

MINUTES

SPRINGDALE JOINT PLAN COMMISSION AND TOWN BOARD

MONDAY August 25, 2025 at 7pm

Approved Sept 22, 2025

1. 7:01pm Call to order and certification of compliance with open meetings law. Present: Plan Commission Chair Jester, Sullivan, Bunn, Hanson, Aburomia, Dorn. Absent: Carrico. TB Chair Rosenbaum, Schwenn and Altschul

2. MOTION [Aburomia/Hanson] to approve minutes from July 2025 meeting. 6-ayes, 0-nays. MOTION CARRIED

3. Dahlk/ Mount Vernon Park Assn / 1644 State Hwy 92/ approx .7 ac from Dahlk to Park via Lot Line Adjustment/ Sec 34.

MOTION [Bunn/Sullivan]: to recommend to the TB to approve the Dahlk lot line adjustment between Dahlk and Mount Vernon Park Assn because it is consistent with the town lot line adjustment ordinance. 6-ayes, 0-nays. MOTION CARRIED

Discussion: Dahlks would like to lot line adjust approx .7 ac on the South Side of State Hwy 92 to the Mount Vernon Park Association. Doug Dahlk spoke about his history with the portion of the land and his desire to see others enjoy the lands as part of the park association lands.

The PC reviewed the map of the proposed adjustment and reviewed the standards of the Lot Line Adjustment Ordinance. PC members thanked Dahlk for his generous donation to the park and the people of the town.

4. Ama C./ Lot 4 CSM 16185 Kollath Rd/ Public Hearing for Building Envelope Change/ Sec 26.

MOTION [Jester/Bunn]: to recommend to the TB the building envelope change as presented. 6-ayes, 0-nays. MOTION CARRIED.

Background: These lots were created from an Option 2 concept plan – there are approved building envelopes. The applicant has an accepted offer on Lot 4 and wishes to relocate the building envelope as presented.

The original concept plan was drawn by an engineer and indicated a waterway. The applicant's building envelope change would require re-engineering the swale. The town asked the applicant to consult with Dane County regarding the waterway. Hans Hilbert indicated that this was a private matter not subject to Dane County regulation and that it would be a private agreement between neighbors. TB chair Rosenbaum said he went out to the site to view the site and to talk with neighbors regarding the changes.

PUBLIC HEARING: Chris Enos, from the neighboring lot on Kollath said that they had discussed the change of building envelope and waterway and they had agreed on a path for the water that worked utilized the existing culvert.

Discussion: During the discussion for the motion Chair Rosenbaum suggested that perhaps it would be easier to remove the building envelope entirely for this lot given the small size of the lot and because it didn't impact farmland. The PC discussed and decided to have the PC just address the applicants' request as presented. The PC saw no issues with the building envelope change and thought it was consistent with the goals of the land use plan.

5. L. Hellenbrand/ Request for exception to 66' frontage for lots on HWY J/ Sec 14.

**MOTION [Bunn/Jester]: to recommend to the TB an exception to the 66' frontage for the lots on Hwy J as it is consistent with the goals of the land use plan in preserving agricultural land and meets the county requirements for the exception. 6-ayes, 0-nays
MOTION CARRIED**

Background: L Hellenbrand came to the town to discuss the lot configuration and the need for a 66' exception in July of 2023. At that time, we discussed the standards for the 66' exception and the lot configuration and indicated that this seemed like a good candidate for such an exception.

At this meeting the plan commission reviewed the preliminary CSM and the Dane County standards for an exception to the 66' frontage from Dane County Ord. Chapter 75.19 (8)

The special shared driveway agreement was submitted by the applicant to the town chair who stated that it met the requirements for the type of agreement needed when a frontage exception is granted.

6. L. Hellenbrand/ Lands on HWY J North of Dairy Ridge Rd/ Public Hearing for CSM consistent with concept plan and Rezone 3 lots to Single Family Residential/ Sec 14.

