

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

In the absence of Mayor Craig, P. Schuman was acting Chairperson and called the meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

ROLL CALL

Present

Phil Schuman
Chrys Mursky
Mike Court
Marty Sawall
Beth Leonard
Roger Dupler
Matt Carlson
Ellen O'Brien

Absent

Mayor Paul Craig
Dick Kuchler

Also Present

Mark Sewell, City Attorney

1. FINAL CONSIDERATION, APPROVALS, PREVIOUS APPROVALS

- a. **TAX KEY 797.979, MAIN STREET AND LAPHAM PEAK ROAD, DELAFIELD.** APPLICANT'S AGENT: ROD CARTER. APPLICANT: TRILLIUM DEVELOPMENT, LLC. APPLICANT SEEKS FINAL APPROVAL OF A GENERAL DEVELOPMENT FOR A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AND CSM.

P. Schuman stated that because this was a continuation of last month's meeting, there would not be any citizen's comments; these comments were taken last month. The Plan Commission will present a recommendation to the Common Council and any citizen who wishes to speak on this item can speak at the Common Council meeting.

Rod Carter was present at the meeting. He distributed a handout that he had prepared comparing where Trillium Development was compared to the City in terms of recommendations after the last meeting. This document also had responses from the Developer to City Staff on their recommendations. He stated that Staff recommended approval with the following conditions:

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

Park Structure in the Common Open Space of the Project – R. Carter stated that they did not have any objection to adding a gazebo to the open space.

Upgrade of the Trail System to Hard Surface Path – R. Carter stated that they were prepared to offer this to the City.

Addition of Pavement & Landscaping to the Parking Lot on the Property – R. Carter stated that they are prepared to do this.

Dedication of that Parking Lot – R. Carter stated that this is an issue that they are pondering. Trillium is willing to enter into a long term lease with the City for nominal consideration. He was concerned about discussing the consideration of paying for the parking lot if the lot was dedicated. He stated that a long term lease would ensure the continuation of the goal of using it as a parking lot as opposed to some sort of future development that might not be harmonious with Trillium's development. They asked that the Plan Commission recommend to the Council that as part of the Developer's Agreement there be a long term lease with some kind of nominal consideration to keep the parking lot a parking lot.

Approval of the Project with +/- 20 units – Trillium was originally at 32 units and they have reduced it to 25 units. This is a PUD. They are looking at what is allowed under the yield plan. R. Carter stated that they would be willing to make a further concession in that the 25 units would not exceed the .20 FAR calculations.

Neighbors across from the Exit Point – This comment originated from the citizen comments. Trillium is willing to provide for landscaping either in the form of actual plantings or landscape allowance to the homeowner(s) recognizing that headlights may create a problem.

R. Dupler reviewed his report from the last meeting. He stated that the Petitioner was present at the last meeting for a public hearing despite not garnering this body's approval of a concept plan by latitude afforded to them in the ordinance. The City has not actually come to an agreement on many of the basic issues. The Plan Commission's recommendation will be forwarded to the Common Council. A CSM was prepared to consolidate the parcels into one parcel and has been reviewed. There are some minor issues that need to be resolved if the project continues. This site has been identified for four units/acre which could potentially amount to 56.9 units. However, there is an R3 zoning that is a bit more restrictive. In order to develop in R3 zone they have 100' wide lots, 10,000 sf area in those lots. The Petitioner was required to produce a yield plan to demonstrate their ability to achieve a base density in compliance with that R3 district standard. This information was provided approximately six months ago. A copy of that initial plan of staff's review was distributed to the commissioners. It identified the maximum potential legal lot count on the site being 17 lots. The

