

MINUTES

SPRINGDALE JOINT PLAN COMMISSION AND TOWN BOARD

MONDAY, March 23, 2026 at 7pm

Approved 4.27.26

1. 7:05pm Chair Jester called the meeting to order and certified compliance with open meetings law.

PC members present: Plan Commission Chair Jester, Carrico, Aburomia, Hanson, and Bunn. Absent: Sullivan and Dorn. TB Members present: Town Board Chair Rosenbaum, Supervisors Schwenn and Altschul. Also Present: Town Admin/Clerk Jackie Arthur.

2. MOTION (Hanson/Carrico) to approval Minutes from February meeting. 4-ayes, 0-nays, 1-abstain (Bunn). Motion Carried.

3. M. and N. Vullings/ 2551 County Road J / 40' x 27' x 16' Residential Accessory Building/ Sec 14.

MOTION (Bunn/ Hanson) to recommend to the town board approval of the 40'x27'x 16' RAB – not for commercial use. 5-ayes, 0-nays. Motion Carried.

Discussion: There were no neighbors or member of the public wishing to make comments on this agenda item. Plan Commission reviewed application and had no concerns. It was noted that the location close to the Southern lot line may result in a Dane County request for a survey to locate when they apply for the Dane County zoning permit.

4. D. Chestnut/ 2149 Dahlk Circle/ 100' x 60' x 22' / Residential Accessory Building / Sec 25.

MOTION (Aburomia/ Carrico) to recommend to the town board approval of the 100' x 60' x 22' RAB – not for commercial use. 5-ayes, 0-nays. Motion Carried.

Discussion: Question about the checked box for water on the application is for in-floor heat and hose bib for washing cars. PC reminded applicant that in the RR8 zoning district the only water that is allowed is water that drains to daylight and is not required by code or Dane County Public Health to drain to a sanitary facility (septic). No neighbors or members of the public in attendance wished to make comment on the agenda item.

5. A.J. Mackler/ Mackler Trust Lands north of PD east of P /Public Hearing for 4 lot CSM and Rezone for residential use/ Sec 10.

MOTION 1 (Jester/Bunn) to recommend to the town board that the preliminary CSMs presented for 4 lots on the Mackler lands are consistent with the concept plan on file with the town and the town land use plan. 5-ayes, 0-nays. Motion Carried.

MOTION 2 (Jester/ Carrico) to recommend to the town board a rezone of 4 lots of 3.25,3.25, 3.25, and 2.53 ac (12.28 ac total) be rezoned from AT35 to Rural Residential 2 (RR2) for residential development. There will be no further division of these lots per the Town Land Use Plan. 5-ayes, 0-nays. Motion Carried.

Background: Last month we revisited the concept plan and removed the 2 ac lot limit on the Mackler concept plan. At that meeting we discussed the possible layouts for lots and today we were presented with 2 preliminary CSMs 1 for 1 lot and 1 for 3 lots.

Discussion: No members of the public wished to make comment at the public hearing regarding the Mackler Lands. The PC compared the concept plan with the layout for the preliminary lot lines and determined that it was consistent and met the goals of the land use plan regarding lot layouts. The town discussed with the applicant next steps involving getting official approval for access from Dane County and the process and requirements for driveway approval including the need for shared driveway agreements for the lots. Regarding zoning, the RR2 zoning district is appropriate for residential lots of this size and is supported by the town land use plan. It will be noted that these lots are not subject to further division.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TB FOR THE PURPOSES OF REVIEWING AND ACTING ON AGENDA ITEM(S) ABOVE.

7:31 Meeting called to order by Chair Rosenbaum.

- **Minutes from Previous Meeting**

MOTION (Altschul/Schwenn): to approve the Town Board portion of the Joint PC_TB minutes from February 2026. 2-ayes, 0-nays, 1-abstain (Rosenbaum) Motion Carried.

- **M. and N. Vullings/ 2551 County Road J / 40' x 27' x 16' Residential Accessory Building/ Sec 14.**

MOTION (Altschul/Schwenn) to approve the 40'x 27'x 16' RAB – not for commercial use. 3-ayes, 0-nays. Motion Carried.

- **D. Chestnut/ 2149 Dahlk Circle/ 100' x 60' x 22' / Residential Accessory Building / Sec 25.**

MOTION (Schwenn/Altschul) to approve the 100 x 60 x 22''' RAB – not for commercial use. 3-ayes, 0-nays. Motion Carried.

Discussion: Schwenn expressed sadness that the original barn where they used to hold square dances would be replaced. Chestnut pointed out that the back wall of the old barn was caved in and that it was time for a new building but that he remembered the dances fondly.

- **5. A.J. Mackler/ Mackler Trust Lands north of PD east of P /Public Hearing for 4 lot CSM and Rezone for residential use/ Sec 10.**

MOTION 1 (Altschul/Schwenn) to approve the preliminary CSMs presented for 4 lots on the Mackler lands as they are consistent with the concept plan on file with the town and the town land use plan policies. 3-ayes, 0-nays. Motion Carried.

