

In attendance: Chairman S. Bierce, B. Bergman, C. Coursin, T. Janka, D. Linsmeier, S. Sullivan and C. Wunder. Also present were CDD/Senior Planner H.E. Clinkenbeard, Community Services Director K. Woldanski and Deputy Clerk A. Hurd.

1. US Department of Housing and Urban Development Fair Housing Training

Prior to the regular meeting, the Plan Commission members took part in the US Department of Housing and Urban Development fair housing training.

2. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Bierce called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM noting there was a quorum present and requested everyone stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Approval of Plan Commission Meeting Minutes dated May 18, 2017

A motion was made and seconded (T. Janka, C. Coursin) to approve the Plan Commission meeting minutes dated May 18, 2017.

Motion Passed: 7-For, 0-Against.

4. Discussion and Action and PUBLIC HEARING Regarding the Proposed 2050 Land/Use Transportation Plan for the Century Farm Neighborhood

Mr. Clinkenbeard described the Century Farm Neighborhood Plan maps. The only difference between the 2035 and 2050 plans is that the density of the remaining developable land is being changed to a higher density, but it is still primarily single-family density. The population would go from 886 to a little over 1,000 because the density is a little different and the lots would be smaller.

Chairman Bierce opened the public hearing at 7:35 PM and asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak on the matter.

Mr. Cory Goodspan questioned what you would do with the floodplain area if you had the small lots. He questioned if that would be dedicated to the City. Mr. Clinkenbeard stated it could be dedicated to the City or it could stay a part of the property. It would be zoned F-1 as it is today.

Mr. Clinkenbeard noted that there is the possibility of archaeological sites in the area that would need to be looked at if a developer were to propose a development. The City would not develop this area and it would be up to a developer.

Mr. Tony Wichman (W234 N4575 Lori Lane) stated he has a two acre lot and he questioned if he would be able to subdivide the lot to pay for the sewer and water. Mr. Clinkenbeard stated it would depend on what the configuration of the lot is. Mr. Wichman noted that he purposely built the house on one side, and Mr. Clinkenbeard confirmed he could probably divide it.

Chairman Bierce then closed the public hearing at 7:42 PM. He felt every neighborhood had very few changes between 2035 and 2050, but it seems like the change is always that we are making smaller lots. Mr. Sullivan agreed and questioned why we were even doing this. He stated he did not like smaller lots and he wanted the 2050 plan to stay like the 2035 plan. Mr. Clinkenbeard said small lots were relative and he clarified that the medium density lot sizes here are 15,000 to 19,000 square foot lots.

Mr. Bergman stated he did not like the change at all and he could not support it. He likes the 2035 plan and does not like the change to the middle section of the 2050 plan. He stated he would like to see the 2050 plan stay the same as the 2035 plan.

Mr. Bergman then referred to the corner of Highway F and Capitol Drive and stated there were 30,000 cars a day on Capitol Drive. He was under the impression that it was going to be more of a commercial/industrial use, but Mr. Clinkenbeard confirmed that it was always planned as a residential area to the east and the south. There is also no good access to that corner. Discussion then took place regarding possible access points.

A motion was made and seconded (B. Bergman, S. Sullivan) to adopt the 2035 plan as the 2050 plan.

Motion Passed: 7-For, 0-Against.

5. Further Discussion and Possible Action on the Rezoning of Land Outside the F-1 Floodplain Delineation on the Gaggl Property Located at W275 N2337 Oak Court From Rs-2 Residential to A-2 Agriculture in Keeping with their 11+ Acre Parcel (PWC 0935979004)

Mr. Clinkenbeard referred to the Gaggl's waste management plan and stated they have contracted with someone to take their waste (see files).

There are also signatures from the neighbors saying they have no problem with the Gaggls having goats on their property.

The Gaggls came to the Plan Commission in April for a rezoning of their property from Rs-2 to A-2. The A-2 zoning would allow them to have animals on their property. The goats would have to be fenced within the area in the north part of the lot as mapped.

Chairman Bierce felt it was heavy-handed to force the Gaggls to ask permission of their neighbors. He then referred to the waste management plan and stated their plan was for three goats, although the recommendation was for five goats. He questioned if they would have to submit a new waste management plan if they increase the amount of goats. Ms. Gaggl stated they chose three goats because they want to make sure they can handle three before they go up to five. The calculation for the waste management plan would not change much for five goats.

A motion was made and seconded (S. Sullivan, D. Linsmeier) to approve the rezoning on the Gaggl property located at W275 N2337 Oak Court from Rs-2 Residential to A-2 Agriculture.

Motion Passed: 7-For, 0-Against.

6. Further Discussion and Possible Action on the Petition for a Conditional Use Permit of Wolfgang and Alexandra Gaggl to be Allowed to Keep Miniature Goats on their Property Located at W275 N2337 Oak Court within a Platted Single-Family Subdivision (PWC 0935979004)

Mr. Clinkenbeard stated if the Plan Commission decides to allow the Gaggls to have goats, then they need to decide what conditions to put on them. The Gaggls noted that they had not yet seen the final seven conditions. They were then given a copy.

