

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

PUBLIC HEARINGS

CONSIDERATION OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR BLUE SPRUCE LANE,
DELAFIELD, **TAX KEY 740.996.006 AND 740.996.007**

M. Czubkowski read the notice. One written comment was received.

Greg Hemm from Cameron Scott Development – They are the developer for this project. G. Hem explained the proposed plan for the land. They would like to put two single family detached houses side-by-side as opposed to east and west. The goal would be to be able to put in a conforming city road through the eastern part of the property to gain access to the northern properties. This would a two property condo association environment. The homes were generally described, would be customized, and each would be priced between \$1.2 and \$1.5 million. The conservancy and environmental corridor areas were discussed.

Dr. John Kuglitsch, 1650 Blue Spruce Lane – He owns the property south of the proposed development. He expressed concern about the amount of area on which the homes would be built. He discussed setbacks to the north, south, and east in relation to the wetlands to the west. He felt that a precedent may be set that multi-family development on lake shore property can be done in a manner that would cause crowding and overuse of land. R. Dupler discussed the minimum side yard setbacks in an RL-1 district and RL-2 district – this proposal is in compliance with the setbacks.

Paul & Lisa Janssen, 1763 Blue Spruce Lane – This is the property just east of the proposed development. He had the same concerns as Dr. Kuglitsch. The proposed road to connect Blue Spruce and Kettle Cove was a concern of his. If the proposed road were put in, Kettle Cove would need to be upgraded to minimum City standards. The developer showed where the homes would be located on the parcels if it were done in an east-west fashion.

Jonathan Dassow, 1791 Blue Spruce Lane – He lives one house directly east of P. Janssen. He gave history of his lot and discussed the dynamics of Blue Spruce Lane in relation to the type of road that Kettle Cove is. He was concerned about traffic flow. Present performance of the road with emergency vehicles, school buses, etc. was discussed. He felt that property values would change and an evaluation should be done to determine if surrounding properties would be adversely affected. Having condos at the end of the road would change the dynamics of the area. When he built his home, they had certain expectations and they would like that to be considered. General discussion took place on possible redevelopment on the property to the north.

Don Tills, 2700 Peninsula Avenue – Was concerned about the lake. He stated that approval of this proposal would be making two lake lots instead of one. An interesting precedent would be set. He discussed the Kettle area on the lake. He stated that the Waukesha County website showed that the shaded area for this lot indicated that both lots are designated in the environmental corridor. He realized that parts of them are zoned conservancy. He urged the City to hold the developers and the future

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

landowners to use natural landscaping – it is a very natural area, and it should not have all grass around the homes.

Lisa Janssen, 1763 Blue Spruce Lane – Her biggest concern is the proposed road (dotted line on the drawing). She would like the two dead-ends to remain. Mayor Craig stated that this would be discussed.

Dr. John Kuglitsch, 1650 Blue Spruce Lane – The Kettle is 32 acres. He was not aware of possible development of land to the north of the proposed development. He fears that in the future this will be a tremendous area of condominium development. He noted that no positive comments had been heard for this development.

Mayor Craig asked if there were any further comments. There were none.

B. LEONARD MOTIONED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. P. SCHUMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Mayor Craig called the meeting to order.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

ROLL CALL

Present

Absent

Mayor Paul Craig
Phil Schuman
Chrys Mursky
Mike Court
Marty Sawall
Beth Leonard
Dick Kuchler
Roger Dupler
Tom Maney
Matt Carlson
Marilyn Czubkowski

1. APPROVE PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 30, 2005

A letter was received asking for clarification on page 7. M. Czubkowski stated that the tapes had been reviewed and necessary changes were made – a verbatim transcription of this section was done. The changes were made. The other changes that he asked to be changed were not on the tape and were not made at this time. P. Schuman did not recall the date below the 9/30/05 elevation, but just thought that there was the elevation of 1022. M. Court

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

stated that the intent was the existing 1022 and he thought that is what the correction was – the existing before any construction started on the lot of that 1022 elevation. M. Court stated that minutes as written were correct. P. Schuman was in agreement.

P. SCHUMAN MOTIONED TO APPROVE WITH THE CORRECTIONS NOTED. M. COURT SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

M. Court stated that the intent was that he (Dallen) was saying is the existing condition contour. M. Czubkowski stated that even though it wasn't on the tape, this is what the motion was. M. Court stated that it was.

