

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Call to Order

Mayor DeYoe called the Wednesday, July 29, 2015 Plan Commission meeting to order at 7:00PM.

Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Roll Call for the Wednesday, July 29, 2015 Plan Commission meeting:

Present

Michele DeYoe, Mayor
Tim Aicher, Ald.
Wayne Dehn
Dave Greenway
Dan Jashinsky
Meghan Johnson
David Simon
Roger Dupler, Planner
Scott Hussinger, Building Inspector

Absent

Jim Reiher

PUBLIC HEARING #1:

General Development Plan – Conditional Use Permit

TAX KEY/ADDRESS:

DELC 0794.017.003, Lot 6 Cushing Business Park, Delafield, WI

OWNER/APPLICANT:

Owner: Jerry Lyons. Applicant: Greg Thompson.

MATTER:

Applicant seeks consideration of a General Development Plan for a business condominium campus.

M. DeYoe opened the Public Hearing at 7:01PM.

Greg Thompson, 6810 Cross Country Road, Verona, WI, explained over ten years ago he had started a business called StorageShopUSA that now had over 16 locations with more than 275 units sold throughout Wisconsin. He was excited to present this plan to the City as he had a good response from premarketing efforts and he thought the proposal suited the area well. This proposal would be a good addition to the last lot in the Cushing Business Park.

Hearing no further comments, M. DeYoe closed the Public Hearing at 7:03PM.

1. Approve Plan Commission meeting minutes of June 24, 2015 meeting.

Hearing no corrections, the June 24, 2015 Plan Commission meeting minutes were approved.

2. City of Delafield Citizen’s Comments pertaining to subjects on this agenda.

Roger Yolo, 2729 Ridley Road, was present regarding Item 5c. He was concerned that neighbors were not notified of this proposal prior to it being on the Plan Commission agenda. Notification should have been provided when it was considered by the Lake Welfare Committee (LWC). Documentation was distributed at this time regarding his opposition to this project to the Commission and is attached to the minutes. The Lake Welfare Committee had already provided a recommendation on this item. He had researched the City’s Municipal Code on this matter and also circulated a petition that opposed the proposed boathouse (The petition is also attached to the minutes). The process of approval for this request, a definition of “boathouse,” certain aspects of the Municipal Code pertaining to “specific consideration...to any obstruction,” and nonconformities on the property were reviewed. This property included a garage that also doubled as a boathouse. This did not meet the definition of a boathouse

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

and as such made the property nonconforming. The survey and proposed boathouse drawings from the epacket for the Lake Welfare Committee meeting were reviewed. He questioned whether the Commission would allow a boathouse to install a driveway or whether asphalt would be allowed to be installed up to a boathouse. The Municipal Code said the structure should be designed for exclusive use as a boathouse and when a property was non-conforming, remodeling of the boathouse should not exceed 50% of its original structure. He believed the proposal would exceed 50% of its original structure and should not be allowed. A rain garden was proposed for the project and this would indicate a plan to exceed more than 50% of the structure. Various views from the lake of other boathouses on the lake were also shared, noting many had a flat roof and did not impact the property owner's view of the lake. In this case, he would lose a portion of his view of the lake and the proposal would impact his view in a negative manner. The parcel of land was large and could easily accommodate a garage somewhere else on the property. In addition, he reviewed a letter of opposition from a neighbor in the area. The Lake Welfare Committee had not discussed obstructed views as part of its consideration of the Kahn boathouse and it was important to do so at this time. Various photos were discussed from the documentation submitted to the Commission, noting the proposed boathouse included a height of 15 feet. This was higher than the current boathouse roof and his view would be obstructed as a result. Most of the other boathouses photographed were small and tucked away from view by the property owner. A map of property owners that signed the petition was noted. Some people already had a view of the boathouse and residence because of their location along the bay. Overall, the LWC had skewed the "grandfather" clause to allow the current use. The Municipal Code identified specific considerations related to obstructed views. His view would be obstructed as referenced in photos shared. He was in opposition to the proposal.