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

difference between this yield plan and that presented by the Petitioner is that the Petitioner's revised yield plan identifies 20 lots – they pick up an additional three lots by extending a cul de sac back into the corner. This amounts to 139' beyond the maximum cul de sac length. The difference between R. Dupler's recommendation and that being proposed is the density bonus that has been considered by the Plan Commission – increasing it to 20 single family lots based on their yield plan. The FAR and the intensity of use was also considered. He would not consider the agreement of having .20 FAR a concession – they are offering to downsize the size of the buildings, but the number units and intensity of the use of the site is still five units higher than what should be afforded them. The setbacks are addressed by sensitive uses of garage placement and building placement. The setbacks for the rear and side-yards, the building separation is proposed at 20'. In order to comply with ordinance, it would have to have a 32' building separation. The Fire Department did not have a problem with the 20' building separation and this should be considered. The rear setback underlying zoning requires a minimum 16' setback. R. Dupler thought that a 30' setback would make for a better living environment. In last month's report from R. Dupler, he mentioned that they were required to have a surrounding 30' setback around the entire PUD – this is not the case in this instance. It appears that the Petitioner has made some considerations.

Attorney Sewell distributed a synopsis of the ordinances. He reviewed the role of the Plan Commission. The criteria for consideration of application for a planned unit development (set-up for an R3 zone) was reviewed. The purpose of a PUD is to enable a developer to have greater flexibility in planning for land uses and site design than would be permitted under standard zoning provisions. There are some general criteria that are specific to a PUD:

1. The character and the intensity of the proposed development must be compatible with the physical character of the site.
2. The existing mature vegetation and nature topography will be preserved to the greatest extent possible.
3. The character and the intensity of the proposed development must be compatible with existing and planned uses on nearby and adjoining properties.
4. The proposed development must not result in a diminishment of property values of adjoining or nearby properties.
5. The existing and planned street and highway improvements are adequate to handle the projected volumes of traffic generated by the proposed development.
6. There is adequate capacity in the public sanitary sewer and stormwater system to handle projected demand.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

7. The proposed circulation system and design layout of the utilities has taken into account existing and potential streets and utility systems on adjoining parcels.
8. The extent of the paving drainage patterns or topographic modifications will not disrupt natural drainage patterns on adjoining or nearby sites or otherwise result in environmental damage to downstream areas.

There is also a density requirement. The development of the proposed PUD must also be reviewed for compliance with the following:

The planned development shall not exceed the densities permitted by the underlying zoning district. Where a proposed development project encompasses more than one underlying zoning district, the densities of the various zoning districts may be averaged (not applicable here).

Attorney Sewell stated that the important sentence is “The planned development shall not (“shall” is a mandatory) exceed the densities permitted by the underlying zoning district (R3)”.

A PUD is also a conditional use. The general criteria for conditional use approval also must be considered.

The Plan Commission shall base its determination on the effect of such grant on the health, safety, and welfare of the community and of the immediate neighborhood in which such use would be located including such considerations as:

- Compatibility with existing uses
- Problems with fire and police protection
- Traffic movement and control
- Water sanitation utilities
- Impact (aesthetically or otherwise) on surrounding property values
- Noise, dust, smoke, and odor, and
- Such other factors as may be appropriate to the granting of a Conditional Use.

In addition, the City has an ordinance that indicates that it is specifically permitted that a Conditional Use shall apply (this is a PUD, so it can vary), the existing lot with an area in the underlying zoning, yards, height, parking, loading, traffic, and highway access.

The Plan Commission must look at the purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance. The intent is to regulate and restrict lot coverage, population, distribution in density and size and locations of all structures so as to lessen congestion in and provide safety and efficiency of the streets and highways, secure safety from fire, flooding, panic, and other dangers, prevent overcrowding, avoid undue population concentration, facilitate the adequate provision of public facilities and utilities, stabilize and

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

protect property values, further conservation of natural resources and appropriate use of land, preserve and promote the beauty and environmental quality of the community, implement the community's comprehensive plan or planned components, achieve those purposes in view as set forth in 62.23.7.c (these regulations shall provide for lessened congestion in the streets, secure safety from fire, panic, and other dangers, promote health and general welfare, provide adequate light and air including access to sunlight for solar collectors and to wind for wind energy systems, encourage the protection of groundwater resources and prevent the overcrowding of land, avoid undue concentration of population, facilitate the adequate provision of transportation, water, sewage, schools, parks, and other public requirements, and preserve burial sites).