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

Don Tills, 2700 Peninsula Avenue – Discussed the boathouse that is proposed at 2112 Baypoint Lane, Hartland. This is on the east side of Lake Nagawicka. The Lake Welfare Committee has been doing a lot of work with boathouses. He was speaking on his own behalf. He was concerned that boathouses fragment the shoreline, disturb it, and create a lot of hard surfaces where the water runs off right into the lake. They visually obscure the lake for the neighbors. He asked the Plan Commission how they wanted the lake to look from the lake in the future. Like an alley with garage doors and party platforms? He would prefer a naturalized shoreline with fewer structures on the edge of the lake. The size of proposed boathouse was discussed – he felt that it would be visually obtrusive. If tracks were to be used to get the boat inside the boathouse, they would need to get a DNR permit to put structure on the bed of a navigable body of water. There were no tracks on the drawing of the proposed boathouse which made him wonder what they would be doing with the boathouse.

Mayor Craig asked three times if there were any more citizens who wished to comment. There were none.

D. KUCHLER MOTIONED TO CLOSE CITIZEN'S COMMENTS. P. SCHUMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

3. CONSENT AGENDA.

IT WAS MADE AND SECONDED THE APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

- a. **Tax Key 803.991.002, 2694 Sun Valley Drive, Delafield.** Applicant: John Gibbs, Grant Sign. Applicant seeks approval of signage and recommendation to Council as a minor amendment to the Conditional Use Permit for PDQ, a convenience store, gas station business.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

- b. **Tax Key 804.994.017, 2846 Heritage Drive, Delafield.** Applicants: Thomas Carignan/Justin Jolliff. Applicant seeks approval of Business Plan of Operation and Signage for Boardwurx, a retail sporting goods store. Hours of operation are weekdays, 10:00 a.m. - 9:00 p.m.; Saturday and Sunday, 10:00 a.m. - 6:00 p.m. Two part-time and 2 full-time employees.
 - c. **Tax Key 793.014.0001 and 793.014.003, 505 Wells Street, Delafield.** Applicant: Rob Gerbitz. Applicant seeks approval of an amended business plan of operation for Lang Investments, real estate development and investment. Hours of operation are Sunday - Saturday, 6am - 6pm;
 - d. **Tax Key 798.966, 418 Genesee Street, Delafield.** Applicants: Ian Browning and Will Nourse. Applicants seek approval of a freestyle ski and snowboard event on Saturday, January 28, 2006 from 5:00 - 9:00 p.m. at the municipal parking lot adjacent to the Fish Hatchery.
4. FINAL CONSIDERATION, APPROVALS, PREVIOUS APPROVALS
- a. **TAX KEY 740.996.007, BLUE SPRUCE LANE, DELAFIELD.** OWNER: GREGG HEMM, RESOLVE PROPERTIES, LLC. OWNERS AGENT: DAVID BORCHERDING, LANDCRAFT ENGINEERING. APPLICANT SEEKS FINAL CONSIDERATION OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO COMBINE THE PROPERTY INTO ONE CSM AND CONSTRUCT 2 SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES.

Greg Hem, developer of the project was present. They felt that this plan was the best solution that they could bring to the City and for their property. Their impact on the property is no more than if they built it and asked for permits. He felt that they would be leaving it more natural than it would be through the use of traditional planning. The building to the north does not impact any trees at all. Their objective is to leave it as a conservancy and as natural as possible. Their customers would like the opportunity to have a condo association so owners do not need to take care of the exterior of their homes. This helps limit the maintenance responsibilities for the individuals living there. They anticipated their customers to be similar to the people living on the lake now.

R. Dupler stated that this was a conditional use on property to house two single family homes in one parcel. In order to accommodate this, the two parcels are being combined into one parcel. The CSM has been prepared and submitted for review. A letter accompanied his report that identified deficiencies in the CSM that should be resolved. The application for conditional use was made, the Petitioner was notified of deficiencies in that petition and they were corrected and resubmitted. The public notice was duly published. All paperwork is in line to proceed. This is a lake property that has three zoning districts assigned to it: conservancy along the lakeshore, RL1, and R1. The RL1 will accommodate 1.91 lots. The reality of two single family homes on this amount of property is within the density regulations. The boundaries of the primary environmental