Kathy Light, 2706 Burries Road, was sent an email from Kent Attwell approximately two months ago, noting this item would be considered at the last Lake Welfare Committee meeting. At that meeting, it was noted she was in favor of the boathouse. There were no other neighbors at that meeting. All opposition had arisen since the notification letter of consideration on this Plan Commission agenda was distributed. The garage/ boathouse combination was unusual; however, the applicant had lived on the property for 40 years. The boathouse/garage was "grandfathered" in correctly. All changes to the residence were positive and had improved the property. She thought matching the peak style of the boathouse to the residence would be better for all neighbors. She supported the proposal in Item 5c.

Sally Kahn, 2700 Burries Road, explained she spoke with K. Attwell regarding the inability of her contractor to attend the last Commission meeting. She thought the item had been cancelled from the agenda. She was not involved in the first meeting.

Donna Stotler, 2729 Ridley Road, explained she just learned of the boathouse proposal through the notification letter from the City. While she was certain it would be beautiful, she lived behind it and could see over it currently. If the height of the boathouse were to be raised from approximately eight feet to 15.5 feet or more, the part of the lake that she could currently view would be gone. The people living behind the residence and boathouse would have impacted views of the lake.

There were no objections from the Commission; therefore, M. DeYoe stated Citizen's Comments were closed.

3. Consent Agenda

- a. **DELC 0794.017.004, 258 Enterprise Drive, Delafield. Owner: AAT Communication Corp. Applicant: Keith Nyman.** Applicant seeks approval for a Site Plan amendment to allow the continued use of a wooden pole in the Cushing Business Park, to be removed by August 31, 2015.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

- b. **DELC 0801.997.001, Hwy 83 and Golf Road, Delafield. Owner: Wis Electric Power Co. Applicant: Keith Nyman.** Applicant seeks approval to extend a temporary Site Plan approval to allow the continued use of a wooden pole, to be removed by August 31, 2015.
- c. **DELC 0804.996.003, 2750 Golf Road, Delafield. Owner: Lake Country Real Estate LLC. Applicant: Lemberg Electric, Tim McGrath.** Applicant seeks approval for a permanent sign for ProHealth Medical Group.

Hearing no objections, the Consent Agenda was approved as presented.

4. Unfinished Business – None.

5. New Business

- a. **DELC 0794.017.003, Lot 6 Cushing Business Park, Delafield. Owner: Jerry Lyons. Applicant Greg Thompson.** Applicant seeks approval of a General Development Plan for a business condominium campus in the Cushing Business Park and recommendation to the Common Council of the same.

TAKEN FROM PLANNER DUPLER'S STAFF REPORT: *There are a number of permitted uses in the B-2, B-3 and B-4 districts that are not reflected in the proposed covenants. This is the owner's prerogative. Any new business owner wishing to operate in the development will require their own Business Plan of Operation approval by the Plan Commission. Any potential use that varies from the approved list of uses will first need to be approved by the Association before applying to the Plan Commission for a B.P.O. Enforcement or mediation of any owner disputes will be the responsibility of the Association and not the City, unless there are clear violations of code. The architecture is well presented with masonry half-walls and the applicant has been informed of Delafield's building material standards. The applicant is also aware that the type of construction may limit the type of use allowed by building code. The business duplexes will be serviced by a private drive and have reserved parking for each business location.*