MOTION 2 (Rosenbaum/ Schwenn) to approve the rezone of 4 lots of 3.25,3.25, 3.25, and 2.53 ac (12.28 ac total) be rezoned from AT35 to Rural Residential 2 (RR2) for residential development. There will be no further division of these lots per the Town Land Use Plan. 3-ayes, 0-nays. Motion Carried.

MOTION (Schwenn/ Altschul) to adjourn 3-ayes, 0-nays. Motion Carried. 7:39pm

5. Landowner Proposed Amendment to the Town of Springdale Land Use Plan - The landowner proposed amendments dealing with building envelope changes and concept plan definition.

Former Supervisor Hefty submitted two amendments to the land use plan – one having to do with the definition of concept plan and one dealing with building envelope changes. Submitting these amendments prompted a lot of discussion regarding the concept plan process and the need to clarify the concept plan/building change language in the land use plan. While ultimately the PC drafted alternate language to propose to address the

concerns, Chair Jester thanked Hefty for his attention to detail and desire to improve the land use planning process in the TOS.

6. Plan Commission proposed Amendments to the Town Land Use Plan.

MOTION (Jester/Bunn): To recommend a formal public hearing and consideration by the town board of the changes in language discussed for the Town Land Use Plan with slight changes proposed during the meeting regarding the definition of strip development.* 5-ayes, 0-nays. Motion Carried.

For the complete list of proposed changes, see addendum A.

Background: Three work sessions were conducted to talk about proposed changes to the town's land use plan. The proposed amendments are summarized as follows:

1. Changes to the Section 2: Definitions - the elimination of definitions that are no longer used in the plan, updates to make definitions consistent with Dane County zoning definitions, clarification of the definition of building envelope to reflect current survey practices, and to the definition of concept plan to reflect the desire to leave lot sizes and lines off of the early concept plan process. We proposed an update to the definition of strip development to try to clarify when it applies.
2. Changes to Sections 5 and 6 Residential Options 1 and 2 – Change to remove lot lines and sizes from requirement on a concept plan, reordering and reorganizing section B – regarding building envelopes, lot lines and changes to concept plans and building envelopes. Added clarification to building envelope section that it is advised to only allow a maximum building envelope (not lot) size of 2 acres when a building envelope is on agricultural land. Added references from the driveway ordinance regarding requirements for shared driveways when exceptions to frontage requirements are granted.
3. Changes to Section 7 – Residential Option 3 – remove the lot lines and sizes from the submitted concept plan for review
4. Changes to Section 10 – Non-Residential Uses - same changes as proposed in Residential Options regarding concept plan - remove lot lines and size and change to lot line language to remove “natural or man-made and such as” Add reference to sign ordinance.

At the meeting Chair Jester walked through slides with all the proposed changes. There were no questions or comments from members in the audience.

Discussion: Member of the PC and TB had discussion about some of the proposed definition changes.

- Regarding “Agricultural land”: while a more expansive definition of agricultural land might be supported by members (beyond just tilled land or pasture land), without further examination of the impact to the policies and goals of the plan - members decided to leave the scope of the definition unchanged.
- Regarding “Agricultural use”: the Dane County definition that we were proposing updating to is tied to income generation, and some members wanted a more expansive definition of “agricultural use”. It was clarified that there was nothing about the Dane County definition that changes landowners permitted uses for small scale farm, hobby farm or other activities that may not be tied to income – the definition is relevant for some zoning activities like “limited farm business CUPs” - in the end of the discussion it was decided that because we use Dane county zoning that having a consistent definition was a good idea.
- Regarding “Strip Development”: suggestions to take out “a pattern of” and “in a manner that produces a continuous or near-continuous built presence along a road corridor”. So the changes to what we originally proposed would look like this: ~~A pattern of Residential or nonresidential development in which three or more building envelopes are arranged in a linear sequence along a public road or highway in a manner that produces a continuous or near-continuous built presence along a road corridor that diminishes the rural character of the town.~~

A few other corrections/ suggestions were noted as we walked through the proposed changes.

- Member of the PC also suggested removing “such as” in the section on standards for lot lines that described existing boundaries.
- Question about a note reference in Option one – reference number error found and recommended correction from “Note 7 to 6”

7. Plan Commission proposed updates to the Town Land Division and Subdivision Ordinance.

MOTION (Jester/Bunn): To recommend a formal public hearing and consideration by the Town Board of the changes in language discussed for the Town Division and Subdivision Ordinance. * 5-ayes, 0-nays. Motion Carried.

Background: The proposed changes were presented – all but two proposed changes were exactly the same as the Land Use Plan recommendations. The two that were not, were needed to be consistent with the recommended changes to the land use plan and addressed lot lines and sizes on concept plan and the technical requirement for building envelopes on CSMs – which is no longer allowed.

*** For a complete list of the proposed changes, see addendum B.**

7. MOTION (Carrico/ Aburomia) to Adjourn 8:30pm

Minutes Submitted by Amy Jester, Chair Town of Springdale Plan Commission

See attached: Addendum A: List of proposed amendments to the town of Springdale land use plan. Dated: March 23 2026 and Addendum B: List of proposed amendments to the Town of Springdale land division and subdivision code. Dated: March 23, 2026.