

**JOINT ARCHITECTURAL BOARD/PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES
MONDAY, MARCH 18, 2019
7:00 PM
BOARD ROOM
MUNICIPAL BUILDING, 210 COTTONWOOD AVE.**

Present: Jeff Pfannerstill, David deCourcy-Bower, Jack Wenstrom, James Schneeberger, Ann Wallschlager, Tim Fenner and Tim Hallquist.

Others Present: Administrator Cox, Building Inspector Hussinger, Ryan Amtmann and Deputy Clerk Bushéy.

Call to Order-

1. Consideration of a motion to approve the Jt. Architectural Board/Plan Commission Minutes of February 18, 2019.

Motion (Wenstrom/Schneeberger) to approve the Jt. Architectural Board/Plan Commission minutes for February 18, 2019. Carried (7-0).

2. Architectural Board review and consideration review and consideration of an application for a sign for 360 Fitness, 592 W. North Shore Drive.

Building Inspector Hussinger said the proposed sign is a simple wall sign, and he said it fits the size requirement.

Motion (deCourcy-Bower/Schneeberger) to approve the application for a sign 360 Fitness, 592 W. North Shore Drive. Carried (7-0).

3. Architectural Board review and consideration of an application for a sign for MGM Properties, 420 Cardinal Lane.

Wallschlager asked if there would be another sign besides this one, and Building Inspector Hussinger said he didn't know of any request for a ground sign, just this wall sign.

Motion (Hallquist/deCourcy-Bower) to approve the application for a sign MGM Properties, 420 Cardinal Lane. Carried (7-0).

4. Architectural Board review and consideration of an application for a sign for Behrend Property LLC, 115 Hill Street.

Building Inspector Hussinger said he believes they have been to BID, and the BID has endorsed the sign. Administrator Cox said there was only 1 question at the BID, and that was if the size was appropriate. He said it is 56 inches in diameter and he thinks that is sufficient. Pfannerstill said he recalled from the BID meeting that the owner said if the Building Inspector said they need to shrink the size, they were ok with doing that. deCourcy-Bower asked about the coloring on the sign and it was stated the color will be blue and white.

Motion (deCourcy-Bower/Hallquist) to approve the application for a sign for Behrend Property LLC, 115 Hill Street. Carried (7-0).

5. Architectural Board and Plan Commission review and consideration of a sign for Nooks & Cranny's Home Décor & Gifts, 540 Hartbrook Drive.

Building Inspector Hussinger said there are 2 signs to consider here, one is a wall sign and the other is a spot on the multi-tenant sign. Hallquist asked if it will be illuminated, and it was stated that on the application says it is not. Denise Nerdahl the owner was present and said the sign above the door is not illuminated but the multi-tenant is illuminated.

Motion (deCourcy-Bower/Hallquist) to approve the application for a sign for Nooks & Cranny's, 540 Hartbrook Drive. Carried (7-0).

6. Architectural Board and Plan Commission review and consideration of a conceptual plan for an expanded entertainment area for Bristlecone Pines.

Jon Schoenheider from Bristlecone Pines HOA was present and explained the conceptual plan. He said with the declining values of the community they are trying to reinvigorate things with an additional entertainment facility. He said as of now they have proposed a pickle ball court and basketball court which would be below the existing tennis courts along with expanding the parking and a covered pavilion. He said they don't think they are going to do the community garden at this time and in the future they would like to put in a bathroom at some point. He went on to say probably this summer they will have a man and women's metro on site so the grandparents have a facility to use and they are also looking at adding security cameras to make it more secure. He said they sent a letter out to the Bristlecone Pines Community to get feedback. Pfannerstill asked Mr. Schoenheider to clarify what he means when he says community and Mr. Schoenheider said he is referring to the Bristlecone Pines subdivision. Mr. Schoenheider said the HOA has approved the conceptual plan. Building Inspector Hussinger asked if they are looking for conceptually approval like to a site plan and then they can come back for approval with specific drawings for the pavilion for the height and size, Mr. Schoenheider said yes. Hussinger said the Plan Commission needs to talk about it in general and say if they think it is ok and if they have any concerns get it out now. Fenner asked about the restroom and Jon said it would be at the front entrance. He said he guessed if they could afford it would be in 3-4 years. There was brief discussion on landscaping.

The general consensus of the Plan Commission is that they are ok with the concept plan. Hussinger said they will need to come back for approvals. No action taken at this time.

