

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor McAleer called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

ROLL CALL

Present

Mayor Ed McAleer
Kent Attwell
Larry Chapman
Dirilee Curtis-Costa
Michael Frede
Kevin Fitzgerald
Beth Leonard
Roger Dupler, Planner
Gina Gresch, Clerk-Treasurer
Tom Maney, Building Inspector
Tim Schuenke City Administrator

Absent

PUBLIC HEARING #1: DELC 0786.998. CONSIDERATION OF A MAJOR CHANGE TO CHRIST THE KING LUTHERAN CHURCH'S EXISTING CONDITIONAL USE TO REPLACE EXISTING WOODEN SIGN PANEL WITH AN INTERNALLY LIT SIGN. OWNER/APPLICANT: CHRIST THE KING LUTHERAN CHURCH. AGENT: FRED ZABEL, BADGER LIGHTING & SIGNS. THIS PROPERTY IS CURRENTLY ZONED RE-1.

Mayor McAleer opened the Public Hearing at 7:01 p.m.

Fred Zabel, Badger Lighting & Signs, explained the proposal included an internally lit monument sign with the upper portion of the sign having an aluminum face. He noted the top portion of the sign was the only illuminated part of the sign and included four lines of changeable copy illuminated with a 120 volt system.

Jenny Pope, 1236 Mill Road, expressed her reservation for having an internally lit sign for the church as she thought this type of signage was inconsistent with other signage in Delafield and this would set a precedent for other illuminated signage. Further, she thought this type of signage would detract from the existing signage in the City.

Tom Kricklow, 362 Nickelby Court, clarified the Church was replacing a deteriorating 17 year old externally lit sign with an internally lit sign. He stated he had been come before the Plan Commission a year ago with a sign request and at that time had been informed it would be difficult to obtain approval for an LED style light and the sign would be nicer looking if it was rounded at the top. As a result, he decided to wait until the Sign Committee met and reviewed issues related to this type of signage. He

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

spoke to a member of the Sign Committee who thought LED signage was not appropriate for the City of Delafield. Since that time, the rounded top had been added to the signage and changes made. He thought the proposed sign was nice looking and was well within the City restrictions as it was less than half a foot candle at the right of way and would be a big improvement from current signage on site.

D. CURTIS-COSTA MOTIONED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:05 P.M. K. ATTWELL SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC HEARING #2: ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT. CONSIDERATION OF A ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT AMENDING CITY OF DELAFIELD MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTER 23, RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION STORMWATER MANAGEMENT. THIS AMENDMENT MAY HAVE AN EFFECT ON ALL PROPERTY WITHIN THE CITY.

Mayor McAleer opened the Public Hearing at 7:06 p.m.

Mike Court, City Engineer, explained this ordinance amendment was presented to the Public Works Committee and Common Council earlier this year, with submission to the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) following for revision purposes. This ordinance amendment related to the MS4 requirements for the DNR's annual stormwater permit. DNR Staff had completed revisions and Staff recommended the Commission and Council take action to adopt the amendment.

K. ATTWELL MOTIONED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:08 P.M. D. CURTIS-COSTA SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

1. APPROVE PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF OCTOBER 15, 2008

D. CURTIS-COSTA MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 24, 2008 AS AMENDED ON P. 2, PARAGRAPH 2, SENTENCE 1, CHANGE THE WORD "REVIEW" TO "RIVER" ON PAGE 11, PARAGRAPH 1, SENTENCE 10, CHANGE "B. LEONARD DID NOT FEEL" TO "B. LEONARD FELT" AND ON PAGE 16, UNDER THE ITEM LISTED AS P. 96, PARAGRAPH 1, SENTENCE 2, CHANGE THE WORDS "UNDEVELOPED PLANS" TO "FUTURE PLANS". K. ATTWELL SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

2. DELAFIELD CITIZEN'S COMMENTS PERTAINING TO SUBJECTS ON THIS AGENDA

Linda Holton, 485 Lillian Court, stated she had sent an email to City Staff regarding her concerns about the Red Prairie Development. In addition, she wanted to express concern for the Delafield Lakes project. She was concerned the developer could turn the project into a satellite clinic or residential

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

outpatient clinic and she suggested the Commission and Council work to prevent that from happening. She questioned the number of physicians and kind of practice the office would supply to area residents. If it was to be more than an eating disorder clinic, she requested area residents be made aware of the purpose. Furthermore, she expressed concern about the driveway entrance onto Genesee Street as it did not seem large enough to accommodate the anticipated traffic from a doctor's office. Also, a clinic and driveway in this location would allow additional traffic through the area and onto Genesee Street.

Jason Steiner, speaking on behalf of approximately 30 tenants in the City's business district; wanted to publicly support the Red Prairie project. He stated each week conversations were heard regarding the lack of foot traffic to downtown Delafield and he thought the Red Prairie project would bring business to downtown. He believed the use of the land to be sensible and he urged the Commission to think about supporting job growth and economic stability for and within the City.

Robert Kuhn, 498 Lapham Peak Road, stated he had three concerns about the Red Prairie project. First, he was concerned about the potential drain on the water for the area and thought if the project did cause it to drain some reimbursement to the City would be in order. Secondly, he was concerned about the drainage in the area as he thought with such a large parking lot, a catch basin should have to be installed. Also, he thought the project developers should have to work with the DNR to construct a larger catch basin further south of the site. Third, he stated people came to the City and surrounding area because of its beauty and while he had only seen certain architectural renderings in the local newspapers, he thought the building lacked originality. He thought the project should include a beautiful building that would sit into the land in an original manner.

At this time, Mayor McAleer explained he had made a previous comment published in local newspapers that was not appropriate related to the consideration of the Red Prairie project. He stated the City would remain committed to being thorough in its review of the project with attention to detail. The planning process would allow for thorough review and with all the public input that could be had. Despite the process of consideration of the project to be lengthy, he was committed to following and abiding by that process.

Scott Esser, 1646 Brookside Court, stated he was not opposed to the Red Prairie project as long as the project met zoning requirements. He stated he was not in favor of Tax Increment Financing (TIF) as the property was not blighted, nor an eyesore. He noted if the developers were not able to pay for it, the taxpayers should not be required to either. He would like to see viable development and to make sure water, sewer, and traffic control would all be handled as well. He wanted to see traffic move in and out of the area expediently should the project be allowed to be located within the City.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Julie Dewey, Indian Springs Drive, was concerned about the proposed TIF district and was adamantly opposed to it. Further, she did not like the concept of rerouting Indian Springs Drive to accommodate the Red Prairie project as she did not like the idea of having to drive through the complex to get to the freeway. She found it disrespectful to local residents of Indian Spring Drive that this was being considered in this manner as it would develop a hardship for current residents of the City.

Jerry Holton, 485 Lillian Court, wanted to see what the developers would propose in the Red Prairie project and he welcomed them to the City. He agreed with J. Steiner regarding the need for a viable business district; however, he thought it prudent to examine the details in the matter. He was opposed to the TIF district as he thought Red Prairie was a profitable company and, as such, they could and should pay their own way. He did not think the City should be put at risk for a project such as this one and if the company believed it could be viable in the City, it should finance its own property with its own money.

D. CURTIS-COSTA MOTIONED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC COMMENTS PORTION OF THE AGENDA AT 7:22 P.M. K. ATTWELL SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS OF PRELIMINARY PUBLIC SAFETY CAMPUS DRAWING & DOWNTOWN CAMPUS DRAWING BY BRAY ARCHITECTS

Matt Woelfert, of Bray Architects, was present and shared preliminary architectural drawings of the Public Safety Campus and Downtown Campus. He explained concept drawings were depicted for the Commission, noting the Department of Public Works (DPW) building remained the same as the last viewing. The City Hall and Library building were new as the members of the project had not yet had the opportunity to view them before this evening. He stated Bray Architects would continue to work toward the goal for final submittal to the Plan Commission in the upcoming months so detailed components would not be found in these concept drawings. He then introduced Steve Kunen, of Bray Architects, and Jim Romanowsk, of Yaggy Colby, a civil engineering firm working with Bray Architects on the project, noting they were present to provide the rationale and reasons for the site driven decisions for the project.