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

corridor have been modified to conform to the existing wetland boundary. The area of disruption will require a Chapter 30 permit. An erosion control plan will be required as part of the Chapter 30. Lake access as originally intended, and as it is now being proposed, was reviewed. Staff was assured that no lake access would be pursued at this time. He asked that this statement be added to the CSM in order to prohibit lake access. They would like to avoid "pyramiding". The site plan accommodates potential road extension to the north as suggested by staff and agreed to by Petitioner to resolve planning issues. Kettle Cove Court is a private road and this would give the area an opportunity to be redeveloped would require a public road through that portion of the property. This petition was evaluated on its own merits. The extension was asked for as a road reservation in terms of good planning practice. He stated that the potential connection to the north would alleviate the two cul de sacs that are now deemed illegal because they far exceed the city's current standard in addition to facilitating emergency vehicle access through and around the neighborhood. Side yard and building separation were discussed. In R1 the side yard is 20' - they would ask that the site plan accommodate a 40' building separation between the homes. The homes and the road connection (if fully realized) would displace 289 caliber inches of trees. If replaced with 2.5 caliber inch replacement trees it would amount to 116 trees. The landscape plan is proposed with two trees with the balance of 114 trees equated to a cash payment in lieu of planting on site in the amount of \$42,600. There is a question of whether the petitioner should be responsible for the financial burden of the trees that might be extracted for the possible road connection. Sixty percent of the trees would be removed for the homes with the balance for the eventual connection of the road. He encouraged the Plan Commission to submit this to Public Works for review of whether the road should actually be installed now or if they would be satisfied with it being preserved with reservation for future connection. The financial responsibility of the connection road was discussed. If the Petitioner should pay for the road, a bond should be established with a sunset clause. If the road is not needed, the bond could be released. If it is determined that the road should be installed at this time, a Developer's Agreement will need to be submitted and approved by the City. The homes as proposed, they would like it to return for approval on the architecture. Building materials could be discussed, but if final architecture is coming back, guidelines could be given now. This property is identified on the Master Plan as two acre lot development. He suggested that the Plan Commission redefine the Master Plan to accommodate this land use and correct it accordingly. His recommendation would be to approve and recommend to the City Council contingent upon creating a building separation of 40', approval of building materials, returning both the initial home and the second home to Plan Commission for final approval, financial assurity for the future road extension, acceptance of cash in lieu of on-site tree replacement, revisions to the CSM as identified in the surveyor's review letter, and submittal of Developer's Agreement and Stormwater Management Agreement as determined necessary by Public Works.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

It was clarified that the City has verification from SEWRPC that the primary environmental corridor coinciding with the map showing the wetlands line has been curtailed to the actual wetland boundary. The building envelopes will be outside of the environmental corridor area.

Mayor Craig reassured the public that the Plan Commission has a list of items drawn up by the Staff that must be gone through by this body that reflects the City ordinances. M. Carlson discussed the roadway connection, the reservation of the property, and the establishment of an account – he stated that it was very similar to what the Plan Commission did with Delafield Commons. The Developer posted money in an escrow account and the City has up to ten years to determine whether or not the roadway actually is constructed. If it is not constructed, the money goes back to the developer. This could be included as a condition of the approval.

B. Leonard addressed the three different zoning districts on the parcel. R. Dupler stated that they all rule. The density of a parcel is determined by the area that is accommodated in each of the unique zoning districts. The C1 gets no credit, the RL1 is one acre with one single family home, and the balance of the property is R1. There is one home attributable to the RL1 zoning portion, none for the C1, the balance of the R1 gets the density attributable to that zoning. B. Leonard clarified that the R1 segment could handle 1.94 lots. The RL1 can also handle one as well. (2.94 lots total). B. Leonard asked if the criteria needed to be considered if it is conforming to the comprehensive plan. R. Dupler stated that the criteria came directly out of the ordinance for Plan Commission's consideration when evaluating a conditional use. A judgment must be made as to whether the development meets the conditions and the comprehensive plan. M. Carlson stated that this development proposal is for two single family homes and there are two lots that would yield two single family homes. He thought it would be a hard determination that two single family homes do not meet the City's Master Plan when the lots are there right now. B. Leonard discussed the Kettle and felt that its preservation needed to be protected. She felt that there should not be lake access or a dock put out on this property. The connector road and the nonconforming cul de sacs were discussed. She did feel it was not good planning to require the connection of the two roads especially if the density of the area to the north was not going to change. It was expressed that it was justified to put two units on this lot, but was concerned about the road connection and lake access.

