

**JOINT ARCHITECTURAL BOARD/PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**MONDAY, AUGUST 15, 2022**  
**7:00 PM**  
**BOARD ROOM**  
**MUNICIPAL BUILDING, 210 COTTONWOOD AVE.**

Present: James Schneeberger, Jeff Bierman, Jeff Pfannerstill, Ann Wallschlager, Tim Hallquist, David DeCourcy-Bower, and Dino Xykis.

Others Present: David Welsh, Alex Dick, Shaun Hoppe, Scott Hussinger, Ryan Amtmann, Ben Nelson and Deputy Clerk Bushey.

Call to Order- 7:02 pm

Roll Call taken.

Public Comments: Please be advised the Joint Architectural Board/Plan Commission will receive comments from the public related to any item(s) on the agenda for a three-minute time period per person, with time extensions per the Chairman's discretion.

Xykis commented that he would like to talk to President Pfannerstill at a later time to talk about

**1. Consideration of a motion to approve the Architectural Board/Plan Commission minutes from July 18, 2022.**

Motion (Hallquist/Wallschlager) to approve the minutes for the July 18, 2022, meeting. Carried (7-0).

**2. Architectural Board review and consideration of an application for signage for FreeUp Hartland, WI, 840 Rose Drive-**

Alex Dick was present to explain the proposed signage. They would like to change out the lettering on the sign facing the road with the FreeUp lettering and logo. He said it would be a like for like replacement with their images and then to include a monument sign out by Rose Drive. Hussinger said 1 is a replacement for an existing wall sign and the other is a new ground sign out by Rose Drive. Hussinger said it is compliant with the zoning requirements so he would recommend approval. Wallschlager asked if they are on the monument that is already there and Mr. Dick said no, they are not. He said there is a sign for a child car facility in the park. Wallschlager asked if it was far enough from the street and Hussinger said they do know it needs to be 15 ft from the property line. Wallschlager asked if there would be foliage at the base and will it be lit. Hussinger said landscaping at the base is a requirement and as far as illuminated he asked the applicant to explain the illumination. The applicant said he does not have any information on the plans, he said a representative from the signage company was supposed to be on this call and he wasn't sure where they are. He said if it is referencing an illuminating sign then it is planned to be powered. Hussinger commented that in a ground sign illumination in a b-5 is usually externally illuminated with a spotlight. Wallschlager asked if that is what it is going to have, and Mr. Dick said he is not sure off hand. Wallschlager said in the cross-section LED is listed so does that mean it is internally illuminated and Hussinger said he thinks so. Hussinger said the standard for a ground sign in

the B-5 is to be externally illuminated and Mr. Dick said OK. Wallschlager mentioned the foliage at the base and Hussinger said that can be in the motion to approve.

DeCourcy-Bower asked why the monument sign is not being incorporated into the existing sign on the property. Hussinger said because the other monument sign is not on the property. DeCourcy-Bower said the plan in the packet shows that it is. Hussinger said that monument sign might be encroaching on this property, and it is not for this property. He said access to this property is an easement and that you pass the existing monument sign that serves another property. DeCourcy-Bower said it seems strange it is on the same property, but he gets the intent. He said it looks like where it is being put right now is where the landscaping is installed to buffer from the street, he said he guesses they would have to relocate the landscaping. Hussinger said if that is important to the Plan Commission it can be modified in the motion. Village Manager Bailey said the address on the other monument sign is different than the applicants. DeCourcy-Bower said he pulled it up and the sign is right there by the road, he said maybe putting a sign on top of that or incorporating into that one, because it does look like it is on the wrong the property and might make things a little less confusing. He said since that is the entrance to get into the property it might make more sense to have it on that roadway.

Motion (Hallquist/Xykis) to approve the application for signage for FreeUp with the landscaping request, to adhere to the timed lighting for 10 pm and to be externally illuminated. Carried (7-0).

### **3. Plan Commission review of conceptual Planned Unit Development, 1112 Lisbon Avenue-**

Shawn Hoppe was present and said they now have drawings for the concept they are seeking approval for. Hussinger said they are fully compliant. He said this is the first step in the formal process for the approval. Pfannerstill asked if a notice is sent out every time something is on the agenda. Bailey said it is, and explained the clerk uses a certain amount of footage from the said property to send out notices to neighboring properties. Hussinger said a month from now, they will go into a detailed review at the project and if appropriate make a recommendation to set a Public Hearing at the Village Board. Bailey said that is correct, he went on to say they are working with the Village attorney, working with stormwater with Ruekert & Mielke, and with staff on the easement they would have to get through to get to the property so they will be working on the final PUD agreement with the Village Attorney.