Steve Kunen explained in consideration of the project, it was important to determine characteristics of the City of Delafield that could be incorporated into architectural elements to maintain the look and feel of the City with the new buildings. Upon review, he found Delafield to be historic in character, with stone buildings, pitched roofs, with a pedestrian friendly atmosphere including planters, paving, places for people to congregate outdoors and pathways to nature areas. He noted Delafield was "all about 'Lake Country'" with boathouses, boats, lakes and sunshine.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

S. Kunen reviewed the concept drawings for the Police and Fire building at the Public Safety Campus. He noted the shape of the building was due to various topographic constraints found on site as well as the necessary access to the site itself. He explained it seemed to have a jagged floor plan that fit into the site very well and would allow all necessary actions on site to take place.

J. Romanowski explained the parking on the Public Safety campus. With the proposed layout, it would be possible to have parking in front of the building that would extend into the WE Energies right of way with additional parking along the westerly property line. Staff parking would be located behind the building at the very north end of the site. This proposed layout would also allow for a stormwater facility on the east side of the site to allow water quality and quantity to be maintained on site. Overflow parking could connect to the existing parking near the stormwater pond. He noted the extensive impervious surface was necessary to accommodate trucks and equipment as well. He noted the inclusion of pedestrian access via bike path and sidewalk to the site, as well as a boathouse look utilizing a base of natural looking stone around the building. He went on to note the cement-board material (giving the look of stone) and cedar shake elements on the building. The tipped roof line at various access points to the building provided natural lighting to the garage and hose tower. The glass doors were designed to showcase the fire engines within the building.

M. Woelfert shared the proposed cement-board material with the Plan Commission noting its durability, affordability and similarity to Hardi-Plank products.

With regard to the addition to the current DPW building, S. Kunen stated there was not a lot of additional information to add as it was obviously a building attached to a metal building. While this would be a utility building, T. Hafner had received comments about the back of the building as it was visible from the trail area and thus design elements had been added for visual interest at the back. Hardi-Plank material would be added to soften the elevation and the brick base would continue to the bottom.

Next S. Kunen shared renderings of the proposed Library and City Hall building, noting the parking was important in the rear of the building as it allowed the focus to be on the streetscape in front of the building.

J. Romanowski noted several challenges to the site including the difference of eight feet in elevation from the southerly end to the northerly end of the property. He also noted the library was proposed as one level with the southerly end of that portion of the building being approximately one foot into the grade and the north end of the building being approximately eight feet above grade. He further explained water from the building would be captured and directed into a stormwater pond on the northeastern part of the property. He showed 83 parking stalls on the back side of the building that would require future refinement. On the eastern side of the building a boulevard island was proposed with a drop box for library materials. Portions of the

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

existing library and City Hall building would remain on the site for incorporation into the new design.

S. Kunen explained that the concept for the front area took shape to accommodate grade change and provide a presence into the building. The entryway was accentuated and streetscape provided. He reviewed the pedestrian walkway area and explained he wanted to keep it that way to preserve cost in the project. Since the entry was not on axis with the main doors, a plaza area was allowed to take shape with same grade as the walkway. Pedestrians would enter the upper plaza with stairs and this would provide an opportunity to have a planter feature or other element in the plaza area. Handicapped accessibility would be found in a ramp further south on the walkway and handicapped parking spaces would be found in the back of the building to allow all persons to access the building. The new building was designed to keep the historic feel of downtown in mind with the inclusion of stone, towers, and brickwork. There was an exterior low wall to the streetscape side of the building that would have decorative balls on the top of the wall spaced evenly along the length of the building. The base of the building would have a granite veneered stone that resembled real stone with less cost and stone work. On the top of that, there would be brickwork that tied into the brick elements of the current City Hall that would remain as part of the project. Several trees were incorporated into the design to soften the existing look of the current building. While portions of the existing City Hall and Library building would remain, its purpose was to serve as a backdrop, thereby softening the look of the design without spending additional dollars to do so. The tower element in the center was created to provide an icon in the community as well as a civic presence and a building that stood for democracy and all that was Delafield.

Mayor McAleer stated he had met with a youth group recently that told him the downtown area needed a clock so he was happy to see this idea incorporated into the tower portion of the building. In response to a question, S. Kunen explained that the area around the clock on the tower would not be glass. She also explained that the building was capped with a precast stone looking material with small windows that would allow daylight into the building as more natural light yielded a decrease in electrical costs.

M. Woelfert noted the presence of Mortenson Construction representatives at this meeting in order to maintain costs for the projects. He noted to keep the proposed schedule a concept drawing had been provided this evening for review.

Mayor McAleer stated he thought the plans looked marvelous. D. Curtis-Costa and L. Chapman agreed.

D. Curtis-Costa questioned the trees along the handicapped accessible area. S. Kunen stated he thought it would be wise to include ornamental trees to provide screening from the sun in the summer. This area included a 14 foot wide space between the building and the low wall, and could easily accommodate both tree and wheelchair in the space. He also noted the trees could be lit at night to provide additional features for the building.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

M. Woelfert stated since the library had an active group in the summer, the plaza space could become a meeting area or amphitheater-type setting. The walkway was another civic place that could be utilized for outdoor use. The elements presented were deemed to be functional as well as aesthetic. He thought this was a great way to create a civic presence that worked for the downtown.

In response to a question by D. Curtis-Costa, S. Kunen explained the trees to be planted in front of the existing building would be carefully selected to draw the eye away from the building. He suggested ivy could be grown on the building to provide additional backdrop. While coniferous trees could be utilized, deciduous trees would provide a canopy to exist that would allow activity under it.

In response to a question by M. Frede, S. Kunen stated there were windows all along the front of the library intentionally placed as a desirable feature to give life to the building and allow people to see what was going on inside it.

Mayor McAleer stated he had directed the architects away from a more typical colonial look to the library as it seemed as though the City had enough of it.

S. Kunen stated the City had many different buildings styles and he would not classify all of them as colonial. He thought the proposed building reflected the iconic buildings in the downtown area.

Mayor McAleer stated he liked the entry way to the building.

K. Attwell questioned what challenges caused the proposed City Hall and Library building to be placed so close to Genesee Street. M. Woelfert explained the library was requested to be one story if feasible and it allowed the streetscape to be defined to make a presence on the site. In addition, the forward location on site allowed for potential future expansion and more parking in back. While there were no plans to expand the building further at this time, it would be sound planning for the future to keep the possibility on site with this location.

B. Leonard stated she liked the location as it reflected other downtown Delafield buildings with the buildings forward and the parking in the rear.

M. Woelfert thanked the Commission for its time and stated any further comments on the project could be shared with the Mayor or T. Schuenke.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

G. Gresch reviewed the items on the Consent Agenda. She stated Item B would need to be removed at the request of the applicant. D. Curtis-Costa requested Item A be removed from the Consent Agenda for additional discussion and consideration as well.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

K. ATTWELL MOTIONED TO APPROVE ITEM C ON THE CONSENT AGENDA. B. LEONARD SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

- a. RECOMMENDATION TO COMMON COUNCIL TO APPROVE EXTRATERRITORIAL CERTIFIED SURVEY MAP FOR MAPLE BLUFF ESTATES, W303 N2595-2623 MAPLE ROAD.

In response to a question by D. Curtis-Costa regarding the primary environmental corridor in the area, R. Dupler explained the Town of Delafield would have jurisdiction in the project; however, the City would work to provide balance in this matter and this was only a request to approve the Certified Survey Map (CSM).