MOTION 1 [Sullivan/Hanson]: to recommend to the TB that the preliminary 3 lot CSM as presented is consistent with the concept plan on file with the town and is consistent with the town land use plan. 6-ayes, 0-nays. MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION 2 [Jester/ Dorn]: to recommend to the TB the rezone of Lot 1 of 2.75 ac from AT35 to SFR2 and Lots 2 and 3 of 1.5 ac lots from AT35 to SFR1. These lots will not be eligible for further division. 6-ayes, 0-nays. MOTION CARRIED

PUBLIC HEARING: No comments during the public hearing.

Discussion: The PC reviewed the most recent concept plan and the rezone paperwork for these lots. Members indicated that the CSMs were consistent with the concept plan and the land use plan and that the rezoning of these lots to single family residential was appropriate for the size of the lots and were also consistent with the land use plan.

7. Bilse Family LLC/ Lands on Lunde Lane / Public Hearing for CSM consistent with concept plan and Rezone from AT 35 to RR4, RM8 and RM16 consistent with lot size for residential development/ Sec 17.

MOTION 1 [Jester/Hanson]: to recommend to the TB that the preliminary 4 lot CSM as presented is consistent with the concept plan and is consistent with the town land use plan. Lots are subject to town approved building envelopes are on file at town hall. 6-ayes, 0-nays. MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION 2 [Aburomia/Jester] : to recommend to the TB the rezone of Lots 1 and 2 of 11.7 and 11.61 ac from AT35 to RM8 , Lot 3 of approx 6.76ac from AT 35 to RR4, and Lot 4 of 33.88ac from AT35 to RM16 consistent with lot size for residential development These lots are not eligible for further division per the town of Springdale land use plan. These divisions also complete the eligible divisions on the Bilse concept plan. 6-ayes, 0-nays. MOTION CARRIED

Background: The Bilse family has decided to divide lots according to the originally approved 2004 concept plan with its original building envelopes.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Ed Eloranta of Lunde Lane stated that he believed that the Bilse concept plan should be considered again and that the original concept plan was merely to divvy up development areas among family members and that 20 years had passed and that the context has changed and the county zoning had also changed. He believes that perhaps concept plans should be time limited and additionally that time limits for public hearing comments were too short.

Discussion: PC member Aburomia observed that a concept plan that sits for 20 years leaves open that there will be changes in how the town approaches land divisions and that this concept plan is not consistent with how we would plan now.

PC member Hanson observed that the survey presented followed the previously approved concept plan

PC member Bunn observed that concept plans are approved only by the PC and that the TBs first opportunity to weigh in on a proposal's conformance to the land use plan is at the CSM approval. Bunn observed that we need to have discussion of how to approach old concept plans/ possible time limits on concept plans in light of this 20 year old concept plan and that that procedural issue should be considered at a future work session.

PC Chair Jester observed that the town board did have an opportunity to weigh in on this concept plan as there were prior lots approved via CSM from this concept plan. In 2004 the first proposed CSM was denied and sent back to the PC because the TB did not feel that the concept plan met an option 2. The PC/applicant was instructed to revise concept plan to better conform to option 2 standards. In April of 2004 the TB approved the first CSM from this concept plan and stated that the 2004 revision of the concept plan better conformed to option 2 standards. So effectively the

TB has had a chance to weigh in on this concept plan as lots have been previously approved from this 2004 concept plan. Jester observed that the standards for an option 2 have not changed in 20 years and that recent changes to the Dane county zoning code actually increase the town's control over land use compared to the A1 zoning that was in effect in 2004. Additionally Jester argued that concept plans are drawn up as tools for families to plan with the town the future uses of land and that the partnership between the town and landowners needs to be trusted and decisions should only change when/if there are changes in the land use plan and that otherwise that we should honor agreements from the past.

8. R. Hoffman/ 2608 White Crossing / Public Hearing for 4 lot CSM consistent with concept plan and rezone for residential use from AT 35 to RR4, RM 8 and RM 16 / Sec 13.