July 24 Report

General Development Plan

A General Development Plan is necessitated by the implementation of multiple structures on a single lot. All ownership will have a fractional interest in the common elements of the site plan. These condominium units may be sold or leased independently. The F.A.R. is 0.18, well below the permitted 0.50; 21,500 sf building/115,434 sf lot. The required setbacks are respected; 30' front yard, 50' rear yard, 10' interior side yard. The building to building separation is 10' and determined to be adequate by the Fire Chief. Building height conforms to the code requirements as well. At this time the mix of end users is not determined. The business plan proposes tenant spaces will accommodate office, warehousing and retail uses. Assuming that each space is at least 50% warehouse the parking requirement will be one space/1,000 sf. This equates to 11 spaces. The other 50% must be assumed to be the highest intensity use, retail. This requires five spaces/1,000 sf, or 54 spaces. In total 65 spaces should be provided. Thirty-five parking spaces are provided, two per unit plus three for building three. To remedy this inconsistency, 30 additional spaces must be accommodated in the site plan. This may be accomplished by employing 24 spaces north of the drive aisle between buildings 6 and 9, and 6 spaces north of the drive aisle between buildings 1 and 2. The Plan Commission may wish to implement these spaces as landbanked parking to be realized at a future date.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

*All parking spaces must conform to 9' wide by 20' deep, the site plan does not illustrate such. In addition the drive aisle must be 24' wide, it is currently proposed as 22' wide. Widening the drive aisle to code requirements will cause an issue with the current placement of Building 1. Building 1 does not provide adequate setback from the drive aisle and creates a potential risk for vehicles backing into the Southwest corner of the structure. The site plan does not propose any stormwater treatment, either storage or water quality. The Cushing Business Park was designed with a basin to accommodate the stormwater storage for the business park;, however the stormwater requirements have changed since approval of the original plan. As a result the City has in the past requested additional water quality mechanisms. Further coordination with the City Engineer must be must be considered and implemented prior to SIP consideration. The proposed Lighting Plan demonstrates the adequate site lighting associated with each unit access and parking spaces. These are wall mounted fixtures that do not produce light shed across property lines and may be approved as submitted. The Landscape Plan offers a very limited amount of vegetative material. However, the existing utility easement across the front of the lot prohibits sizable canopy trees. As a result the understory trees proposed will not be very significant. The Plan Commission may wish to request increased materials. The proposed sign location must respect the minimum building setback. As proposed it offers no setback from the right-of-way and the associated plantings extend into the right-of-way. The proposed architecture conforms to the City's expectations for appearance and materials. The proposed covenants and deed restrictions should be revised as described last month; see above. **Recommendation: Approval, contingent upon public hearing feedback. Also contingent upon the addition of 30 landbanked parking spaces, 9'x20' parking spaces throughout, 24' drive aisle, increased landscaping, relocation of the project sign, and incorporation of stormwater mechanisms to be recommended by the City Engineer. Any motion to approve, approve with conditions, or deny must reference the Conditional Use Review, Determination, and Approval criteria.***

Greg Thompson, applicant, explained the history of StorageShopUSA, noting that if a condominium complex model was used all would share in the cost of business and affordable business storage could be brought to market for approximately \$100,000. In the past, he located a commercial property, put in a drive aisle and constructed separate duplex style buildings of approximately 50 feet by 50 feet. A person could have either a 1,250 feet or 2,500 foot duplex depending on whether they wanted to rent out half, sell off half, or use the entire space. He would then install private sewer and water. This was a simple idea that allowed all owners to share the cost of the land. The same building style was used over and over; however, in this proposal, he was using the LP Smart Side wood siding instead of vinyl siding. While there were many units, there were few cars because of the limited use. Parking was not allowed and many people either parked inside the garage space or would be there for the business day and leave. There was no overnight outside storage allowed, nor auto repair, woodworking, welding and thus, no commercial traffic. Each unit had two parking stalls in front. There were no parking issues in the past and the units were typically kept very clean due to the owners taking pride in the business site.

Dupler noted the site would be governed by conditional use requirements. There were issues with the proposal as noted in the Staff Report. Because retail use was allowed in this zoning district, parking had to accommodate retail parking standards on the site. Thompson questioned whether the retail requirements could be removed in this case, as there would be no retail business in this development because it wasn't allowed. Parking was not an issue. Signage was not an issue either. Retail businesses wanted visibility. Businesses in these developments typically did not have signage.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Dupler noted the Commission could establish that retail requirements were not part of this development and retail was not allowed; however, this would be a result of the Specific Implementation Plan process and deliberations of the Plan Commission. As noted in the Staff Report, changes were needed for the driveway aisle, parking stall depth and loading zone needs. Thompson explained he had compromised the density with a 100 foot setback and a 50 foot setback from the back. Building #1 was right on the line and moving the building as proposed would change the site plan a lot. He questioned whether barriers could be placed in that area to make all aware that they needed to get around it. Having a 24 foot drive aisle width would cut into Building #1 and only this unit would have an issue with it. All others could accommodate this width. He hoped to be able work around this width for this building through the use of a barrier.