K. ATTWELL MOTIONED TO APPROVE AND RECOMMEND TO COMMON COUNCIL TO APPROVE EXTRATERRITORIAL CERTIFIED SURVEY MAP FOR MAPLE BLUFF ESTATES, W303 N2595-2623 MAPLE ROAD. K. FITZGERALD SECONDED THE MOTION. D. CURTIS-COSTA STATED A FEW OF THE PROPOSED UNITS WERE WITHIN THE ENVIROMENTAL CORRIDOR. R. DUPLER STATED SPECIFIC FOOTAGE WAS ALLOWED FOR CLEARING IN THIS MATTER. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

- b. **TAX KEY 0798.036.001, 0798.037.001 & 0798.038.001, 711 WELLS STREET, DELAFIELD.** OWNER: VILLARD COMPANY, INC. APPLICANT: JOHN KNOWLTON. APPLICANT SEEKS APPROVAL OF A BUSINESS PLAN OF OPERATION FOR A RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE OPERATIONS CENTER, INLANTA MORTGAGE. HOURS OF OPERATION ARE MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY 8:00 A.M. TO 6:00 P.M. WITH 4 PART-TIME EMPLOYEES AND 28 FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES.

This item was removed from the Consent Agenda at the request of the applicant.

- c. **TAX KEY 0793.014.008, 637 GENESEE STREET, DELAFIELD.** OWNER: ACE DELAFIELD PROPERTIES, LLC. JASON STEINER. APPLICANT: DELAFIELD FINE FOODS. LLC. APPLICANT SEEKS APPROVAL OF A BUSINESS PLAN OF OPERATION FOR A GROCERY STORE, DELAFIELD FINE FOODS. HOURS OF OPERATION ARE SUNDAY THROUGH SATURDAY, 8:00 A.M. TO 9:00 P.M. WITH 20 PART-TIME EMPLOYEES.

Approved. See above.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

4. FINAL CONSIDERATION, APPROVALS, PREVIOUS APPROVAL

- A. **TAX KEY 0786.998, 1600 GENESEE STREET, DELAFIELD.** OWNER: CHRIST THE KING LUTHERAN CHURCH. APPLICANT: BADGER LIGHTING & SIGNS. APPLICANT SEEKS DETERMINATION OF MINOR VERSUS MAJOR CHANGE TO THE CONDITIONAL USE TO REPLACE EXISTING SIGNAGE AND RECOMMENDATION TO COMMON COUNCIL OF THE SAME.

R. Dupler explained that at the last meeting, the Commission decided this item should be a major change to the Conditional Use for the site due to the issue of photometrics. The applicants had returned with evidence demonstrating compliance of a half foot candle at the right of way line as requested. In order to mitigate any future concern related to the lighting for this sign, F. Zabel had committed to installation of a control allowing the lighting to be dimmed after the light had been installed.

In response to a question, Mayor McAleer explained the neighboring resident across from the Church did not have an issue with this request.

R. Dupler questioned F. Zabel as to which example provided in the photos submitted with the application would most resemble the proposed signage. F. Zabel stated St. Gregory's Church sign was most similar to the type of manufacturer. In response to a question by D. Curtis-Costa, S. Zabel further explained the reader board would have light passing through it in a manner similar to St. Gregory's with readings that were approximately 0.3 foot candles at the lot line located approximately 30 feet away. Since the closest lot line was approximately 42 feet from the signage at Christ the King, he thought it made the example comparable. He stated he could add a vinyl back to the sign as well that would aid in restricting light flow through the signage if needed.

K. Attwell questioned whether the City had standards in place for cases such as this one and noted it seemed as though a method of measurement had been utilized in the Village Square issues to attempt to mitigate lighting concerns. R. Dupler explained a measurement of 0.5 foot candles at the lot line had been utilized in other cases and would be applicable in this case.

Mayor McAleer stated a rheostat would be utilized in the sign for dimming purposes and a film applied to deter light in this case.

In response to a question from D. Curtis-Costa, F. Zabel stated the signage would measure 0.5 or less foot candles at the lot line and would be measured prior to bringing the sign to the site. He would personally

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

guarantee the signage would not exceed the 0.5 foot candle restriction the City had utilized in the past once the sign was in place.

M. Frede stated, with regard to the comment made by J. Pope, R. Dupler had noted the sign would be noticeable for people traversing Genesee Street in that area and he thought the Commission would like to make sure mechanisms were in place for reduction of lighting if objections were raised after installation.

R. Dupler noted restrictions on back lit signs were only in the downtown district and the request should be considered on its own merits in this case.

T. Maney explained residents had been notified within 300 feet of the Church and no issues had been heard on this matter.

M. FREDE MOTIONED TO APPROVE A MINOR CHANGE TO THE CONDITIONAL USE TO REPLACE EXISTING SIGNAGE AND RECOMMENDATION TO COMMON COUNCIL OF THE SAME, SUBJECT TO THE PETITIONER HAVING FLEXIBILITY FOR CHANGE IF THE LIGHTING WAS OBJECTIONABLE AFTER BEING INSTALLED. L. CHAPMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. B. LEONARD QUESTIONED WHETHER THIS MOTION WAS TO BE A MINOR OR MAJOR CHANGE TO THE CONDITIONAL USE. MAYOR MC ALEER STATED HE THOUGHT THIS CASE SHOULD BE A MAJOR CHANGE IN ORDER TO REMAIN CONSISTENT WITH OTHER CASES LIKE THIS ONE. DISCUSSION ENSUED REGARDING WHETHER THIS ITEM CONSTITUTED A MAJOR OR MINOR CHANGE TO THE CONDITIONAL USE FOR THE PROPERTY. B. LEONARD STATED SHE WAS CONCERNED ABOUT SETTING A TREND FOR SIGNAGE IN THIS CASE AND R. DUPLER'S COMMENTS WOULD IMPACT HER VOTE IN THE MATTER. MAYOR MC ALEER CLARIFIED WITH R. DUPLER THAT IF A RHEOSTAT WAS UTILIZED IN THIS CASE, THE LIGHT COULD BE DIMMED AT THE REQUEST OF THE CITY AFTER THE LIGHTING WAS INSTALLED EVEN IF IT WAS CONSIDERED TOO BRIGHT WITH PHOTOMETRIC READINGS OF 0.5 AT THE LOT LINE. T. MANEY STATED THE CHURCH WAS ATTEMPTING TO BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR IN THIS CASE AND HE DID NOT ANTICIPATE THIS BEING A PROBLEM. MAYOR MC ALEER CALLED THE QUESTION. D. CURTIS-COSTA REQUESTED A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT BE MADE TO THE MOTION TO LOWER THE FOOT CANDLES FOR THE SIGNAGE IF DEEMED NECESSARY AT A FUTURE DATE AND TO HAVE THE MANUFACTURER OF THE SIGN GUARANTEE THE PHOTOMETRIC READINGS OF 0.5 FOOT CANDLES AT THE LOT LINE. M. FREDE AMENDED HIS MOTION TO INCLUDE APPROVAL OF A MAJOR CHANGE TO THE CONDITIONAL USE TO REPLACE EXISTING SIGNAGE AND TO ALLOW BACKLIT SIGNAGE NO HIGHER THAN A 0.5 FOOT CANDLE

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

READING AT THE LOT LINE WITH RECOMMENDATION TO COMMON COUNCIL OF THE SAME, SUBJECT TO THE PETITIONER REDUCING THE LIGHTING IF THE LIGHTING WAS OBJECTIONABLE AFTER BEING INSTALLED. T. MANEY EXPRESSED CONCERN FOR HAVING A POLICY MADE IN MAKING A MOTION CONTINGENT UPON POSSIBLE FUTURE COMPLAINTS. MAYOR MCALEER AND L. CHAPMAN AGREED. M. FREDE WITHDREW HIS MOTION. L. CHAPMAN WITHDREW HIS SECOND. D. CURTIS-COSTA WITHDREW HER REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT.