D. Kuchler stated that the street was not being discussed at this time. B. Leonard did not want the approval of the CSM to be conditioned on the street. Mayor Craig stated that if there is a redevelopment on the property with the condos to the north, it would be smart planning to provide access through the area, only if it is called for. If it is called for, there is an opportunity here. It is not saying it must go through. It would have to come back to this body. M. Carlson stated that there are

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

two cul de sacs that are illegal. This is an opportunity to correct an illegal condition. To not to include the reservation of the roadway, whether or not it is connected, would be derelict. General discussion took place.

C. Mursky discussed the pier that could be attached to the property. R. Dupler stated that the Petitioner has sought the input of the DNR for an interpretation of their lake access rights. Discussion took place on lake access. There is no request for lake access at this time; however should the northern property be acquired then it would be attached to the northern property. Mayor Craig thought it was important to protect the two properties so they have no shore access. C. Mursky stated that in the future it could not be added on. It was M. Carlson's understanding that on the State Stats a property owner that owns two adjacent properties can re-divide those properties without going through the CSM process, but through a meets and bounds description. M. Court agreed and stated that they can transfer land that is adjacent. The City had asked the developer to think about consolidating the lots to clear up these issues with an opportunity for the Plan Commission to add conditions for the approval of a CSM. He does not have to do a CSM. D. Kuchler thought that to say this property would never have lake access was unreasonable. T. Maney stated that in theory the developer could buy the property to the north, tear it down, redevelop it, put two less units on the northern property, and then add these two and give them access. But the shoreline along these two properties being presented tonight would never have access because of the CSM. C. Musky was concerned about adding density from one property to density that was appropriate for another piece of property that might be added in order to increase the overall. Mayor Craig asked if the land was purchased, kept the same density, if the DNR would stop the lots from being added in terms of additional pyramiding. T. Maney stated that the properties to the north are zoned R6. It is not known whether they are built out because they are not being looked at tonight. B. Leonard would like to know what the density to the north could be before approving this. The number of piers was again discussed. The Petitioner clarified that they could actually have four slips on this piece of land based on the front right now, even on the Kettle. However, because it is a sensitive area, their discussions with the DNR, they said they would forego access from this area. He stated that they could put a pier where there currently is and the trade-off with the DNR was if you don't mess with this sensitive area because there is so much traffic coming through already because the condos to the north all access through the little channel, the disruption is there. Putting a development that would combine the current one with the north one and the access there would not negatively impact it because it is already impacted heavily. They had no problem with the condition of no slips allowed on this land at this time, but would not be in agreement that if they ever got the lands to the north that they couldn't be combined.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

C. Mursky discussed having landscaping restrictions placed on the CSM in order to have assurance there is not mowed grass down to the wetlands and to assure that there are natural plantings. R. Dupler thought that there could be a landscape preservation easement. He suggested that as an element of the landscape plan to have preservation boundary markers across the lot as part of the landscape plan.

The separation between the buildings was discussed. This was something that the Commission was very adamant about in a recent decision and C. Mursky thought that the board should be consistent with the 40' separation. The developer did not think this would be an issue. They will design the buildings to be as least disruptive as possible. It was clarified that these lots would be sewerred. D. Kuchler stated that in an attempt to not make this an official road, state that there would be no tree mitigation necessary at this point for the road area, but to deal with it when the road would come through. However, if that road is required by a future developer they would be required to pay for the mitigation.

The developer stated that they would not be interested in posting a ten year bond for that road because it is an "if".