Simon questioned the enforcement of bylaws. Dupler noted owners who purchased the units would need the City's approval on a business plan of operation. Other issues requiring resolution included water quality improvements and establishment of easements under the high wires in the development area. Dupler also reviewed lighting and landscaping. Landscaping was minimal and required additional variety and materials comparable to other developments in the vicinity. Architecture was adequate; however, the sign location would need to be worked into easement agreement with WE Energies. Covenants and deed restrictions required modification of allowable uses.

With regard to landscaping, Thompson explained he typically provided canopy trees, such as crabapple trees, between the buildings. Dupler suggested additional crabapple trees should be planted; especially near the entrance, on site and moving signage back off the 100 foot easement. There would be a requirement of native plantings in the water quality basin area. Screening the parking lot with greenery would be required as well.

AICHER MOVED TO APPROVE THE STORAGE SHOP, USA DEVELOPMENT CONTINGENT UPON CONDITIONAL USE REVIEW AND APPROVAL INCLUDING:

- NO RETAIL USES,
- DEVELOPER AND OWNER SELF ENFORCES USES IN COVENANTS AND RESTRICTIONS,
- BUSINESS PLAN OF APPROVAL FOR EACH INCOMING PROPERTY OWNER,
- PARKING SPACES MODIFIED TO INCLUDE A WIDER DRIVE AISLE PER PLANNER RECOMMENDATIONS SPECIFIED IN THE STAFF REPORT FOR THIS MEETING,
- REALIGNMENT OF BUILDING 1 OR BARRIER PLACEMENT NEAR BUILDING ONE IF APPROPRIATE WITH STAFF APPROVAL,
- IMPLEMENTATION OF WATER QUALITY MEASURES AS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF REPORT IN THE EPACKET FOR THIS MEETING,
- INCREASED LANDSCAPING CONSISTENT WITH ADJACENT PROPERTIES TO INCLUDE SCREENING AND SCREENING OF LIGHTS TO ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNERS,

WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THIS DEVELOPMENT WAS ALLOWED BECAUSE IT WAS A COMPATIBLE LAND USE WITH ADJACENT PROPERTIES AND THESE MEASURES WOULD INSURE THAT PROPERTY VALUES WOULD NOT BE IMPACTED NEGATIVELY, THE PROPERTY WOULD BE COMPATIBLE WITH EXISTING USES, TRAFFIC MOVEMENTS AND CONTROL WERE NOT IMPACTED NEGATIVELY, WATER QUALITY WOULD BE IMPROVED, AND THE MUNICIPAL WATER SYSTEM WOULD NOT BE ADVERSELY IMPACTED AND TO RECOMMEND TO THE COMMON COUNCIL THE

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

SAME. SIMON SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

- b. **DELC 0804.999.002, 004, 006 and 007. Nagawaukee Shopping Center 3141 Golf Road, Delafield. Owner: Ramco-Gershenson Properties LP, Delafield Partners LLC, Waukesha State Bank. Applicant: Innovative Signs** Applicant seeks feedback for an amended sign program to allow green signs in the multi-tenant sign program and schedule a public hearing.