M. FREDE MOTIONED TO APPROVE A MAJOR CHANGE TO THE CONDITIONAL USE TO REPLACE EXISTING SIGNAGE AND RECOMMENDATION TO COMMON COUNCIL OF THE SAME. L. CHAPMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

- B. **TAX KEY DELC 0793.001.001 THROUGH 0793.001.006, 415 GENESEE STREET, DELAFIELD. OWNER: DELAFIELD COMMERCE CENTER CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION. APPLICANT: KRIS TIMMER. APPLICANT SEEKS APPROVAL OF A MINOR CHANGE TO THE CONDITIONAL USE TO ALLOW FOR A CAMPUS WIDE DIRECTIONAL SIGN PROGRAM.**

R. Dupler explained the Steiner Group had submitted a proposal for directional signage for the Delafield Hotel campus. The site was governed by Conditional Use and typically had three requirements for signage. Consideration needed to be given to the request posing a major or minor change for the use and he also noted the sign requirements had been waived in other signage requests in the City. Staff recommended the request be a minor change at this time.

K. ATWELL MOTIONED TO APPROVE A MINOR CHANGE TO THE CONDITIONAL USE TO ALLOW FOR A CAMPUS WIDE DIRECTIONAL SIGN PROGRAM FOR TAX KEY DELC 0793.001.001 THROUGH 0793.001.006, 415 GENESEE STREET, DELAFIELD. OWNER: DELAFIELD COMMERCE CENTER CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION. APPLICANT: KRIS TIMMER AND TO WAIVE THE 3 SIGNAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR THIS DISTRICT. B. LEONARD SECONDED THE MOTION. R. DUPLER PROVIDED CLARIFICATION TO B. LEONARD REGARDING THE PHOTOS SUBMITTED WITH THE APPLICATION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

- C. **TAX KEY DELC 0794.952, 322 W. ENTERPRISE ROAD, DELAFIELD. OWNER: WE ENERGIES. APPLICANT: VERIZON WIRELESS C/O VELOCITEL, INC. APPLICANT SEEKS APPROVAL OF A SITE PLAN**

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AMENDMENT TO PLACE A GENERATOR AND APPROPRIATE SCREENING.

R. Dupler explained the communication service provider returned to the Commission with an amended petition to accommodate an emergency generator. This request had been modified to accommodate existing easements and lease agreements with the providers on the tower. As a result, the previously approved generator location had been shifted to the west of the existing building. The final configuration was an L shape rather than a linear extension of the existing building. All proposed equipment and materials were the same as previously approved. In addition, the proposed location was not visible to the public.

D. CURTIS-COSTA MOTIONED TO APPROVE A SITE PLAN AMENDMENT TO PLACE A GENERATOR AND APPROPRIATE SCREENING FOR TAX KEY DELC 0794.952, 322 W. ENTERPRISE ROAD, DELAFIELD. OWNER: WE ENERGIES. APPLICANT: VERIZON WIRELESS C/O VELOCITEL, INC. AS A MINOR CHANGE TO THE CONDITIONAL USE FOR THE SITE AND RECOMMEND TO COMMON COUNCIL THE SAME. K. ATTWELL SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. SIX WERE IN FAVOR. B. LEONARD OPPOSED. MOTION CARRIED.

B. Leonard stated if other requests were not screened, she wondered why this required screening at this time. R. Dupler explained a request could not be encumbered by a previous petition. K. Attwell stated the concern was noted and City Staff could work this out with the applicant.

- D. **TAX KEY DELC 0807.985.016, 3820 KETTLE COURT EAST, DELAFIELD. OWNER: CITY OF DELAFIELD. APPLICANT: VERIZON WIRELESS C/O VELOCITEL, INC. APPLICANT SEEKS APPROVAL OF A SITE PLAN AMENDMENT TO PLACE A GENERATOR AND APPROPRIATE SCREENING.**

R. Dupler explained the communication service provider returned to the Commission with an amended petition to accommodate an emergency generator. This request had been modified to accommodate existing easements and lease agreements with other providers on the tower. As a result, the previously approved generator location had been shifted to south of the western building. Previously the generator had been approved for location between the two buildings.

K. ATTWELL MOTIONED TO APPROVE A SITE PLAN AMENDMENT TO PLACE A GENERATOR AND APPROPRIATE SCREENING FOR TAX KEY DELC 0807.985.016, 3820 KETTLE COURT EAST, DELAFIELD. OWNER: CITY OF DELAFIELD. APPLICANT: VERIZON WIRELESS C/O VELOCITEL, INC. L. CHAPMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. B.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

LEONARD CLARIFIED THERE WAS NOT A CONDITIONAL USE IN THIS MATTER. R. DUPLER EXPLAINED THE ZONING DISTRICT AND THAT IT WAS NOT NECESSARY. **THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.**

- E. DISCUSSION AND ACTION OF REQUEST FROM REINHART ATTORNEYS AT LAW FOR CHANGE OF LAND USE FOR FOXWOOD ESTATES ADDITION #1 WITHIN THE AREA OF THE LAKE COUNTRY CORRIDOR COMPACT, AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE SAME.

R. Dupler explained the subject development is located outside the City, but is governed by the Lake Country Corridor Compact. This inter-municipal agreement involved the City of Delafield, Town of Delafield, and Village of Hartland. The three communities forged this agreement in order to preserve the heritage of the Highway 83 corridor and to regulate land use changes with the potential to impact each community across the formed boundary. Foxwood Estates falls within this zone within the Village of Hartland. Originally it was planned for development that would produce multiple residential units and the associated traffic. Three years ago, the land owner petitioned the City, Town, and Village to change the intended land use from a multi-family complex to a 12 lot single family development. That request was granted as it was perceived as a reduction in density and intensity of use. The current request would constitute a reversal of that decision and would reintroduce a multi-family development.

Mayor McAleer stated he had history with this issue as he was a signatory of the Lake Country Corridor Compact that had allowed 160 lots on this site. Given the recent history in this case, he did not have a problem with the request as the court case for this matter had allowed 12 units and the Council and Commission had accepted that. The petitioner now requested 48 units and he did not think this was an issue of concern. He stated he did not agree with the previous Council decision and R. Dupler's recommendation in this matter.

K. ATTWELL MOTIONED TO THE DENY REQUEST FROM REINHART ATTORNEYS AT LAW FOR CHANGE OF LAND USE FOR FOXWOOD ESTATES ADDITION #1 WITHIN THE AREA OF THE LAKE COUNTRY CORRIDOR COMPACT, AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE SAME. D. CURTIS-COSTA SECONDED THE MOTION. M. FREDE CLARIFIED THE HISTORY OF EVENTS IN THIS CASE. MAYOR MC ALEER STATED THIS SET OF PROPERTIES WOULD ABUT THE TOWN OF DELAFIELD, NOT THE CITY. D. CURTIS-COSTA STATED IT WOULD IMPACT THE CITY AS A RESULT OF ITS LOCATION AS ITS RESIDENTS WOULD UTILIZE THE ROADWAYS AND BUSINESSES IN THE AREA. M. FREDE WAS CONCERNED ABOUT