When the decision is made, it will need to be in the record why the Plan Commission believes or does not believe the development is appropriate in a way that brings the Commission's own experiences and thought processes into the decision.

It was stated that the Plan Commission had the ability to approve something with conditions that had not been represented by the Developer. The Plan Commission would be making a recommendation to the Common Council and would want to provide the Common Council with the best information possible.

In reviewing a development proposal it is accurate to say that the proposal must take into account both the zoning code and the master plan. One of the requirements of the master plan is that large parcels of property that are coming in must be developed under a PUD. The Plan Commission does not need to make a determination as to whether the PUD is the appropriate way to go about development. Attorney Sewell stated that any time you have in the Delafield code multiple units on a single lot, (a condominium is a single lot), the only way to develop condominiums in Delafield would be as PUDs.

M. Carlson stated that there were two aerial photos showing different red delineations of the site. He asked the Petitioner to sign the photo which was correct. The correct aerial photo was distributed to the commissioners. R. Dupler stated that the exhibit that identifies the existing zoning in what would be the NE corner of the site as being R4 – but the entire site is R3.

B. Leonard discussed the criteria document that the attorney distributed, particularly that the character and intensity of the proposed development must be compatible with the physical character of the site and asked for an example of what this meant. Attorney Sewell explained. Part of the Plan Commission's responsibility is to give the Common Council some guidance as to what is appropriate.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

C. Mursky asked what the two options were in terms of the park land dedication and how much dedication would there be with this amount of property. It was stated that a tree inventory was included with the materials given to the commissioners. M. Carlson stated that the City's new tree ordinance would apply. M. Court stated that in regards to the roadway width that the normal ROW is 60', the normal pavement width is 27', but can be reduced down to 24' width with Plan Commission approval (the 24' width is what is being proposed). C. Mursky asked what kind of restriction would result with on street parking with 24'. M. Court stated that there are trade-offs, i.e. less impervious area and he although he personally liked the narrower road widths, if a car was parked it would be approximately 18' wide and would be harder to get a vehicle through. C. Mursky was concerned about the road width because it did not seem that there was any provision taking into account the general public comfortably accessing the park. Connection of the bike trail to the regional bike trail was discussed. M. Carlson stated that he believed that the park land dedication would be 1/20th of an acre per unit or approximately one acre. The size of the parking lot is approximately 1.5 acres. It was clarified that it was up to the City as to whether the requirement would be actual parkland dedication or fee in lieu of. M. Carlson suggested that the parking lot be available for public parking including spill over parking for residents who lived in the neighborhood. This would give the parking lot dual use and the ownership could still lie with the Association. Discussion took place on restrictions. C. Mursky stated that she would not be in favor of going beyond the density requirement of 20. R. Dupler stated that the yield plan that identifies 17 legal lots employs more road length. In order to increase the density, the yield plan uses an extended cul de sac and shows 20 units.

B. Leonard discussed the cut-out and preplanning along Main Street. Nick Paterio responded that it was not at this time their intention to acquire or develop the lots along Main Street. M. Carlson stated that if at some point in time these parcels were acquired, the developer would have to amend the PUD and go through the approval process. B. Leonard thought that the setbacks around these single family lots were too shallow. N. Paterio addressed various setbacks within the development. Attorney Sewell stated that if the perimeter setback were to be changed, justification would be needed. N. Paterio stated that the whole plan is conformed and configured in such a way to fit with the land and the property. If something needs to be manipulated further to address abutting properties, he would be happy to adjust to accommodate the City. It was clarified that the roadway would be public.