7. Architectural Board and Plan Commission review and consideration of a request to renew a Conditional Use Permit for Homegrown Farms for operation of a temporary retail flower hut to be located at Piggly Wiggly parking lot, 550 Cottonwood Ave.

a. Public Hearing to hear comments on the request to renew the request for a Conditional Use.

Pfannerstill opened the Public Hearing at 7:20pm for comments. Cathy Magill was present and said this will be their 15th year doing the temporary flower hut. She said they have staff to man the flower hut, they share water from the fire hydrant and they won't need to use electricity. Ms. Magill said the hut is locked up at night, and they have had no problems. There are no changes from previous years. There were no other comments so Pfannerstill closed the Public Hearing at 7:22pm.

b. Consideration of a motion to approve the Conditional Use for Homegrown Farms.

Motion (Swenson/Wallschlager) to approve the Conditional Use for Homegrown Farms. Carried (7-0).

8. Plan Commission review and consideration of a request to renew a Conditional Use Permit for operation of a temporary greenhouse to be located at Biebel's True Value, 580 Hartbrook Drive.

a. Preliminary consideration of plans for the Conditional Use Permit.

Wallschlager asked if the area down by Sweet Dreams is going to remain open because sometimes it is open and sometimes it is not. Pfannerstill said he does not know the answer to that. Administrator Cox said they will have to ask them about that. He also there are specific rules on what they can do and they can ask about that on April 15, 2019 at the Public Hearing.

b. Motion to set a Public Hearing to be held during the regular Plan Commission meeting on April 15, 2019.

Motion (Fenner/Swenson) to set Public Hearing for April 15, 2019. Carried (7-0).

9. Consideration of a motion to table a petition to rezone property at 345 Cottonwood Ave. to the RS-3 Residential Single Family District until the April 15 meeting.

Motion (Swenson/Wallschlager) to table the petition as a whole to the April 15 meeting. Carried (7-0).

10. Plan Commission review and consideration of actions and items related to The Glen at Overlook Trails, condominium development on the property located at and adjacent to N56 W28628 CTH K (Libson Road).

Bryan Lindgren from Neumann Developments was present and said they have gone thru all the plans and all of the requirements of the PUD except for the clarifications today. President Pfannerstill said they had an extensive meeting on Friday regarding this with the Building Inspector, the Village engineer, Neumann Developments, the administrator and himself. Administrator Cox said he gave everyone a copy of the revised tree planting landscape plan. He said at a quick glance it seems to address what they were talking about at the meeting. Mr. Lindgren said the number of street trees is 103 and the number of overall trees is 206 and they are spread out no more than 2 of the same species in a row.

Administrator Cox said the Plan Commission needs to make a determination if that feels acceptable. Admin Cox asked Mr. Lindgren if they could characterize at all the kinds of trees that will come out for the stormwater or are there many quality trees coming out. Bryan said they can give more detail on that when they give their tree preservation permit. Admin Cox said one of the things that came out of the discussion on Friday is that they will delineate in detail any significant trees in the area in the INRA and tree protection of the trees staying behind so roots aren't damaged. He said also in their plan is a fair amount of evergreens going in and some hard woods in the front. Fenner asked if the Plan Commission is taking action on the landscaping tonight. Admin Cox said he thinks that would be the intent so you can make the recommendation to the Village Board on the whole for the development agreement and if there are specific concerns we can address them as well.

Wallschlager asked didn't someone come and look at it and how many trees need to come out?

Bryan said they haven't gone through the interior of the area yet. Pfannerstill said one thing they talked about on Friday is that they will access the trees on diameter and health.

Wallschlager asked what was decided about the snowplowing regarding the stub road, and

Pfannerstill said that was discussed on Friday as well and DPW felt best for a hammerhead for turning around and a sign will be placed there. Pfannerstill pointed out a sign will also be going in stating that it will be going through so no one ever does not know it is designated to go through.

Motion (Fenner/Swenson) to recommend approve the revised landscaping plan as presented with the clear understanding that it does not address the additional work that needs to be done with the drainage ponds. Pfannerstill clarified that Fenner's motion just has to do with the placement of the trees and landscape. Carried (7-0).