Bierman asked if it will be 2 homes on 1 lot or 2 separate lots. Bailey said it will be 2 homes on 1 lot, it will be a PUD. It was stated it is like Paradise Trails and Overlook Trails, all on one lot.

DeCourcy-Bower said he appreciates the applicants' efforts to go through the processes the village has. He said this property lines up and is consistent with what the Comprehensive Plan says now. He said for clarification he understands it is for a PUD on a singular property and he asked if there is an intent in the future from the Property owner for these to be 2 separate properties that will be sold or is it 2 houses on a single property. Hussinger said it is 2 houses on a single property that can be sold separately. He went on to say the Villages zoning code won't support 2 free standing lots without substantial improvement to roadways and such so they thought this was the best route for the applicant.

Bailey said if there are any questions or concerns reach out to him. He said they did have the concern of only having to houses there can't be a majority vote, but they are working thru that.

No action taken at this time.

#### **4. Plan Commission discussion related to proposed modifications to the multi-family standards in the B-3 Zoning Code-**

Hussinger said the intent was to forward to the Plan Commission some revised wording that would have addressed some of the Plan Commissions concerns, but he didn't think all the Plan Commissioners got the revised wording so he thought they should at least discuss it and bring it back in a formal format next time.

Hussinger said his concern all along is that the B-3 does not specifically address multi-family, it refers to mixed use, but not what kind of mixed use. He said the first mixed use he can think of is Bristlecone Pines in a golf course in a residential development. He said to imply multi-family in a B-3 as a mixed use without any standards was problematic. Hussinger said he said the Village Manager Bailey that they should at least acknowledge multi-family as a mixed use in the B-3, so he came up with some wording last month, and used a term like significant but he felt it was too vague. So, he said he came up with some new wording and thought they could create a new item #15 as a CU which reads "mixed-use developments with multi-family residential must have the following:

1<sup>st</sup> floor commercial use or uses fronting a Village Street providing goods or services to the public on a daily basis.

Appropriate residential density in a building as determined by the Village Board after recommendation from the Plan Commission.

Pfannerstill asked the Village engineer Ryan Amtmann if he had any reservations to what the Building Inspector is proposing. Amtmann said he understands the goal in the B-3 is to promote commercial aspects on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor rather than there be 1 or 2 units of multi-family on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor.

Bailey said that is what they have discussed. He said they already have it in the downtown, so this is more of what we hope going forward. Hussinger said there was some concern a fairly recent downtown development new building probably 6-7 years ago does not utilize its 1<sup>st</sup> floor for commercial retail use, and we wanted to address that in our revised language. Pfannerstill said he was grateful for the BI, engineer and Village Manager looking out for the Village.

Wallschlager said she appreciates all the work they have put into this, but she heard someone say they want to have commercial on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor, she asked if an insurance company would fall under the new language. Hussinger said they simply want to eliminate non-commercial use. He said if she wants to further restrict to retail that can be done. He said if you are passionate about that we can list types of services.

Pfannerstill said maybe the board wants to put on a future agenda a list of commercial uses that can be reviewed. Hussinger said he thinks the appropriate process would be to hammer it out at the Plan Commission level and then at some point the Plan Commission would recommend it up to the Village Board where they can revise and send it back down if it is not right. Bailey said we can talk about it and discuss it internally. Pfannerstill encouraged all Plan Commissioners that by the end of day Wednesday to send emails to Hussinger or Amtmann of anything they want added or omitted and copy Bailey on it as well.

Biermann said he does not want to see the board hindering the private sector in being able to move forward a project by saying they are only allowing certain uses in a space because the space is going to change hands. He said he does not want to discourage development and what Hussinger has outlined there he thinks looks good.

DeCourcy-Bower said to the concern Bierman raised, he thinks the language that was read out sounds good but what we also do not want is something shrunk down. He said is there a way in the ordinance to have the Plan Commission hold an applicant accountable for the square footage when we review a plan specific to a property if they say the ground floor will be commercial, we hold them to it. He said he would lean on, is there additional language that would give the Plan Commission authority to make that determination when we review the plans that come forward. He said he questioned gasoline stations and did not think it was the best use of the property, is that something we would want in a B-3. Xykis commented that times change, businesses change and that the options should be open.

Hallquist said he likes what Hussinger has done and agrees with Xykis that things change and thinks we should make the decision when it comes to us.

Pfannerstill reminded everyone this is just a review and there is no motion to be taken.

#### **5. Announcements-**

Pfannerstill reminded everyone that Trustee Meyers visitation is coming up on Friday. Bailey said the office will be closed until 1pm to give staff time to attend the visitation and funeral.

#### **6. Adjourn**

Motion (Schneeberger/Wallschlager) to adjourn. Carried (7-0).

Adjourned at 7:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted by

Recording Secretary,  
Deidre Bush y, Deputy Clerk