C. Mursky addressed the vision problem when coming east on Main Street. A plan had been submitted to M. Court. There are two issues: site distance and stopping distance. To the east, the site distance is 580'. For the 25 mph speed limit, the Federal Highway Guidelines on site distance calls for 290'. This provides for almost 300' in excess to the eastern direction. To the west there is an available site distance of 400',

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

compared to 290' required, so there is 110' extra. Stopping site distance, at 25 mph stopping site distance is 155', they have 360' of stopping site distance available. At 30 mph the required stopping site distance is 200', at 35 mph it is 250', and at 40 mph it is 305' – the Developer would still be in excess. The other issue is in regard to the area where the road dips – with minor repaving to take out the high point in the road, it could be taken care of. It is an existing condition of Main Street. By correcting this problem it would help with the intersection site distance. This should be reviewed by PWC.

The location of the ingress and egress and their relation to the residents across the street was addressed. The turning movements would shine lights into the residents' homes across the street.

B. Leonard asked how much more run-off would be incurred with the development as opposed to how the land currently is. M. Court stated that the Developer would need to satisfy ordinance. They will need to reduce peak flows for different storm events and infiltrate at least 90% of the existing infiltration on the site. They will need a combination of detention and infiltration bases in the final design.

Water supply to the development was discussed. M. Carlson stated that at a minimum, they would require the Developer to design for a municipal system and show that system in the ROW within the road. The Developer stated that it was their intention to have one well per unit.

B. Leonard discussed the parcels that were not owned by the Developer. M. Carlson suggested that the Plan Commission could express its planning desires for that already developed parcel should a re-development present itself. The Plan Commission could request a land use plan – that would not require acquisition of the parcel. B. Leonard thought that it would be reasonable to assume that in some point in time that this would be part of the development and she wanted to know how many units they could put there. She wanted to see a layout of what would go here. N. Paterio displayed an earlier drawing. He stated that they are providing a road that could serve lots on their side and alleviate some of the traffic on Main Street.

C. Mursky discussed the draw down on the water level. A report from CTW was referenced. The conclusion of the report was that the affect on surrounding wells would not be noticed by the users. C. Mursky asked if it would make more sense to have a subdivision well instead of individual wells. M. Carlson stated that the City has completed a water master plan that included plans to run the city water main into downtown Delafield and the City stands by that report. The alternative would be city water.

There are trees in the SE corner of the parcel that the City Forester recommended preserving.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

Attorney Sewell stated that the City Ordinance stated that the PUD shall not exceed the densities permitted by the underlying zoning district. That is a mandatory. It has been defined that whatever is approved must meet the density units permitted by the underlying zoning districts. It was his understanding that this was without any waivers. There are a number of different ways to calculate out what the density was; there is a range of density. It was his understanding of the building inspector that the top range of density was 20 units.

The commissioners expressed that separation between the buildings should be no less than 32'.

Building materials were reviewed. The designer for Kingsway homes displayed a sampling of both the exterior and interior materials being used. The complete master plan will show that two elevations of the exact same unit are not next to each other (a non-monotony code) so that there are different elevations, different front approaches (or side approach units), etc. When you drive through the neighborhood there will be a variety. The Developer will identify certain buildings that will belong on certain lots. C. Mursky requested that this be identified on the SIP – a complete matrix of every unit with every possible option in order to evaluate compliance with bulk ordinance regulations and FAR, lot coverage, etc. M. Carlson stated that for GDP consideration there should be one developer developing these units and one builder (Kingsway Homes). B. Leonard would also like this tied in with the in-fill lot and that they meet the same requirements. Attorney Sewell stated that there may be some difficulties because it is in the condominium form of ownership rather than the standard subdivision.

B. Leonard asked if there were any safety or health concerns with the homes being so close to the power lines. C. Mursky stated that there are existing properties already along that ROW. Access to the trail was discussed. N. Paterio stated that one route would be to come up Lapham and then to come back to make the connection. Grade would be a consideration. They would be open to working with the City on this.