Fenner asked is this is an expandable condo and Bryan said yes, the CSM will be put forward with access roads as accurate as possible. Pfannerstill said there is a silhouette of where a condo will go. Admin Cox said the Village Code states condo plats have to be reviewed like subdivision plats. He said condo plats aren't subdivision plats, they are treated differently in the state law. He went on to say there are completely different state codes that address them. He said however, our code wants them to be reviewed like we have been doing. In the instance of where they start from scratch, the only exception in our code which is the same as the state law is if you take an apartment building and turn it into a condo. He went on to say as Pfannerstill had said we have the

silhouettes or the envelopes that pc has allowed on where condos can go. He said the intent would be for the developer to come back with a CSM, because a condo plat can't combine parcels, can't dedicate land, and can't do anything but create condos, so a CSM is needed to combine land. He said both the Plan Commission and Village Board will review that and approve of that initial plat. He went on to say what the Plan Commission will probably see on that plat is a revised legal description that references the CSM and 4 condo units with an actual outline of the building that will go there. A building you would have already approved the appearance of as the arch board. Subsequent to that initial condo plat, the intent would be from that point forward condo plats could be administratively without having to go through the Plan Commission or Village Board. He said they could be approved administratively provided they met the declaration of condo, met the CSM and the preliminary plat etc. He said as long as they met those agreements, staff could say go ahead and file the next 4 units and so on until they hit 50 and then that would be the last of the expandable condos plats to be filed.

deCourcy-Bower asked about the small leg of property adjacent to this property and if there will be anything in there that will allow that small piece to be included or something similar. Cox said there is nothing to prevent the PUD agreement from being expanded and all the agreements into that area. Pfannerstill said there is a way to be proactive and address that early on. Admin Cox commented on if that is something the pc would like to do.

There was brief discussion on the amendment regarding the access, where the access will be changed once permanent access has been instituted.

Motion (Fenner/Pfannerstill) to approve amendment regarding access. Carried (7-0).

Admin Cox then said the Plan Commission needs to talk about the paths and then the general question is the site plan, lighting etc. and is it something the Plan Commission is satisfied with. There was brief discussion on lighting, which will be at intersections and each property will have a decorative light. deCourcy-Bower commented on expanding the trail to the east, and said it would be nice if it connects to the North of the development if that property were to get developed and to possible have one of the documents changed to show a possible future connection. Fenner commented that the one that precipitates the connection should pay for it. He said he would like to see in the PUD document that it makes reference to that it is a future connection and it will happen on the Villages request and that the property owner would have to agree to it. There was discussion on providing an easement for future expansion of the path system.

There was discussion regarding the southeast corner of the property and if the Plan Commission wants to have an easement for a connection to the east so the village can make a crossing. There was also discussion on the trail in that southeast corner and it being paved.

Motion (Fenner/deCourcy-Bower) to approve the path as presented with addition of the reservation of 4 future easements discussed tonight with connectivity of the trails at the 4 places they identified. Mr. Neumann brought up the issue of how close the path on the east side of the property are close the backyards of several future homes. He said he will contact Siepmann about possibly snaking the path around.

Fenner had a question regarding outside irrigation watering hours of 10pm-2am in section 5 paragraph B in the PUD. It was clarified it is during high flow times and that is regarding using an immense out of water using sprinklers. There was brief discussion regarding section 5 paragraph B in the PUD regarding watering hours of 10pm-2am.

Motion (Fenner/Pfannerstill) to recommend approval to the Village Board of the plans & agreements as presented tonight with the specific amendments that were made in the prior motions.

Schneeberger asked about some driveways coming into the side of the buildings. deCourcy-Bower said he felt they were wasting a lot of green space having driveways coming into the side of the buildings. Neumann explained the reason behind the design of some of the side driveways being that having some larger sq ft homes they felt they needs a little bit bigger of a foot print. And having homes closer to the road he isn't a fan of garages coming out from the house vs being inside the building envelope. Pfannerstill brought up about possibly using 4-5 different type of garage doors. Neumann said there will be different packages to pick from. Cox reminded the board that the Arch will have to review the aesthetics of the homes. Cox said right now the plan with the intent is the Plan Commission won't see a condo plat after the first one so staff or whoever is doing the review will have to decide if a driveway that comes in as a side load on a plat that was supposed to be straight load is compliant. deCourcy-Bower asked about the maintenance easement. Carried (7-0).

11. Adjourn

Motion (Wenstrom/Fenner) to adjourn. Carried (7-0). Meeting adjourned at 8:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted by
Recording Secretary,

Deidre Bushéy, Deputy Clerk