MOTION 1 [Aburomia/Hanson]: to recommend to the TB that the preliminary 4 lot CSM as presented is consistent with the concept plan and is consistent with the town land use plan. Lots 2 and 3 and 4 are subject to town approved building envelopes on file at town hall. This exhausts the divisions that the Hoffman lands are eligible. 6-ayes, 0-nays.

MOTION CARRIED

MOTION 2 [Jester/Aburomia]: to recommend to the TB the rezone of Lot 1 of 5 ac from AT 35 to RR4, Lot 2 of 22.14 ac to RM 16 and Lot 3 of 10.17 ac to RM8. These lots are not eligible for further division per the Town of Springdale land use plan. 5-ayes, 0-nays, 1-abstain (Bunn).

PUBLIC HEARING:

Maggie Schessler, Dairy Ridge Rd. Is concerned about the impact of allowing a split and rezone for residential development. She is concerned that allowing the farm to be split will allow Epic to acquire the land and that the future development of the area will be uncertain. She is concerned about the impact on her land values as they moved to the town to have rural property and she believes that if this land is purchased its future is uncertain.

PC Discussion:

The plan commission reviewed the terms of the option 1 concept plan whereby the landowner was eligible for 3 density units and then the lots that are created would be deed restricted from future development per the terms of the land use plan. The only way there would be a change of use or an expansion of the number of density units on this farmland would be if the land use plan changed. Residents of the town are encouraged to stay involved in town land use policies.

The Plan Commission reviewed the CSM for these divisions to see if they were consistent with the approved concept plan and to rezone them for residential use consistent with the lot sizes.

Note: Lot 4 is not being rezoned for residential development at this time. It is remaining AT35. This lot will need to be rezoned for residential development in the future if someone wishes to

use the density unit with it and that the driveway access that is shown on the concept plan map is suggested but not approved.

~~9. C Kelly and L Hellenbrand/ Lands on J and Dairy Ridge Rd / Public Hearing for CSM consistent with approved Lot Line Adjustment and Rezone from AT35 go RM8 and AT35 to UTR/ Sec 14.~~ Postponed until next month per the request of the applicant.

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

TB Chair Rosenbaum called to order the TB portion of the meeting and confirmed that the meeting was posted according to open meeting law.

- **MOTION [Schwenn/Altschul] to approve minutes from TB portion of the joint PC_TB meeting from July 2025. 3-ayes, 0-nays. MOTION CARRIED**

Dahlk/ Mount Vernon Park Assn / 1644 State Hwy 92/ approx .7 ac from Dahlk to Park via Lot Line Adjustment/ Sec 34.

- **MOTION [Altschul/Schwenn]: to approve the Dahlk lot line adjustment between Dahlk and Mount Vernon Park assn because it is consistent with the town lot line adjustment ordinance. 3-ayes, 0-nays. MOTION CARRIED**

Discussion: The town board also thanked Dahlk's for their donation to the park.

Ama C./ Lot 4 CSM 16185 Kollath Rd/ Public Hearing for Building Envelope Change/ Sec 26.

- **MOTION [Schwenn/Altschul]: to approve the recommendation of the PC for the building envelope change as presented. 3-ayes, 0-nays. MOTION CARRIED.**

Discussion: While Rosenbaum observed that it might not have made sense to have building envelopes on these lots – the PC made a recommendation and the TB decided to act on it as recommended.

L. Hellenbrand/ Request for exception to 66' frontage for lots on HWY J/ Sec 14.

- **MOTION [Altschul/Schwenn]: to approve an exception to the 66' frontage for the lots on Hwy J as it is consistent with the goals of the land use plan and meets the county requirements for the exception. 3-ayes, 0-nays MOTION CARRIED**

Discussion: Rosenbaum observed that this was a clear case of preserving ag land by granting this exception, which is a goal of the land use plan. Schwenn was glad to have a way to avoid the flagpoles.

L. Hellenbrand/ Lands on HWY J North of Dairy Ridge Rd/ Public Hearing for CSM consistent with concept plan and Rezone 3 lots to Single Family Residential/ Sec 14.