D. KUCHLER MOTIONED TO APPROVE TO THE COMMON COUNCIL CONTINGENT THAT IT CONFORMS TO THE BUILDING SEPARATION, THAT THERE IS APPROVAL OF THE BUILDING MATERIALS TO CONFORM WITH ORDINANCES, AND THAT THE SECOND HOME WOULD RETURN, IF NOT BUILT TOGETHER, TO THE PLAN COMMISSION FOR APPROVAL, THAT THE ROAD BE DELINEATED ON THE CSM AS A RESERVE RIGHT BUT THAT THE TREES THAT WOULD BE INVOLVED IN THAT CORRIDOR WOULD BECOME THE RESPONSIBILITY OF A FUTURE DEVELOPER AS NEEDED, THAT THIS PIECE OF PROPERTY WILL NOT HAVE LAKE ACCESS, THAT THE LANDSCAPE EASEMENT IS DELINEATED ON THE CSM FOR THE WETLAND PRESERVATION WITH POSTS PUT IN TO SEE WHERE THE MARKS ARE (4X4 WOOD POSTS) WITH THE HOMEOWNER/CONDO ASSOCIATION TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTAINING THE POSTS, CASH IN LIEU OF TREE REPLACEMENT, AND CORRECTION TO THE CSM PER THE LETTER DATED DECEMBER 16, 2005, AND THE STANDARD STORMWATER AGREEMENTS, AND THAT THIS GO TO PUBLIC WORKS BECAUSE OF THE LOCATION BEING SENSITIVE. IT WAS CLARIFIED THAT AS PART OF THE MOTION THE ROAD WOULD NOT BE BUILT NOW OR BONDED FOR. C. MURSKY SECONDED THE MOTION. IT WAS CLARIFIED THAT THIS APPROVAL WAS FOR A CSM AND A CONDITIONAL USE. D. KUCHLER AMENDED THE MOTION TO REFLECT THAT ARCHITECTURE FOR THE BUILDINGS BE BROUGHT BACK. C. MURSKY AGREED TO THE AMENDMENT. ALL WERE IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

5. PLANS OF OPERATION, SIGNAGE AND SITE PLAN

- a. **TAX KEY 804.994.002, WALMART, 2863 HERITAGE DRIVE, DELAFIELD.** APPLICANT: PHILLIP FETTERS, HARRISON FRENCH & ASSOCIATES. APPLICANT SEEKS APPROVAL OF ARCHITECTURAL MODIFICATIONS TO THE SEASONAL SHOP ADDITION AT THE WALMART STORE

P. Fetters was present at the meeting on behalf of WalMart. He was before the Plan Commission on August 28, 2005. The Plan Commission at that time expressed some conditions of approval on elevations for changes at the WalMart Store. This would be for adding a seasonal shop and they would also add some efface, pilasters, and changing the chain link fence to ornamental. One of the conditions was to add a parapet wall at the rear of the store. WalMart approved him to continue the design work on the project. The structural consultants had an issue with adding a parapet to the rear wall since they would then need to add in snow drift as the existing trusses would not meet that load. P. Fetters understood the need for screening around the whole rear wall of the store. He had photos of a WalMart Store in Texas with screening of the rear wall. He asked that the Plan Commission allow him to submit elevations using this type of screening to staff and allow staff to approve it. The photos were distributed to the Commissioners. A five minute break was taken. P. Fetters explained how the proposed screen would work. They would maintain the elevations on the front and side walls as they were conditionally approved previously. The seasonal shop will have the high wall in the back.

D. KUCHLER MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE PLAN WITH CHANGES TO THE PARAPET AND DID NOT WANT TO SEE A FAKE PARAPET WALL, BUT SOMETHING THAT HAD THE CHANGES IN ELEVATIONS. R. DUPLER WOULD LIKE TO SEE A SECTION THROUGH THE BUILDING ILLUSTRATING THE PERTAINANCE, THE HEIGHT OF THE UTILITY WHERE THE FALSE PARAPET FALLS, AND HILLSIDE DRIVE TO MAKE SURE THAT IT WILL PROVIDE THE SCREENING THAT IS BEING SOUGHT. A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT WAS MADE TO THE MOTION TO APPROVE CONTINGENT UPON STAFF REVIEW. D. KUCHLER WAS IN FAVOR OF THE AMENDMENT. C. MURSKY SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

- b. **TAX KEY 782.030, 2112 BAY POINT LANE, HARTLAND.** APPLICANTS: ROBERT J. AND MARYEVE HEATH. APPLICANTS SEEK APPROVAL OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF A BOAT HOUSE.

R. Heath was present at the meeting and explained the proposed boat house. The site was selected after consideration of how it would impact them and their neighbors. The boathouse is located essentially in the middle of their lot. There is currently a gazebo located in the area where

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

the boathouse would be built. They are in the process of planning a new home on the site – the boathouse would be consistent with the architecture of the new home. They are concerned about the lake and would position the structure so that the run-off is proper and provide landscaping to keep groundwater from getting into the lake. It is their intention to not use lighting of any great extent. He discussed the transparent panels that are being proposed for the top of the boathouse. The transparent panels would provide safety while at the same time preserve the sight lines. It was hoped to limit grading and retaining walls – they would like to find ways to maintain the topography and to make sure that the boathouse does not interfere with it. Jim Hoffman from James Hoffman Builders in Mequon was present at the meeting and commented on the use of the transparent panels and grading/retaining walls.