N. Paterio stated his response from a land planning perspective regarding the 32' building separation would be that he would be pushing. There presently is a 2 acre open space. He did not want to compromise that. The reason that the units are in proximity to each other, closer than 32', are so the fronts can fan out so as not to be monotonous and the view is modulating. He stated that the setback being considered is an arbitrary number. It is what your experience will be driving through the area, not what the arithmetic provides for. If the City were to require 32', it would compromise the fluidity and open space, some of the setback, and may end up pushing homes up into the other parcel. He asked for consideration on this. The FAR is taking the entire property minus the internal roadway and then taking the residual (net land area) and multiplying that by .20. That will support 25 homes in the configuration shown. He felt that they have been respectful of the ordinance. R.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

Dupler stated that one point of consideration is compatibility with like or neighboring developments; in the RL2 district (very close to this Development) there is an allowable 8' side yard. The 20' side yard proposed has, perhaps, a better streetscape appearance than what is along Milwaukee Street. P. Schuman stated that it looked as if it were the difference of the FAR .20 versus the underlying density in the zoning and which is dominant. N. Paterio stated that this was a transitional piece. This is a sophisticated plan that requires creativity on both sides.

R. Dupler stated that it was not unreasonable to see a proposed potential layout for the neighboring lots. The proposed road butts up along the south side of those two existing lots and essentially creates illegal lots (they would become double frontage lots). There should be due consideration as to potential development of those lots or shifting of the proposed road away from the lots. An earlier drawing where the road was held against the ROW to the south and the homes were backed up to the residences may be a better alternative. The possibility of linking the existing lots to this development would become a foregone conclusion. Attorney Sewell stated that one of the conditions for final approval (SIP level) could be that there would be some kind of concept plan regarding how other buildings of a similar nature would be dealt with in the plan. R. Dupler stated that if the option is to approve the plan, it could be made contingent upon revising the layout to reflect the Plan Commission's intentions (i.e., create additional setbacks, move the road, etc.). The creation of the illegal lots with dual frontage was discussed. M. Carlson stated that if the Plan Commission wanted to incorporate the two lots in the PUD the road would have to stay where it is. If the issue of having nonconforming lots was a bigger concern, the road would need to be moved. N. Paterio asked if the ROW could be separated from the rear of the lots so it would not be a double fronted lot. The ROW could be moved off of the lot line itself (5'-10') so that the road no longer would front directly on the lots. R. Dupler suggested that the entire spit strip be preserved as a road reservation such that at a future date that if this developer does not develop these two existing single family lots that the City would be allowed to approve a plan with ROW linkage through the spit strip to the ROW. N. Paterio stated that they would accommodate the reservation for landscaping or future access as a provision and not make it just into a spit strip.

A five minute break was taken.

C. Mursky felt that greater credence must be given to the necessity of a municipal system as opposed to individual systems. She proposed that rather than having individual wells that the Developer connects to the municipal water system at Highway 83 and 94. B. Leonard addressed the radium issue in this well. M. Carlson reviewed the history of the radium issue. It was only recently that the DNR sent the City of Delafield an action letter. The challenge of hooking the development up to the water system would be the path that would be necessary to use for

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

connecting to the water line. There are circumstances that would allow the City to use the WEPCO ROW.

Discussion took place regarding the roadway that would be located by the rear of the two lots. Attorney Sewell stated that when the City determined that it was appropriate for whatever development to take place, there could be access to that road without anyone having to purchase it.

N. Paterio stated that the density could afford a high quality development. They would like to have 25 units that are attributable to staff's work. R3 provides for provisions whether it is 17 lot yield with no attributes to the City or 20 lot yield with a deeper than average cul de sac, that also convertible into 40 or 34 count in a 2 family side by side configuration. This is not what they are proposing but has been used as a standard in the ordinance. He felt that they had a reasonable development with 25 units. This is no where near two family, the units are detached single family homes of high caliber. The density is approximately 1.75 to be used per acre.