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

INFRINGING ON THE DESIRES OF ANOTHER GOVERNING BODY IF THE PETITIONER WAS WITHIN THE GOVERNING AGREEMENT AND THE OTHER GOVERNING BODY AGREED WITH THE PROPOSED ACTION. B. LEONARD THOUGHT THE AGREEMENT SHOULD BE HONORED AS IT WAS SOMETHING AGREED TO BY ALL PARTIES INVOLVED. SHE THOUGHT THE MAYOR WAS REMAINING CONSISTENT WITH THE ORIGINAL AGREEMENT IN THIS MATTER. D. CURTIS-COSTA STATED SHE DID NOT WANT TO INCREASE TRAFFIC ONTO HIGHWAY 83 AND APPROVE A HIGHER DENSITY IN THAT AREA. MAYOR MC ALEER STATED THE TOWN HAD APPROVED THIS REQUEST AND WOULD BE MORE SIGNIFICANTLY IMPACTED THAN THE CITY IN THIS CASE. IN RESPONSE TO A QUESTION BY M. FREDE, R. DUPLER STATED THE VILLAGE OF HARTLAND DID DE-MAP THE CUL DE SAC AND VACATED THE RIGHT OF WAY. **THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. THREE VOTED IN FAVOR. L. CHAPMAN, K. FITZGERALD, M. FREDE AND MAYOR MC ALEER OPPOSED. MOTION FAILED.**

K. FITZGERALD MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE REQUEST FROM REINHART ATTORNEYS AT LAW FOR CHANGE OF LAND USE FOR FOXWOOD ESTATES ADDITION #1 WITHIN THE AREA OF THE LAKE COUNTRY CORRIDOR COMPACT, AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE SAME. L. CHAPMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. B. LEONARD EXPRESSED CONCERN THAT THIS DECISION WOULD IMPACT AN EXISTING NEARBY NEIGHBORHOOD AND REGARDLESS OF HOW THE OTHER MUNICIPALITIES VOTED ON THIS MATTER; SHE THOUGHT THE NEIGHBORHOOD SHOULD BE HEEDED IN THIS CASE. K. ATTWELL QUESTIONED WHY THE DENSITY SHOULD BE INCREASED IN THAT AREA IF IT WAS NOT NECESSARY. HE FURTHER STATED THE DEAL HAD CHANGED IN THE LAST TEN YEARS WITH REGARD TO HOUSING NEEDS. **THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. FOUR WERE IN FAVOR. K. ATTWELL, B. LEONARD, AND D. CURTIS-COSTA OPPOSED. MOTION CARRIED.**

5. PLANS OF OPERATION, SIGNAGE AND SITE PLAN.

- a. **TAX KEY 0624.001, CTH B (OAKWOOD DRIVE), NASHOTAH.** OWNER/APPLICANT: SUE & MIKE MICHELS. APPLICANT SEEKS APPROVAL FOR A BOATHOUSE AS RECOMMENDED BY LAKE WELFARE COMMITTEE.

R. Dupler explained the history of the request, noting the proposed boathouse was located at the south end of Nashotah Lake in the newly approved subdivision on Oakwood Drive. This would be new construction and would be in association with a new home. He noted the architecture to be consistent with the new home; however there were three issues requiring change. First, the boathouse was wider and larger

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

than ordinance allowed. Second, the maximum square footage allowed had been exceeded. In addition, the exact location of the boathouse had not yet specifically been illustrated in relation to the ordinary high water line. The proposed boathouse also included a bathroom and did not comply with the revised boathouse ordinance requirements. A detailed list of plants or plans for the rain garden was also required for submission. Staff recommended denial of the request due to the area and width of the boathouse.

Jim Siepmann, landowner for the lots on Upper Nashotah Lake was present and spoke on the Michel's behalf. He stated the Michel's were purchasing two of the three lots that border Valley Road. He noted the location of the lots on a map for the Commission as well as the proposed boathouse location on the shoreline. He stated the request tried to take into consideration the old and new ordinances with regard to the location of the boathouse. The Michel's were awaiting the DNR's location of the Ordinary High Water Level (OHWL) mark for exact placement of the boathouse. Once determined, the boathouse would be located five feet back from the OHWL mark. He also explained the lot's shoreline was approximately 360 feet long, of which 30 of it would be utilized in a boathouse to hold a pontoon boat and ski boat if allowed. To make the boathouse only 20 feet wide would not accommodate the storage of these two boats. He noted the topography had been taken into consideration as well with the design and location of the boathouse as it would include the boathouse being constructed into the side of a naturally occurring hill at the shoreline. Water would be directed from the roof of the boathouse into a rain garden on the site that would also collect the water from the lake side portion of the house. Construction materials for the boathouse were comprised of masonry brick with corners of stone with an open railing concept on the top. In this way, there would be a viewing corridor over the top of the boathouse to the lake. J. Siepmann further explained the hope was to store two boats and have a bathroom on the interior as the Michel's had three young children and without a bathroom, the lake would be the most likely alternative as the house was located several feet back from the shoreline. In addition, with a bathroom facility in the boathouse, fish could be cleaned lakeside as well. Natural native plantings would be used to soften the corner of the building and they were intending to leave a majority of the shoreline naturalized with only minimum turf at the shore.

Mike Michels, owner, was present and stated he had enjoyed lake living for 20 years. All lakes had character and he did not want to change the character of this lakeshore with its naturalized shoreline. He believed by building a boathouse into the hillside, the boats would be hidden from view as he was opposed to seeing canopies with boat lifts and piers. In general, he stated, he would much prefer the look of boathouses on lakes as they fit into the hills and he wanted to eliminate any manmade

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

appearance on the lake. He was requesting only 30 feet of shoreline out of 360 feet. The boathouse would be located right in the middle of the property on the shoreline. J. Siepmann owned the property to the right and he owned the lot to the left. Despite a future sale of either lot, the boathouse would not be visible from either location.

Sue Michels, owner, stated they were placing the house further away from the lake than necessary and as a result it would be a long way to go from the lake for the children to utilize the bathroom.

Discussion ensued regarding the necessary compliance given the pending process of approval for the boathouse ordinance. R. Dupler explained the petitioners were informed months ago that the request was not compliant.

T. Maney stated he had worked with the Michels on this matter and he thought in this case, the City should grant an exception. In addition, the Michels were meeting the 5 foot setback and 35 feet requirements necessary.

K. Attwell stated, while it exceeded the revised boathouse code recommendations, the Lake Welfare Committee (LWC) had reviewed and approved the request as it was interpreted as 30% in this case.

K. ATTWELL MOTIONED TO APPROVE A REQUEST FOR A BOATHOUSE AS RECOMMENDED BY LAKE WELFARE COMMITTEE FOR TAX KEY 0624.001, CTH B (OAKWOOD DRIVE), NASHOTAH. OWNER/APPLICANT: SUE & MIKE MICHELS. L. CHAPMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. B. LEONARD QUESTIONED WHETHER OTHER APPLICANTS HAD BEEN TOLD THEY NEEDED TO COMPLY. K. ATTWELL STATED THIS WAS THE FIRST REQUEST IN SEVERAL YEARS LIKE THIS AS LOTS WERE NOT TYPICALLY BIG ENOUGH TO ALLOW THE SIZE REQUESTED AND HE THOUGHT THIS WAS WHY THE LWC HAD UNANIMOUS APPROVAL OF THIS REQUEST. T. MANEY STATED THE COMMISSION WOULD NOT BE SETTING A PRECEDENT DUE TO THE TIMING OF THE REQUESTED APPROVAL OF THE BOATHOUSE ORDINANCE REVISIONS AS THIS WAS A ONE TIME REQUEST. S. MICHELS STATED THERE WAS 100 FEET OF SOLID WOODS BETWEEN THE BOATHOUSE AND THE NEIGHBORS SO IT WOULD NOT BE VISIBLE FROM THE OTHER LOTS. R. DUPLER SUGGESTED THE MOTION ALSO BE MADE CONTINGENT UPON STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF A RAIN GARDEN WITH A SPECIFIC PLANT LIST. K. ATTWELL AMENDED HIS MOTION TO APPROVE THE REQUEST FOR A BOATHOUSE AS RECOMMENDED BY LAKE WELFARE COMMITTEE FOR TAX KEY 0624.001, CTH B (OAKWOOD DRIVE), NASHOTAH. OWNER/APPLICANT: SUE & MIKE MICHELS, CONTINGENT UPON MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE BUILDING INSPECTOR IN

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

THIS CASE, AS WELL AS STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF A PLAN FOR A RAIN GARDEN. L. CHAPMAN SECONDED THE AMENDED MOTION. FIVE WERE IN FAVOR. D. CURTIS-COSTA AND B. LEONARD OPPOSED. MOTION CARRIED.