TAKEN FROM PLANNER DUPLER'S STAFF REPORT: Amended Sign Program: The Nagawaukee Shopping Center was approved as a Planned Development and as part of the architectural approval the current sign program was adopted. All signs throughout the development are red except for Kohl's (white), and Sentry Foods (black). These signs were red until recently when the tenants petitioned to allow for individualization of the anchor tenants. At this time the property owner wishes to amend the original color scheme and allow green signage for tenants in addition to the existing red. It is also requested to allow green signage in the existing monument signs. Since the original sign program was approved as a Planned Development any changes will require a conditional use public hearing. **Recommendation: Share any comments or concerns with the petitioner and schedule a public hearing accordingly.**

M. DeYoe noted there was no one present to represent this request. Due to this absence, the applicant would be contacted regarding scheduling a public hearing for the August, 2015 Plan Commission meeting.

- c. **DELC 0755.984.001. 2700 Burries Road, Hartland. Owner/Applicant: Sally Kahn.** Applicant seeks approval of a boathouse site plan and architecture.

TAKEN FROM PLANNER DUPLER'S STAFF REPORT: Site Plan and Architecture: This petition requests approval to rebuild an existing boathouse in its current location. The Kahn property has exhibited this structure since the Kahn's purchased it in 1972. It is not a conventional boathouse; it is a combined boathouse and automobile garage. Ordinance 17.22(1) identifies boathouse use is limited to the storage of marine and accessory items. The combination with an automobile garage conflicts with this regulation. The Lake Welfare Committee determined that this structure may be grandfathered as legal non-conforming. Placement and size of the structure conforms to the code location requirements. The building is designed with a gable roof and therefore is allowed to achieve a total height of 18; the proposed building height is 15'7". Materials and styling are compatible with the residence. The Lake Welfare Committee recommended the petition to the Plan Commission contingent upon submittal of a raingarden plan and a revised lighting detail. A raingarden plan and lighting detail have been submitted and are included in the packet. **Recommendation: Approval**

Sally Kahn, applicant, and Bob Riemer of Mukwonago Remodeling, were present. Kahn explained the garage doubled as a boathouse and vice versa in her case. The boathouse was nine feet high and the requirement for a boathouse allowed 15 feet. At least two of the people that were depicted in the presentation earlier lived more than 250 feet away from her property. The picture presented by Mr. Yolo was distorting. It made her property look much closer to them than it was. She had lived at her residence since 1972 and she had two purposes in her request. She could not currently get her boat into the boathouse and she wanted the boathouse to look more like her residence. When coming to her property, people could see her boathouse and house at the same time. She thought the boathouse should

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

look more like the house. The current boathouse was nine feet tall. If a four foot railing were to be added, approximately 13 feet of space would be used. This was only two feet shorter than her request. In addition, she wanted to put dormers on the boathouse to match the house. She wanted to make the proposal bigger to include a two cars and one boat; however, she was told this was impossible so the footprint of the boathouse/garage was going to stay the same.

Aicher questioned the functional use of the added height. Remer explained it was being requested for aesthetic reasons. Discussion ensued regarding the ability to construct a boathouse on this property to current standards. A boathouse could be built today if slid further south approximately 20 feet; however, the garage aspect of the structure made it nonconforming. This structure had predated city incorporation. Greenway noted the LWC deliberations had contemplated the longer wall on the lake side. A longer wall on the lakeside would be required because it was on a peninsula and it was an existing structure. The requested height was still within current code requirements for the height. Aicher noted the LWC did not have the information received earlier in the meeting from Mr. Yolo. Hussinger noted Kahn was not replacing the building. She had every right to repair the structure. The neighbors had a legitimate concern regarding the change in height. If Kahn were to rebuild the structure, a 12 foot flat roof height was allowed and a railing could be placed on top of that. Discussion further ensued regarding setting a precedent in this matter. Dupler explained in a similar case in the past, it was determined that each house had the right to view the lake as far as an extension of the side lot line out into the lake, but was not entitled to have a view out into the lake beyond that.

GREENWAY MOVED TO APPROVE A BOATHOUSE SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURE AS PRESENTED FOR DELC 0755.984.001. 2700 BURRIES ROAD, HARTLAND. OWNER/APPLICANT: SALLY KAHN. JASHINSKY SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. FOUR WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED WITH AICHER, DEHN AND SIMON VOTING NAY.