Mr. Bergman questioned why they were limiting the area that the goats could be in to only outside of a floodplain. Mr. Clinkenbeard clarified that we are keeping them out of the wetland part of the floodplain.

The waste pick-up was questioned and the Gaggls noted that the “hutch” area will be kept clean, but the waste is mostly odorless. They will also rotate the electrical fencing on the property every two to three days in order to not overload any area with waste or have over-grazing.

There are only “does” (nannies) because males smell too strongly. They will not be neutered, but will be de-horned.

A motion was made and seconded (C. Coursin, C. Wunder) to allow the Gaggls to keep miniature goats on their property located at W275 N2337 Oak Court with the seven conditions noted on Mr. Clinkenbeard’s report (see file).

Motion Passed: 7-For, 0-Against.

7. Discussion and Action Regarding the Site and Building Plans for a Storage Building on the new Payne & Dolan Asphalt Plant Operation Site on Bluemound Road (PWC 0968999)

Carl Theisen with Payne and Dolan noted that this was at the old Spancrete site and is part of the new asphalt plant site being constructed. Mr. Clinkenbeard described the site and location.

The purpose of the building will be partly for the lab associated with the asphalt plant, which will occupy a 40 x 60 portion of the 60 x 100 structure. The balance of the structure will be used for parking of the CAT loader that feeds raw aggregate into the asphalt plant. They would like to keep their equipment out of the elements whenever possible.

The siding on the building is proposed to be laminated insulated metal panel. Mr. Theisen felt it looks good and solves a lot of the problems with insulation. The roof will be a standing seam metal roof.

Mr. Clinkenbeard discussed the plant and the storm water management facilities, as well as the site plan. He questioned when they would like to open the operation and Mr. Theisen stated they'd like to be operational before the snow flies so that next spring they can shut down the other plant.

Mr. Sullivan stated he did not see an issue with it, as it was basically a garage, but he did not want to set a precedent with it. He felt it was a unique opportunity to try this out.

Mr. Clinkenbeard commented that the maintenance of the building would be a concern. Mr. Theisen noted that they would not allow parking up tight to the building, to avoid any cars hitting it.

Mr. Bergman saw it as a metal building and not indicative of what we've allowed in the past and he felt he could not support it. He did not want to set a precedent.

Mr. Coursin felt you would have to look past all of the other buildings and an asphalt plant to see this building. They should not have to make an architectural statement.

A motion was made and seconded (C. Coursin, D. Linsmeier) to approve the site and building plan for a storage building on the Payne & Dolan asphalt plant site with the stipulation that a 15 foot greenspace and landscape plan be submitted to Mr. Clinkenbeard at a later date.

Motion Passed: 6-For, 1-Against (Bergman).

8. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Conceptual Approval of Proposals to Address the Chicken Issue

Mr. Clinkenbeard stated he has come up with a proposal for allowing chickens in more than one residential district. He noted that there are proposals for Rs-1, Rs-2, which is a two-acre lot, and Rs-3, which is a one-acre lot. Rs-4 is a half-acre lot, and he stopped there, as putting chickens in anything less than a half-acre lot would not work.

Mr. Clinkenbeard then reviewed the ordinances of several neighboring communities

(see file) on the subject.

Mr. Coursin felt in Rs-2 they could have up to ten, but he suggested adding five feet from property line or 25 feet from residences in all of them. Mr. Clinkenbeard recommended it be in the buildable area. Mr. Coursin suggested ten chickens in two acres, five on one acre, and four on a half-acre.

Ms. Wunder and Mr. Janka did not agree and felt they could agree to one in Rs-1 and Rs-2, but not in Rs-3 or Rs-4. Mr. Janka suggested going to two acres with a conditional use. He questioned how the City would enforce construction of the coop and fence. He also questioned how the feed would be contained.

Mr. Sullivan felt a half-acre lot was too tight and he agreed with two acres.

Mr. Linsmeier felt there was a potential on one acre, but he would have a problem with the half-acre on Rs-4.

Chairman Bierce suggested the Plan Commission decide which residential districts to allow chickens in before they decide what the rules in those districts will be. The Plan Commissioners were in agreement with Rs-1 and Rs-2, but not Rs-3.

Mr. Bergman felt this wasn't a problem with anyone and he questioned why we were creating an ordinance. He suggested leaving it like it is and having Clink continue to say no and not enforce it.

The districts were narrowed down to Rs-1 & Rs-2 and at the next meeting the Plan Commission will decide if they agree with what Clink has come up with.

9. Adjournment

A motion was made and seconded (C. Wunder, T. Janka) to adjourn the meeting at 8:10 PM.

Motion Passed: 7-For, 0-Against.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ami Hurd
Deputy Clerk