M. Carlson stated that earlier this evening it was established that for a development to be approved it must meet the zoning code and the master plan and that even within the zoning code you can't just pick one piece of the zoning code and say that because it meets the FAR (for instance) that it meets the code. It is required to meet all of the components of the code and to have a development that is compatible with the City's master plan. The City's master plan specifically discourages additional duplex development. This is not a question about how many duplex units you can fit on this lot.

C. MURSKY MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE GDP FOR TRILLIUM DEVELOPMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: THAT THE MINIMUM DISTANCE BETWEEN THE STRUCTURES BE 30' WITH DENSITY TO BE A MAXIMUM OF 20 STRUCTURES; THAT THE AREA PRESENTLY USED AS THE PARKING LOT FOR FIREMAN'S PARK BE PAVED AND IMPROVED AND AN AGREEMENT DEVELOPED BETWEEN THE CITY AND THE DEVELOPER TO USE THAT AREA FOR CITY PURPOSES FOR PARKING; THAT THE ROADWAY CONFIGURATION BE AMENDED SO THAT THE TWO EXISTING RESIDENCES THAT PRESENTLY ARE FRONT MAIN STREET BUT ARE NOT PART OF THIS DEVELOPMENT HAVE AN AREA BETWEEN THE ROW AND THE EXISTING LOT RESERVED FOR FUTURE ROAD PURPOSES; THAT THE DEVELOPMENT BE CONNECTED TO THE CITY MUNICIPAL WATER SYSTEM; THAT THE PWC REVIEW THE ISSUES DISCUSSED REGARDING THE ROADWAY AND INGRESS/EGRESS, SIDELINES; THE FOUR STANDARD DOCUMENTS (DEVELOPER'S AGREEMENT, STORMWATER MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, AND THE DEEDS, COVENANTS AND RESTRICTIONS); THAT THERE BE A PARK STRUCTURE IN THE COMMON OPEN SPACE; UPGRADE THE TRAIL

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

SYSTEM TO A HARD SURFACE PATH AND LOOK AT THE FEASIBILITY OF PROVIDING A MORE FRIENDLY VERSION FOR THAT TRAIL SYSTEM TO BE CONNECTED TO THE DEVELOPMENT OTHER THAN GOING ONTO LAPHAM PEAK ROAD; STORMWATER INFRASTRUCTURES TO BE REVIEWED BY PWC; A 30' EXTERIOR SETBACK MINIMUM; PRESERVE THE TREES IN THE SE CORNER AS OUTLINED BY THE CITY FORESTER; THAT ANY ASPECT OF THE TREE ORDINANCE AND THE PARK DEDICATION OR FEE IN LIEU OF DEDICATION WOULD APPLY; THAT LAND USE FOR THE TWO RESIDENCES BE OUTLINED PRIOR TO THE SIP; THE ALTERNATIVE PALETTE AND MASTER PLAN FOR THE BUILDING MATERIALS; A MATRIX OF THE ULTIMATE BUILDOUTS, THE LOFTS AND THE BASEMENT BUILDOUTS. B. LEONARD SECONDED THE MOTION. B. LEONARD QUESTIONED HOOK-UP TO THE MUNICIPAL WATER SYSTEM. M. COURT ASKED IF IT WOULD BE GOING AGAINST THE ORDINANCE FOR CONNECTION WITH THE WATER BEING AVAILABLE. M. CARLSON STATED THAT THE COMMON COUNCIL HAD ADOPTED A RESOLUTION WHICH MADE CONNECTION TO THE DOWNTOWN WATER SYSTEM VOLUNTARY. IT WAS HIS INTERPRETATION THAT WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE PROPERTY THAT IS UNDER QUESTION RIGHT NOW, CONNECTION TO THE WATER LINE WOULD BE VOLUNTARY FOR THOSE WHO ARE ALONG THE LINE. IT WAS CLARIFIED THAT THE DEVELOPER WOULD PAY FOR THAT LINE. ATTORNEY SEWELL STATED THAT CONDITIONS MUST BE JUSTIFIED AS TO WHY IT IS APPROPRIATE. GENERAL DISCUSSION TOOK PLACE ON THE VARIOUS CONDITIONS LISTED IN THE MOTION. M. CARLSON STATED THAT FOR NEWLY DEVELOPED PARCELS, THE COUNCIL'S POLICY IS TO HOOK-UP TO MUNICIPAL WATER. IT WAS STATED THAT IT WOULD COST APPROXIMATELY \$300,000 - \$400,000 TO EXTEND THE WATER LINE TO THE DEVELOPMENT. B. LEONARD WITHDREW HER SECOND. P. SCHUMAN STATED THAT IT APPEARED THAT HAVING A REQUIREMENT TO HOOK UP TO A CITY WATER SYSTEM MIGHT BE FRAUGHT WITH A LOT OF CONTROVERSY IN THIS COMMUNITY. C. MURSKY STATED THAT IT WAS NECESSARY TO HAVE THIS DISCUSSION. THERE WAS NO SECOND TO THE MOTION. THE MOTION DIED.