Kahn questioned whether a carriage light style lamp could be utilized. Dupler recommended the light presented not be used and lighting on the lakeside should be downcast and minimized.

6. Zoning and Ordinance Revision

- a. Discussion of repealing Section 17.734 of the City of Delafield Zoning Code related to Sandwich or A-Frame Style Signs and schedule public hearing for the same.

TAKEN FROM PLANNER DUPLER'S STAFF REPORT: ***Signage:** The Plan Commission is asked to consider an amendment to the sign code to repeal the allowance for sandwich-board signs as a permitted use for all business operations. The stipulations of Ordinance 17.734 are continually disregarded by the business community and result in a less than desirable appearance throughout the City. To repeal the section of code pertaining to sandwich-board signs a public hearing must be conducted and the Plan Commission must make a recommendation to the City Council. **Recommendation: Schedule a public hearing to initiate action.***

17.734 - Sandwich Board or A-Frame Style Signs. (Cr. #597) Sandwich board or A-frame style signs are permitted for commercial businesses in the City of Delafield without permit,

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

review, or fee collection, so long as the board or sign complies with all of the following provisions:

- (1) The signs shall be located directly in front of the business frontage either next to the building face or at the street side of the sidewalk by newsstands, streetlights or other amenities. On multi-occupancy parcels, signs must be spaced at least 40' apart.*
- (2) Only one sign shall be permitted per business.*
- (3) The sign shall be removed from the right-of-way at the end of the business day and not left outdoors overnight.*
- (4) The sign shall not exceed 2' wide by 3½' high.*
- (5) Signs shall be constructed of durable materials (steel, iron, metal, wood, or corrugated plastic) and shall be maintained in good condition. The use of cardboard, paper, canvas or similar impermanent material is prohibited.*
- (6) The use of metallic or fluorescent paint shall be prohibited, and all permanent lettering must be of professional quality. Creativity is encouraged, and all signs shall be maintained and kept in good repair.*
- (7) The signs shall not be lighted.*
- (8) The signs shall not interfere with streetlights, street trees, utility poles, benches, ramps, fire hydrants or other structures, and shall not impede traffic visibility or vision corners as regulated in [§ 17.50](#)*
- (9) The content shall be limited to the name and trademark of the business establishment, a listing of products for sale and prices, or the advertisement of special products and prices.*
- (10) The signs shall not advertise a business or products, goods and services located on another property.*
- (11) Signs located on the sidewalk shall not impede pedestrian traffic, shall not cause the minimum accessible path to be less than 5' in width, and shall not interfere with the turning movements of a wheelchair.*
- (12) An approved business plan of operation is required prior to the installation of the sign. The sign rights of the business are nontransferable.*
- (13) If the sign is to be located within the public right-of-way, the business owners must agree to indemnify the City from any and all liability arising out of the placement of the sign in a public right-of-way. The business owner also must provide the City with proof of a minimum general liability insurance of \$1,000,000 in a form satisfactory to the City Attorney, and indicating the City as an additional insured.*
- (14) Signs placed in violation of this section will result in the immediate removal of the sign by the City.*
- (15) Signs within the public right-of-way may be moved or removed by the City for municipal purposes, including for the benefit of the public health, safety or welfare.*

M. DeYoe requested this item be placed on the agenda as she was concerned about the eleven sandwich board style signs visible on City streets recently. In the past, due to the economic downturn, latitude had been granted regarding use of this style signage; however, the repeated violations and complaints from people walking in the downtown area had prompted discussion. She thought this type of signage should not be allowed as it changed the look of the downtown area and posed an enforcement issue. Simon agreed, noting he was concerned about the enforcement. A public hearing should be scheduled on the issue with feedback gathered from the business community. Discussion ensued regarding whether business owners would be prompted to action to stay within the ordinance if the signs were removed each time they were in violation of the ordinance. Jashinsky noted there were communities where this style of signage looked appropriate and issues were minimal. He suggested contacting these communities to see what ordinances were in place governing this signage. M. DeYoe

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

requested this item be placed on a future Commission agenda for additional discussion prior to scheduling a public hearing.