R. Dupler stated that the plans comply with the intent of the ordinance. He would like to see a site/grading plan that identifies that this project could be done without retaining walls. The code takes into account light shed from boathouses (150' out into the lake). Photometrics for the lights need to be determined. Architecture for the proposed building is needed to ensure that this will be in compliance and will be compatible with the home to be built. Comments from the Lake Welfare Committee and Don Tills should be considered. The Plan Commissions needs to determine if the transparent panels comply with the intent of the ordinance. Although they provide visibility, they are in opposition of 17.22 which prohibits permanent enclosures. He suggested consideration of approval if a determination on the railings can be made and if Petitioner can submit to Staff for approval the grading plan, photometrics, and architecture of the home.

It was stated that the boathouse is being proposed with two doors and would accommodate the boats that they have. They are evaluating whether they need a separate DNR permit for the tracks coming into the boathouse itself. It is their intention to store both boats inside the boathouse and they will determine whether they need to utilize one single door or two.

Mayor Craig suggested that it may be best to firm up the plans and to bring the package back in.

P. Schuman stated that this boathouse was discussed at the Lake Welfare Committee meeting and they are reviewing the wording of the boathouse code. Their concerns on boathouses in general are that they disrupt the shoreline. In order to offset this destruction they were looking for some naturalizing of the shoreline. Run-off could go into a rain garden to prevent it from going into the lake. The grading plan needs to be done and they want to make sure that the shoreline is protected from erosion. Concerns were expressed about lights and railings on the boathouse.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

Reflection from the clear panels was discussed. An acrylic safety glass with a non-glare feature is available. The boathouse code has been under review by the Lake Welfare Committee for the past year. M. Carlson stated that the boathouse regulations are included in Chapter 17 of the Municipal Zoning Code. In order to change the text it requires a zoning text amendment which would mean that a public hearing before the Plan Commission, a recommendation from the Plan Commission and final approval by the City Council would be needed. C. Mursky discussed assurance that the clear panels would not become etched and weathered. She was uncomfortable with this plan as it seems very conceptual with many pieces missing. B. Leonard was in agreement. Mayor Craig stated that he would like the Petitioner to come back with the site plan illustrating the architecture of the house and the location of the house and boathouse and neighbors (looking for consistency between the boathouse and the main house), a landscaping plan showing the shoreline preservation and conversion to show 30' away from the shoreline to incorporate natural vegetation and rain gardens, a grading plan, a photometric analysis for the light fixtures that will be on the boathouse, and the house plans.

This item will be discussed at the next Plan Commission meeting.

6. PRELIMINARY

None.

7. ZONING AND ORDINANCE REVISION

a. DISCUSSION REGARDING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND ZONING INCONSISTENCY.

R. Dupler stated that there were multiple inconsistencies between the City zoning map and the Comprehensive Plan. Sarah from Yaggy Colby discussed. There are approximately 38 parcels that are incongruent. B. Leonard asked when the City plan would be updated and felt that it was very important to begin to update the land use plan. R. Dupler stated that if the two documents were brought into conformance where the zoning reflects the intents of the Comprehensive Plan, it would make it easier for Staff to make decisions. M. Carlson suggested authorizing R. Dupler as City Planner to take the 1991 Master Plan, update the map for any Master Plan amendments that have been made since then to re-establish the starting point and then take the inconsistencies that are "no-brainer inconsistencies" and change them to be consistent with the zoning. It was requested that a list be provided for the "no-brainers".

8. HEARING DATES

A hearing on January 25th will be held for a Master Plan Amendment.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

9. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

No report.

10. BUILDING INSPECTOR'S REPORT

Total number of permits to date are 26, plus four occupancy permits. The only new permit was for the interior finish on the Sports Authority building.

11. BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

No report.

12. CORRESPONDENCE

None.

13. ADJOURNMENT

P. SCHUMAN MOTIONED TO ADJOURN FROM THE MEETING. M. SAWALL SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:01 P.M.

Respectfully submitted:

Minutes Prepared By:

Marilyn Czubkowski, CMC
City Clerk/Treasurer

Accurate Business Communications LLC