- b. **TAX KEY 0788.024, 1445 MILWAUKEE STREET, DELAFIELD.**
OWNER: FRED & SUE WEIGEL. APPLICANT: R.I. CONSTRUCTION, ROMAN IWINSKI. APPLICANT SEEKS APPROVAL FOR A BOATHOUSE AS RECOMMENDED BY LAKE WELFARE COMMITTEE.

R. Dupler explained the applicant sought approval for a boathouse for Fred and Sue Weigel. The boathouse was an existing boathouse that complied with the existing boathouse ordinance and included no proposed changes to the size and location of the structure. Remodeling of the boathouse was slated to match the architectural style of the newly remodeled home. The proposal included replacement of the exterior siding and sill, addition of stone "piers" along the top of the boathouse, a new door, and removal of two existing windows. He noted Staff had requested submission of plans for a rain garden; however, upon review, the plan submitted did not conform to the new ordinance regarding species mix.

K. ATTWELL MOTIONED TO APPROVE A REQUEST FOR A BOATHOUSE AS RECOMMENDED BY LAKE WELFARE COMMITTEE FOR TAX KEY 0788.024, 1445 MILWAUKEE STREET, DELAFIELD. OWNER: FRED & SUE WEIGEL. APPLICANT: R.I. CONSTRUCTION, ROMAN IWINSKI, CONTINGENT UPON STAFF APPROVAL OF A REVISED RAIN GARDEN PLAN. M. FREDE SECONDED THE MOTION. B. LEONARD QUESTIONED THE SPECIES UTILIZED IN THE PLAN. R. DUPLER STATED ONLY ONE PLANT SPECIES CURRENTLY COMPLIED. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

Mayor McAleer recessed the meeting at 8:52 p.m. and reconvened at 9:00 p.m.

- c. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON DOWNTOWN DIRECTIONAL SIGNAGE CONCEPT.

Without objection from the Commission, Mayor McAleer skipped Item 5C at this time and moved to Item 6a on the agenda.

6. PRELIMINARY

- a. **TAX KEY 0799.973, INDIAN SPRING ROAD & CTH C, DELAFIELD.**
OWNER/APPLICANT: RP TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT GROUP.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

APPLICANT SEEKS REVIEW OF A PRELIMINARY CONCEPT PLAN FOR RED PRAIRIE CORPORATION.

Rob Gerwitz, of RP Technology Development Group, stated he was present to provide information on the Red Prairie concept plan for Red Prairie Corporation. Red Prairie wanted the City to consider development for a group of parcels located on the southeast portion of the intersection of Interstate 94 and Highway C in Delafield. He understood this was the beginning of a process of consideration in this matter and Red Prairie representatives would continue on in that process.

R. Gerwitz stated he had been in Delafield for 9 years and had worked on one other company of this size and caliber in those years. He thought the project request was important to the community in the best interests of all and that it included great potential for the City for commerce, housing and community involvement in addition to the obvious property tax revenues. He thought other companies like this one would follow if allowed to develop within the City. He requested comment and direction from the Commission regarding specific information needed and then he introduced Greg Mar, of Red Prairie, Bill Mitchell from the Waukesha County Economic Development Corporation and George Irwin from RP Technology, who would provide closing comments and TIF discussion.

Greg Mar explained he had worked for Red Prairie for 11 years and noted his purpose for this meeting was to provide an introduction to the company called Red Prairie. He shared the history of growth and innovation, noted its financial strength in the world market, with global operations and support for many global businesses. He noted Red Prairie's software systems provided inventory of the world's best assets, delivery of products, schedule of workforce personnel and provided revenue increases with cost reduction. He named several leading companies, such as Wal-Mart, Ford, Dell, and others that utilize Red Prairie services and technology. Next, he provided a detailed chronology of the company's growth since 1975 and noted Red Prairie to have 350 employees locally with many other employees in numerous cities throughout the world. He anticipated workforce growth in the local and global markets in the upcoming years as the company continued to expand its role as a solution provider for business. R. Gerwitz noted Red Prairie representatives viewed the proposed project as a partnership with the City and the development group. All would need to be happy with the agreement in order for it to come to fruition and he visualized Red Prairie as being a lead anchor attraction to a growing business park for the City.

Bill Mitchell, of Waukesha County Economic Development Corporation, indicated support for the project and stated he wanted to be clear that the County is behind the project for enthusiastic reasons. While he had

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

recently presented information on three other projects, none were as complete with economic development drivers, high-end talent, intellectual capital and exporting as Red Prairie. He noted Red Prairie had all four components of success and this would be the type of business the City would want to attract and retain for the area. It would provide multi-million dollar revenues and growth. To that end, the Waukesha County Executive Board of Directors urged the Commission and City to continue to support the project.

Bob Goehner, President of Briohn Building Corporation, was also present. He shared a concept for the project noting projects of this magnitude start with a concept drawing. He appreciated the concern and interest shown in this project.

B. Goehner then provided a computerized tour of the site, noting it would be located on the southeastern corner of Highway C and Interstate 94 off of Indian Spring Drive and just to the south of the Park and Ride site. The property included 24 acres with a pond to handle regional stormwater runoff from the development that would back up to Lapham Peak. Red Prairie thought connectivity to be very important on numerous levels, such as between the Red Prairie buildings and downtown, I-94 and business corridor; the site and Lapham Peak with walkways within the business park itself. Red Prairie representatives had spoken with the DNR and Department of Transportation (DOT) about having a trail way down the easterly side of the road all the way to Lapham Peak.

With regard to the business park, the proposed Red Prairie building would have a 30,000 square foot footprint with four floors and underground parking. Development would allow for mixed use office space and essential services such as physicians, attorneys, and chiropractors throughout the 63,000 square feet found in three additional buildings. There would be two ponds on site with and incorporation of the ponds into landscape amenities. The back two buildings on site would be approximately 53,000 square feet each and would include office space.

In meetings with the DOT, the DOT expressed concern about the close proximity to Indian Spring Drive, bridge repairs and expansion, and the possible removal and relocation of the Park and Ride. Discussions were held regarding the relocation of Indian Spring Drive and the Park and Ride into the proposed business park as well as construction of a roundabout on site. The bridge over I-94 would require widening with hill reduction and reconstruction on site also a necessity. There would be a roundabout within the proposed business park and a trailhead was planned in the business park that would connect to other regional trails.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Red Prairie's building would prominently be constructed on the northeastern corner of the site out of masonry and glass or brick and glass. B. Goehner stated the whole concept was designed to attract and retain high tech industries and allow for growth to the interstate corridor. He then discussed the computerized view from the fourth floor of the building, noting it would overlook Lake Nagawicka in the distance and the site had been chosen for its location and proximity within the community. He noted Red Prairie was mindful of technology in its design and wanted the building to function in an energy efficient manner without transmissions from the freeway. LEEDS (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) certification was anticipated for this project as well.

T. J. Morley of Epstein Architects explained Red Prairie to be a dynamic technology driven firm with design elements incorporated into the architectural renderings that would allow it to showcase its flexibility to handle growth and adapt to technology needs, with energy efficiency and environmentally responsibility. He noted the building would not be anything like those found in downtown Delafield and would be different in how it handled daylight and views and yet would provide connectivity through pedestrian areas. He noted care would be taken to work within the site and leverage the amenities on the site to enhance the value of the site.