B. LEONARD MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE ABOVE MOTION WITH THE REMOVAL OF THE CONDITION OF HOOKING UP TO CITY WATER. M. SAWALL SECONDED THE MOTION. ATTORNEY SEWELL STATED THAT IT WAS A MOTION TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WITH A LIMITATION OF DENSITY TO 20 PRIMARY STRUCTURES, A MINIMUM 32' SEPARATION, PARKING LOT THAT IS PAVED AND IMPROVED AND USED FOR CITY PURPOSES, A ROAD ROW AREA SOUTH OF THE TWO LOTS THAT ARE NOT PART OF THIS THAT ARE RESERVED FOR FUTURE ROAD ROW, PWC TO REVIEW ROADWAY INGRESS/EGRESS, THE FOUR STANDARD DOCUMENTS, THE PARK STRUCTURE, HARD SURFACE PATH, A REVIEW OF THE STORMWATER, A 30' SETBACK FROM THE

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

EXISTING RESIDENTIAL AREAS, PRESERVE THE TREES IN THE SE CORNER, AND TO ASK THAT A CONCEPT PLAN OF PROPOSED LAND USES BE PREPARED PRIOR TO THE SIP AND TO HAVE ADDITIONAL PALETTES PRIOR TO THE SIP, AND THE BUILDOUT MATRIX, AN ARCHITECTURAL MASTER PLAN FOR THE BUILDING ARRANGEMENTS, AND THAT PWC REVIEW TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENTS AND STORMWATER. C. MURSKY ASKED IF THEY COULD ASK THE DEVELOPER TO PLACE STUB OR THE SAME TYPE OF IMPROVEMENTS THAT WERE REQUIRED OF CARRIAGE HILLS IN THE EVENT THAT MUNICIPAL WATER IS AVAILABLE. M. COURT STATED THAT CARRIAGE HILLS WAS REQUIRED TO HAVE THE DESIGN OF THE WATER MAIN FOR THE FUTURE AND TO MAKE SURE THAT THERE WAS ENOUGH ROOM IN THE ROW. B. LEONARD WOULD LIKE TO SEE A DOCUMENT THAT DEALT WITH THE EAST AND WEST SIDE OF THE CITY EQUALLY IN TERMS OF ANALYSIS. B. LEONARD AMENDED HER MOTION TO INCLUDE THE DESIGN OF THE WATER MAIN FOR THE FUTURE. M. SAWALL AGREED WITH THE AMENDMENT. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

2. ADJOURNMENT

P. SCHUMAN MOTIONED TO ADJOURN FROM THE MEETING. D. KUCHLER SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 11:01 P.M.

Respectfully submitted:

Minutes Prepared By:

Marilyn Czubkowski, CMC
City Clerk/Treasurer

Accurate Business Communications LLC