to the privately owned park area and noted that it was zoned floodplain, but according to the DNR it was not being mapped as such. The area will be open to the general public. Mr. Fuchs recommended making a connection to the Lake Country Trail and providing a small parking lot for visitors.

Regarding access, the development would be served by a public road extending from Golf Road to Fieldhack Drive, and the applicant is proposing a gate for emergency access only at Fieldhack Drive. Mr. Fuchs recommended eliminating the gate from the plan and would prefer to see through traffic. He felt it would be helpful for the existing apartments on Fieldhack Drive to utilize the new road so that they would not have to go to Milkweed Lane or Fieldhack Drive.

A traffic impact analysis was completed for the property. Mr. Fuchs summarized the findings and noted that the study recommended a right turn lane into the site on the east approach, and constructing an eastbound bypass lane along the south side of Golf Road.

Mr. Fuchs mentioned that the applicant was proposing to fill about 27 wetland areas of varying sizes, which totaled approximately 5.19 acres. An additional 3.94 acres of environmental corridor would be disturbed, which would require DNR approval.

It was noted that the Fire Department was requesting the attics in the buildings be sprinkled. Alternatively, the Fire Chief would want to work with the applicant to increase building separation or widen drives in order to accommodate Fire Department access.

For the condominium portion of the development, Mr. Fuchs pointed out that there were 27 dwelling units proposed amongst four different building types. The developer planned to retain ownership of the condos. For the single-family development, there would be up to 160 single-family lots.

Staff recommended approval of the development.

Chairman Bierce opened the public hearing at 6:40pm.

Walt Russell (N11 W26655 Milkweed Lane A) was opposed to any access onto Milkweed Lane and Fieldhack Drive, as there was already too much traffic. He felt sidewalks would have to be added if more traffic was added to the roads.

Patricia Gustafson (N16 W26561 Wild Oats Drive H) stated she wanted to put a petition on record for 190 Spice Creek residents that were opposed to a second exit onto Fieldhack Drive, and she requested a gated emergency-only access onto Fieldhack Drive. The petition noted that there was a safety concern for pedestrians on foot or riding a bike. Ms. Gustafson was also concerned about turning onto Meadowbrook Road, especially with the proposed bike trail. She also did not want any construction traffic on the roads she currently pays for.

Bob Lorier (W273 N875 Robby Lane) stated this land was once apart of his family's dairy farm and he cautioned that the land to the north being rezoned from P-1 to Rm-3 could never be farmed, as it was muck, peat, and unstable. The soil is formed from vegetation being under a lake bottom, and he questioned if it made sense to develop this land.

Christine Howard (N16 W26543 Meadowgrass Circle E) was scared to add any more traffic onto the roads with all of the kids, bikers, and walkers in their neighborhood. She felt only 120 units should be allowed to Fieldhack Drive, as that was what was planned for the remainder of Meadowbrook Farms. Ms. Howard also questioned the traffic study results. She requested a provision in the approvals that a traffic study continue after the development is built, and if it got beyond what the traffic study said, then an emergency exit would be put in. Overall, she felt it was a good development, but it would be tough for the people that live in the area.

Dan Cobus (N16 W26543 Meadowgrass Circle E) did not believe people would use Golf Road instead of driving through thru Meadowbrook Farms, and felt people in this new development would come through his subdivision.

Carol Sazama (N16 W26532 Meadowgrass Circle B) stated she typically has to drive in the middle of the road in Meadowbrook Farms because there are so many people on the streets. There are so many walkers, bikers, strollers and dogs out on the roads, and that is where they gather for a sense of community.

Christine Howard (N16 W26543 Meadowgrass Circle E) added that she had the same petitions as Spice Creek.

Arlene Iglar (N19 W26637 Honeysuckle Court A) stated Milkweed Lane was a very narrow road, and the residents have to back out onto the road. She was concerned about the traffic on the road and the high speeds.

Charlie Browning (N16 W26563 Tall Reeds Lane B) questioned why land was always being built up, and he did not understand the need to develop land.

John Zigler (N19 W26671 Goldenrod Court A) stated he was almost hit by a truck in his neighborhood while on a walk and he had to jump out of the way. He felt Fieldhack Drive was three times as wide as Milkweed Lane, and he suggested sidewalks along Fieldhack Drive.