George Irwin, Principal of the development team assembled for the project, thanked the Commission for its time in this matter. He would like to have an affirmative recommendation to move forward with a public hearing. He wanted it made clear the project would not require any rezoning as his team would work within the zoning of the existing property. He planned to provide a Planned Unit Development (PUD) concept and hoped to have flexibility in assembling more than one building with several parties expressing interest. The project plan and site plan included 300,000 square feet with a mixed use of essential services within the buildings and he thought this plan fit well within those categories. Open space was consistent with zoning and he hoped for a recommendation by the Commission for a public hearing.

Mayor McAleer stated he thought the TIF information was intertwined in this and while the information could be shared at this time, the Council would hear and decide upon the financing element of the project. R. Dupler explained the site held 24.74 acres and was zoned B-5 and identified on the Master Land Use plan with the Office land use designation. The proposed project would be pursued as a PUD which would necessitate the consolidation of all parcels into one as well as the vacation of Tomahawk Trail. In compliance with the long range plans of the DOT, Indian Spring Drive was shown as being rerouted through the site and accessed Genesee Street at the crest of the hill. To

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

accommodate the necessity of driveway placement, the road was shifted off of the B-5 zoned parcel southward into the RE-2 zoned district. There is no proposed development in the RE-2 parcel and the road location was permissible. While bike and pedestrian trails had not yet been submitted for review, it seemed as though end users would have connections to those types of uses both on and off the site. Utilities that would service the site included a communal single well with sanitary service being provided by Del-Hart through directional boring beneath I-94 and implementation of a lift station. As proposed, the building layout offer six unique buildings totaling 347,000 square feet. The resulting Floor Area Ratio (FAR) was 0.322; the allowable FAR in the zoning district was 0.50. With regard to the parking on site, R. Dupler explained the propped parking ratio was approximately 85% of the required amount of parking. Additional parking spaces might be realized as the process moved forward, however, it might be prudent to consider "land bank parking" in order to assure adequate parking in the event of a change of user.

The height of the building was that of a four story building and R. Dupler did not anticipate this conforming to the height limitation of 45 feet. With a setback increase, future plans should identify the mandatory dimensions for this allowance. He stated he would like to see the plans for connectivity on the site as well as buffering and screening efforts from the east and south side of the site.

Mayor McAleer stated he thought, based on presentation, Red Prairie seemed to be a quality company. He noted there was acreage between the site and Lapham Peak and he wanted to make sure that can RP Development Group could partner with the City to allow for appropriate use to take place as well as having the Master Plan preserved and memorialized for the future.

G. Irwin stated he could not control the properties that were not under his governance; however, he was willing to work with the City but did not see the project being able to hinge on what happened south of the site.

In response to a question by D. Curtis-Costa, G. Irwin explained the land to the south of the property was owned by NSL Holdings and also held the original detention pond. The Park and Ride had not yet been relocated in the plans as the team needed to meet with the DOT after receiving affirmative response from the City in the project process. G. Irwin also stated there was enough interest in the project by other parties that discussions about the site could be had. He had extensive experience in commercial development and he would make sure the City had little to no risk in the matter. He stated the business park would fill with job growth and the Red Prairie team was committed to getting the project going.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

G. Irwin also stated he would submit detailed landscape plans, including a tree inventory and building elevation plans prior to a public hearing as well as supplying information on the Park and Ride relocation and materials for stormwater runoff. He anticipated, with approval to begin the process, that the Red Prairie building would be occupied in two years time.

R. Dupler stated many of the standard engineering materials utilized for analyzing the site would also yield environmental impacts and necessary actions to be had for maintenance of environmental corridors.

B. Leonard stated she was concerned about relocation of Indian Spring Drive as the neighborhood it served viewed its relocation as complications with accessibility. She questioned alternatives for secondary access to serve the neighborhood to the east as well as the roundabout planned for the business park. B. Goehner stated the DOT is requesting relocation of the roadway as it would be a safety issue for people attempting to access the freeway.

K. Fitzgerald expressed concern about the PUD zoning issues for the site and for future expansion. R. Dupler explained the project would yield a nicer plan with greater flexibility in place as a result of this zoning.

D. Curtis-Costa expressed concern for the widening of the bridge especially in trying to envision four lanes coming into two lanes near the downtown area. G. Irwin noted the DOT wanted to see the bridge widened to better accommodate connectivity of pedestrians and motorists as long range planning needs could be better realized. A traffic study would identify if needed currently or in the future.

John Stigler, of Jahnke & Jahnke, stated he had documents dating from 1996 noting that Indian Spring Drive should be moved. Right of way might need to be acquired near Stocks Drive and he thought the County would echo the same concerns and the project should anticipate heavy costs for resolution of this issue. G. Irwin stated a traffic analysis should help to bring clarity to the bridge issues.

G. Irwin stated, in terms of a TIF plan, preliminary cost information made it clear that the project could not be supported without a TIF. He stated this was based on information provided to him and his years of experience in this field. He noted the project would qualify under TIF requirements. As for who does the work and the financial development costs, a financial consultant retained at the developers expense would provide answers for all concerned parties on this matter. He thought approximately \$4.5 million would be needed; however, it could be slightly more once the project estimates were available.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

He went on to explain there are two kinds of TIF's, one developer funded and one City funded. With a developer funded TIF, the developer would pay for costs out of pocket. Once the project was approved, the TIF amount would go back to the developer as reimbursement for the costs out of pocket. This was considered a longer life TIF and the property would be removed from the tax roll for a longer period of time. With a City financed project, the City would be able to borrow the money cheaper with the same guarantees and considerations in place. The estimated TIF amount would be outlined with no monies being expended until the project was built. The City would reimburse the cost incurred and a shorter TIF would result. G. Irwin stated this was the preferred method in this case as it would allow the project to be constructed faster and would bring the TIF expenditures concluded quicker.

T. Schuenke stated, it would be prudent for Red Prairie representatives to answer the question of why a very rich company needed help to complete the project for area residents in order for the TIF to be supported as Red Prairie representatives desired.

G. Irwin stated he thought there was a wonderful opportunity before the City and in order to delve into the competitive leasing rate, the project would need infrastructure that would be supported through a TIF. Basically, he explained the developer would obligate himself to do certain things and then the City would borrow the money to pay the developer for those expenses. He stated he was asking for a recommendation for a public hearing and recommendation to Council on this matter as well as consideration being given to having personnel hired to discuss TIF possibilities.

R. Dupler questioned whether any other information was deemed necessary from the Commission for submission in consideration of this project.

Discussion ensued regarding the need for rain gardens for the site and pervious pavement feasibility. K. Attwell questioned whether there were any concerns for emergency personnel as well as any additional sewer service required. While sanitary sewer service had been discussed as part of future Smart Growth endeavors, R. Dupler did not believe the petitioner should be encumbered by it.

K. ATTWELL MOTIONED TO SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING ON THIS MATTER FOR DECEMBER 2, 3, OR 4TH, 2008 TO BE HELD AT CUSHING SCHOOL, SUBJECT TO SCHOOL AVAILABILITY. L. CHAPMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. M. FREDE QUESTIONED WHETHER THERE WERE ANY OTHER TOOLS FOR FUNDING WITHOUT HAVING A TIF THAT COULD BE UTILIZED IN THIS CASE. T.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

SCHUENKE STATED HE WAS NOT AWARE OF ANY; HOWEVER, THE TIF WAS WIDELY USED IN ALL PARTS OF THE COUNTRY FOR PROJECTS SUCH AS THIS. BOND COUNSEL WOULD NEED TO MAKE A FINAL DETERMINATION REGARDING THE USE OF A TIF IN THIS MATTER. **THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.**

- b. DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL TIF FINANCING FOR RED PRAIRIE DEVELOPMENT.

This item was discussed as part of Item 6a.