- b. Discussion of amending Section 17.22 of the City of Delafield Zoning Code related Boathouses and determine appropriate action.

TAKEN FROM PLANNER DUPLER'S STAFF REPORT: Boathouses: *The Plan Commission is asked to consider amendment to Section 17.22 Boathouses. In a number of instances groupings of narrow frontage lake lots could be negatively impacted by the erection of a lakeside structure. The ordinance identifies a minimum shoreline width of 40' required to allow a boathouse. Such a lot may not be a practical location for a boathouse, especially when taking into account the approval process identified in subsection 10. Note that the maximum boathouse width may not be more than 20', or be wider than 30% of the lot width. Therefore the maximum width boathouse (20'), applied to the minimum lot width would equate to a 66.7' wide lot. Of course a boathouse need not be the full 20' wide, but in the last 15 years no petitions have requested any width less than the maximum allowable.*

- *Should the City amend the ordinance to increase the minimum shoreline frontage?*
- *Should Staff work with the Lake Welfare Committee to create a zone of boathouse prohibition?*
- *Should the City do nothing and rely on the current approval procedure to limit inappropriate boathouse locations?*

17.22 - Boathouses.

- (5) *Building and lot width. No boathouse shall exceed 20' in width or 30% of the shoreline footage whichever is less, computed at the ordinary high water mark. No boathouse may be constructed on any lakeshore lot having less than 40' of shoreline frontage computed at the ordinary high water mark.*
- (10) *Required approvals. All building permit applications for new boathouses, or for the repair, remodeling or for additions to boathouses, shall be filed with the Building Inspector, who shall submit the application to the Lake Welfare Committee for review. The Lake Welfare Committee shall make a recommendation to the Plan Commission and authorize the City Clerk to notify those property owners within 250' of the subject property for comments and/or recommendations prior to Plan Commission consideration. The Plan Commission shall consider the location, architectural design, color and material to be used and compatibility with the principal structure, buildings on adjacent properties[,] the lakeshore setting, and the neighbors' comments and Lake Welfare Committee recommendations. Specific consideration shall be given to the visual impact of the boathouse from the lake and to any obstruction by the boathouse to an adjacent property owner's view of the lake.*

Dupler explained this item was placed on the agenda to hold an initial discussion on whether the Commission should begin to evaluate areas where it was not appropriate for boathouses to be constructed based on practicality of location, lot size or geographic condition. There was no action necessary at this time. Discussion ensued regarding whether the LWC should be involved in discussions with a recommendation given to the Plan Commission on this matter. Consensus was indicated for having the LWC review this issue and provide a recommendation to the Commission. GIS mapping should also take place in order to provide additional information for discussion. Greenway suggested discussion also take place regarding a change in notification to neighbors earlier in the process, such as the time that the LWC reviewed any boathouse requests instead of when it came upon the Plan Commission agenda.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

7. Reports of City Officials:
- a. Plan Commission Meeting Dates & Deadlines
Meeting: August 26, 2015
Regular submittal deadline: August 12, 2015
Public Hearing submittal deadline: July 29, 2015

b. Planner

- 1. Genesee Street/Highway C Reconstruction, July 9, 2015 Memo.

Dupler noted a memorandum was distributed via the epacket for this meeting to dispel rumors and provide accurate information regarding the Genesee Street/ Highway C reconstruction project. In addition, a public hearing was scheduled for next month to hear a request from J. McCormack regarding tree mitigation issues with his development.

c. Building Inspector

S. Hussinger stated the total number of permits to date was 53 with three residential permits this month.

8. Correspondence: None.

9. Adjournment

There was no further business; therefore, the Wednesday, July 29, 2015 Plan Commission meeting adjourned at 8:42PM.

Minutes Prepared By:

Accurate Business Communications, Inc.