- **MOTION 1 [Schwenn/Altschul]: to approve the preliminary 3 lot CSM as presented as it is consistent with the concept plan on file with the town and is consistent with the town land use plan. 3-ayes, 0-nays. MOTION CARRIED.**
- **MOTION 2 [Schwenn/Altschul]: to approve the rezone of Lot 1 of 2.75 ac from AT35 to SFR2 and Lots 2 and 3 of 1.5 ac lots from AT35 to SFR1. These lots will not be eligible for further division. 3-ayes, 0-nays. MOTION CARRIED**

Discussion: No additional discussion.

Bilse Family LLC/ Lands on Lunde Lane / Public Hearing for CSM consistent with concept plan and Rezone from AT 35 to RR4, RM8 and RM16 consistent with lot size for residential development/ Sec 17.

- **MOTION 1 [Rosenbaum/Schwenn]: to approve the preliminary 4 lot CSM as presented as it is consistent with the concept plan and is consistent with the town land use plan. Lots are subject to town approved building envelopes on file at town hall. 2-ayes, 1-nays (Altschul). MOTION CARRIED.**

Discussion: Schwenn believed the town should stick with what we say we will do. Altschul agrees that the town's actions should be consistent over time but does not believe that this division is consistent with the land use plan. Rosenbaum believes that we should support the 2004 decision makers and wants to make sure that the original building envelopes are communicated.

- **MOTION 2 [Rosenbaum/Schwenn] : to recommend to the TB the rezone of Lots 1 and 2 of 11.7 and 11.61 ac from AT35 to RM8 , Lot 3 of approx. 6.76ac from AT 35 to RR4, and Lot 4 of 33.88ac from AT35 to RM16 consistent with lot size for residential development These lots are not eligible for further division per the town of Springdale land use plan. These divisions also complete the eligible divisions on the Bilse concept plan. 3-ayes, 0-nays. MOTION CARRIED**

No further discussion.

R. Hoffman/ 2608 White Crossing / Public Hearing for 4 lot CSM consistent with concept plan and rezone for residential use from AT 35 to RR4, RM 8 and RM 16 / Sec 13.

- **MOTION 1 [Schwenn/Altschul]: to recommend to the TB that the preliminary 4 lot CSM as presented is consistent with the concept plan and is consistent with the town**

land use plan. Lots 2 and 3 and 4 are subject to town approved building envelopes on file at town hall. This exhausts the divisions that the Hoffman lands are eligible for. 2-ayes, 1-nays (Rosenbaum). MOTION CARRIED

Discussion: Resident from Dairy Ridge Road stated that you never know what will happen in the long run and that she is worried about Epic acquiring land in the township. Schwenn expressed frustration with folks who come to town on developed land and then want to deny others the ability to develop. He observed that he too wishes that things were the way they used to be with lots of dairy farms, but that everyone is entitled to develop their own land by the terms of the plan. Altschul observed that she also moved to Springdale for the rural nature of the town and that part of why she ran for town board was to work to protect the rural nature of the town. She encouraged people to stay involved in town land use. Rosenbaum noted that he could not support the preliminary CSM as he did not believe that it was consistent with the land use plan because it placed a density unit on the 40 ac farm field and that he felt it could have been avoided if there was an additional density unit on the 10 ac lot.

- **MOTION 2 [Altschul/Schwenn]: to recommend to the TB the rezone of Lot 1 of 5 ac from AT 35 to RR4, Lot 2 of 22.14 ac to RM 16 and Lot 3 of 10.17 ac to RM8. These lots are not eligible for further division per the Town of Springdale land use plan. 5-ayes, 3-nays, 0 nays. MOTION CARRIED.**

No further discussion.

- **MOTION [Schwenn/Rosenbaum] to adjourn. 3-ayes, 0-nays. MOTION CARRIED**

~~10. C Kelly/ Lands off Dairy Ridge Road and County Hwy J/ Conditional Use Permit to extend mineral extraction area/ See 14. It will be postponed until next month at the applicant's request.~~

11. MOTION [Hanson/ Aburomia] to adjourn 8:45pm