- c. **TAX KEY 0798.055, 737 MAIN STREET, DELAFIELD.**
OWNER/APPLICANT: RED TOP CAPITAL, LLC. TOM ROLFS.
APPLICANT SEEKS PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION FOR A HOME BUSINESS CONDITIONAL USE.

K. ATTWELL MOTIONED TO APPROVE A REQUEST FOR PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION FOR A HOME BUSINESS CONDITIONAL USE FOR TAX KEY 0798.055, 737 MAIN STREET, DELAFIELD. OWNER/APPLICANT: RED TOP CAPITAL, LLC. TOM ROLFS AND SET A DATE FOR PUBLIC HEARING ON THIS MATTER OF DECEMBER 17, 2008. B. LEONARD SECONDED THE MOTION.
D. CURTIS-COSTA READ THE CITY CODE INTO RECORD RELATING TO HOME BUSINESSES AND NOTED THAT ONLY ONE EMPLOYEE COULD RESIDE OUTSIDE THE RESIDENCE. R. DUPLER CLARIFIED T. ROLF WAS THE SOLE EMPLOYEE AND THE BUILDING WOULD BE MAINTAINED FOR RESIDENTIAL USE. **THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.**

- d. **TAX KEY 0798.965.003, GENESEE STREET, DELAFIELD.** OWNER: DELAFIELD LAKES. APPLICANT: JOEL MCCORMICK. APPLICANT SEEKS REVIEW OF A REVISED PRELIMINARY CONCEPT PLAN FOR DELAFIELD LAKES, A MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT.

Joel McCormick, was present and shared architectural renderings for Randy Bruce of Knothe and Bruce Architects. He also introduced Kurt Johnson. J. McCormick shared revisions to the multi-use project noting there was an efficient layout proposed with the western most building turned to the south and a fire access from Oneida Street added to the plans. Neighboring properties to the site were also added to the drawings as requested. He noted the new layout of the site and that the density had been reduced. He shared a draft Master Plan noting one parcel of land now worked with the other. While he was sharing preliminary information related to the easterly parcels, he wanted approval at this time only for the western parcel. Original elevations were shared and he introduced Kent Johnson to the Commission.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Kent Johnson, of Johnson Design in Oconomowoc, explained he was asked to provide consulting advice on the project. His experience in the area included Town Bank as well as local 7-11 stores and other various buildings. When asked to consult on this project, he noted the building was generic in architectural details, so he provided some elements that made it look more consistent with the City of Delafield, such as balconies, dormers, hip roof with horizontal siding, gable peaks and brickwork on the bottom of the building.

Discussion ensued regarding the use of brickwork throughout the entire building or left as proposed. L. Chapman noted everyone would have a different opinion and while he thought maintenance was a lot less and it looked nicer, J. McCormick would need to make that determination.

K. Johnson noted the locations of design details on the building as proposed including raised panel columns with brick on the bottom of the building, clad windows, horizontal siding, entry pieces of board and batten with accent colors being different than the trim color.

K. ATWELL MOTIONED TO APPROVE A REVISED PRELIMINARY CONCEPT PLAN FOR DELAFIELD LAKES, A MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT FOR TAX KEY 0798.965.003, GENESEE STREET, DELAFIELD. OWNER: DELAFIELD LAKES. APPLICANT: JOEL MC CORMICK AND A PUBLIC HEARING BE SCHEDULED ON THIS MATTER. K. FITZGERALD SECONDED THE MOTION. J. MC CORMICK EXPLAINED THE TWO UNITS OF OFFICE SPACE IN THE ORIGINAL PLAN WOULD BE LOCATED IN ONE OF THE CORNERS OF THE BUILDINGS. R. DUPLER NOTED THE REQUIRED INCREASE FOR PARKING SPACES SHOULD THIS USE COME TO FRUITION. DISCUSSION ENSUED REGARDING WHO HAD ARCHITECTURAL CONTROL IN THIS CASE. B. LEONARD CLARIFIED THE REQUEST FOR APPROVAL. R. DUPLER EXPLAINED THE PETITIONER HAD RETURNED WITH A REVISED PLAN THAT WAS COMPLIANT WITH EXISTING ZONING. WHILE DUPLEX LOTS HAD BEEN IDENTIFIED, HE ANTICIPATED THOSE WOULD ALSO BE SINGLE FAMILY UNITS IN THE FUTURE. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

7. ZONING AND ORDINANCE REVISION

- a. DISCUSSION AND ACTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE COMMON COUNCIL TO AMEND CITY OF DELAFIELD MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTER 23, RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION STORMWATER MANAGEMENT.

This item was not discussed at this meeting.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

- b. RECOMMENDATION FROM LAKE WELFARE COMMITTEE TO ADOPT ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT FOR SECTIONS 17.22 AND 17.24 RELATED TO THE BOATHOUSE CODE, AND RECOMMENDATION TO COMMON COUNCIL OF THE SAME.

This item was not discussed at this meeting.

- c. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON SIGN COMMITTEE SIGN ORDINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATION TO COMMON COUNCIL OF THE SAME.

This item was not discussed at this meeting.

- d. DISCUSSION AND ACTION TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 2008-35, RESOLUTION AMENDING THE LAND USE PLAN OF THE CITY OF DELAFIELD, FOR THE CITY OF DELAFIELD PUBLIC SAFETY CAMPUS LANDS

B. Leonard noted the wording on the resolution presented was incorrect and required correction.

B. LEONARD MOTIONED TO HAVE THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION REWORDED TO INDICATE PLAN COMMISSION APPROVAL, AND RECOMMEND TO COMMON COUNCIL APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION NO. 2008-35, RESOLUTION AMENDING THE LAND USE PLAN OF THE CITY OF DELAFIELD, FOR THE CITY OF DELAFIELD PUBLIC SAFETY CAMPUS LANDS. K. ATTWELL SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

8. HEARING DATES

- A. WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2008 AMENDING CITY OF DELAFIELD MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTER 17, SECTION 17.33(5) WHICH ADDS TWO ADDITIONAL CRITERIA BY WHICH THE PLAN COMMISSION CAN EVALUATE PROPOSED PLANS OF OPERATION.

This item was not discussed at this meeting.

9. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

- A. WORKING LANDS CONNECTION LOCAL LAND USE WORKSHOPS

This item was not discussed at this meeting.

- B. DISCUSSION OF STAFF REVIEWING BUSINESS PLANS OF OPERATION

This item was not discussed at this meeting.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

10. BUILDING INSPECTOR'S REPORT

T. Maney stated the total number of permits to date were 27, plus 3 occupancy permit. There were no permits for new single family homes this month.

11. BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS.

The following appeals were noted.

A. OCTOBER 23, 2008 HEARINGS SCHEDULED:

1. DELC 0788.997; APPEAL OF ANDREW & BARBARA JOHNSON (OWNERS) FOR PROPOSED REBUILDING OF SHED AT 1133 MILWAUKEE ST, PERTAINING TO SECTION 17.39(11)(H) REGARDING MINIMUM INTERIOR SIDE YARD REQUIREMENTS.
2. DELC 0752.022; APPEAL OF MICHAEL SCHUETTE (OWNER) AND JODY RYG (AGENT) FOR PROPOSED ENCLOSING OF 2ND FLOOR DECK AREA INTO MASTER BEDROOM AT 2710 BURRIES RD. PERTAINING TO SECTION 17.39(9)(G) REGARDING SHORELINE SETBACK REQUIREMENTS, SECTION 17.39(9)(I) REGARDING INTERIOR SIDE YARD REQUIREMENTS AND SECTION 17.39(9)(M) REGARDING FLOOR AREA RATIO ALLOWED.

12. CORRESPONDENCE

None noted.

13. ADJOURNMENT

K. ATTWELL MOTIONED TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 29, 2008, PLAN COMMISSION MEETING AT 11:03 P.M. B. LEONARD SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

Minutes prepared by:

Accurate Business Communications, Inc.