John Ardis (N15 W26510 Golf View Lane A) questioned if other options had been explored other than this one road and he questioned the rationale against an emergency access only. Mr. Ardis felt the current roads were constructed to a planned capacity related to what the development was at the time the road was constructed, and he questioned how that would factor into the increased traffic. He questioned whether the greenspace would be maintained and if there were any assurances that it would remain greenspace to avoid further development.

Casper Balistreri (N19 W26720 Primrose Court) noted there was so much traffic on Milkweed Lane currently that he has to walk on people's property to avoid the cars. He questioned what would happen when it snows and they are not able to walk on the grass.

Bill Hinze (N16 W26521 Meadowgrass Circle) questioned if the 300 apartments would cause the development to go over the 40 percent greenspace requirement. He felt the apartments would lower the value of the single-family residences and condos and he felt the density was too high. Mr. Hinze questioned what the development would look like 20 years from now and what the effect would be on the City.

Chairman Bierce closed the public hearing after hearing no other requests to speak.

Chairman Bierce stated he was opposed to the apartments. He did not believe this was the right spot for them and he felt they would bring down home values. He felt the apartments would eventually get sold and the quality would go down. Chairman Bierce noted he was not opposed to the single-family portion of the development, but traffic was a big issue.

Emily Cialdini with Land by Label confirmed that she spoke with GE regarding the possibility of using the road on their property. The response from GE was that they did not want to encumber the property with public access, as they did not know what their future plans were for the land. The answer was unequivocally no, any which way they tried to acquire it.

Ms. Cialdini referred to the greenspace and mentioned that they agreed to a restricted covenant that would preclude development of the area. They are also planning on rezoning it to P-1 Park and Open Space, and the existing wetlands will remain and will not be impacted.

Chairman Bierce questioned sprinkling the apartments. Ms. Cialdini felt ongoing conversations would have to take place, as she did not believe the code required the attics to be sprinkled if they were to draft-stop them.

Further discussion took place regarding filling of the wetlands according to the Army Corps of Engineers. Ms. Cialdini stated they were only partly through the process at this time, but they would have to go through the approval process.

Commissioner Schoenemann stated she was in favor of the development because she liked the mix that was being offered. She felt they would be missing a huge opportunity to offer choices to younger members of the community. Commissioner Schoenemann felt it was extremely discriminatory to say the City should not allow some very well-done multi-family on the site.

Commissioner Brown felt the only way she would vote for this would be with the emergency access, and she felt the development would look very nice if it went through. The developers are willing to put in the emergency access in order to balance the capacity that they want and the capacity that is already next to them.

Commissioner Kiser stated he was in favor of concurring with staff and connecting the road. He felt the rest of the traffic in the development would head south. Commissioner Kiser felt from an overall development perspective, this would go over extremely well because we have a lot of early-career professionals in the City that want this product.

Discussion took place regarding the amount of parking. Ms. Cialdini pointed out that the code requirement was 450 stalls, but they were providing 540 because they accounted for driveway stalls of the attached parking. She stated they would agree to a lower parking count that more closely aligns with the code.

Commissioner Kiser referred to the stormwater ponds and questioned why they were all wet. It was noted that a wet pond was the most cost-effective way to remove the sediment. Ms. Cialdini mentioned that the ground water in this area was very high, so it would be tough to keep a stormwater management pond dry in that situation.

Buck Knitt with Rinka Architects spoke about the landscaping. He felt there was opportunity between the buildings to find room for more hardwood or spruce trees. Ms. Cialdini added that there were streets trees all along the public road in the single-family for rent development.

Commissioner Schoenemann mentioned the garages that would face mostly residential, and she suggested some lighter colors other than the charcoal. She felt it looked like a black hole, and Ms. Cialdini confirmed that they could look at different colors. Commissioner Schoenemann felt the building materials were all very nice quality.

A motion was made and seconded (C. Brown, A. Schoenemann) to recommend approval of the Comprehensive Master Plan Amendments, Rezoning from Rm-3 to Rm-6, Rezoning from P-1, F-1, and LC to Rm-3, P-1, and LC, the Conditional Use Permits, and the Certified Survey Maps as proposed, including staff recommendations, but including an emergency gate at Fieldhack Drive for emergency use only. Motion passed: 3-For, 1-Against (Bierce).

5.0 Adjournment

A motion was made and seconded (C. Brown, D. Kiser) to adjourn the meeting at 8:22pm.
Motion Passed: 4-For, 0-Against.

Respectfully Submitted

Ami Hurd
Deputy Clerk/
Community Development Coordinator