

Minutes of the Joint Meeting of the Springdale Plan Commission and Town Board at the Plan Commission Monthly meeting on April 25, 2022 at 7 p.m. held in-person at Town Hall and concurrently on zoom. Minutes prepared by Maggie Milcarek, Deputy/Elections Clerk Approved May 23, 2022.

IN ATTENDANCE: Plan Commission: Rich Bernstein, Ellen Bunn, Amy Jester, Jim Hanson, Mike Healy, Wayne Hefty, (a quorum is present) Town Board: Wayne Hefty, John Rosenbaum (Chair), Richard Schwenn. Town Admin: Jackie Arthur, Maggie Milcarek

- **Call to order by PC Chair Amy Jester. Compliance with the Open Meeting Law was confirmed. Quorum is present. Approval of the agenda (Public input at the time of each agenda item may be permitted)**

- **Minutes of previous meetings**

MOTION: Hefty/Hanson to approve minutes

Vote-Aye-5, Nay-0, Abstain-1 (Bernstein)

- **A. Carrico / 52' x 32' Residential Accessory Building/ 8177 CTH G/ Sec. 25**

MOTION: Healy/Bunn recommend that the Town Board approve the 52" x 32" residential accessory building at 8177 CTH G. The building shall not be for commercial use.

Vote: Aye-6, Nay-0

Discussion: PC members discussed that if the foundation for the house is in we can approve the permit for accessory building. Dane county decided that it was enough of a commitment to the permanent residence that they can approve accessory building before home is built. Commercial activity is not planned for this building, according to the applicant.

- **J and C Schultz/ Building Envelope Change/ Lot #2 Bruner Rd/ Sec. 10**

MOTION: Healy/Bunn recommend that the Town Board deny the proposed building envelope change to Lot #2 Bruner Rd because it is moving it too far into the center of agricultural land and away from the woods. The building envelope change is not consistent with the Springdale Land Use Plan.

Vote: Aye-6, Nay-0

MOTION: Jester/Bunn motion to recommend that the Town Board approve a move of building envelope for Lot #2 Bruner Rd, the new building envelope is the lands approximately 3.5 acres south of the driveway and includes the woods, it allows for a buildable lot, and is consistent with the Land Use Plan.

Vote: Aye-6, nay-0

Discussion: Original concept plan shows the original building envelope for three sites. Since the original concept plan a couple of things have happened. The building envelope for Lot 1 moved and has a 1-acre Building Envelope, It is low and close to the woods. New Building Envelope for lot 3 is just off of where the new driveway will come in and is tucked along the woodline. Owners of these lots went through process to move driveway, owners of the lots came to an agreement and decided to move to the easement. This resulted is saving ag land because a longer drive cutting across lot 3 will be abandoned.

Lot 2: Applicant wanted to take into account the moving of the neighboring lot to give them a little more distance from their neighbor. The original BE would be a tight squeeze given the woodland according to

the builder. The new location allows more privacy for both lots. This would be on the hillside but also concealed. Applicant has some safety concerns because of the ravine and drop-off in the woods.

PC members discussed that the potential building envelope of the accessory building would be very exposed from the road. Also asked if the top of the roofline would be below the top of the ridge--the top of the roofline would be slightly above the ridge but below the brow/peak of the hill. There would be some visibility. In the original concept plan all the building envelopes were tucked into the woods but they have all been pulled out a little bit. PC discussed that there are fewer objections to the location of the house but more issues with the location of the future accessory building. Lots of discussion at site visit about keeping the house out of the ag field, and this new location is moving the house closer in to the ag field. Discussed that the house would be more visible in this location. There is some difficulty with this lot because of the location of the driveway.

PC members discussed the criteria for residential density option 2: the BE shall be located out of ag field, avoid putting the BE on ridges or extending over the ridgetop, or require plan commission to require screens. The BE needs to be as close to the woods as possible and the rooftop should be below the ridgeline to the extent possible. It has to be between the woods and the driveway given how far north the driveway extends. Also given the Land Use Plan, some clustering of houses might be necessary. It was passed as an option 2 so the owner was taking on these extra restrictions in order to get this extra lot. This entire lot is very close to the ridgetop of the surrounding land.

PC discussed moving homesite to the west but keeping it south of the driveway and close to the woods. Applicant agreed this might be possible. Applicant discussed moving the BE directly south closer to the woodline and south of the driveway including the accessory building. Applicant asked about another option on the other side of the driveway at the bend of the driveway, on the furthest spot south, hugging the driveway, off the ridgeline as much as possible and as far away from PD as it could be.

PC discussed that they have pulled all the BE out of the woods because it is difficult to build in the woods. A lot of the ag land has been preserved and the houses are clustered. There is less wooded land on this lot to begin with.

PC members pointed out that there is 3.5 acres south and west of the driveway between the woods and motioned to recommend the Town Board approve this area as the BE including accessory building.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TB FOR THE PURPOSES OF REVIEWING AND ACTING ON AGENDA ITEMS ABOVE. Called to order at 7:59 P.M.

- **Carrico / 52' x 32' Residential Accessory Building/ 8177 CTH G/ Sec. 25 ACTION**

MOTION: Hefty/Schwenn motion to approve 52' x 32' residential accessory building at 8177 CTH G contingent on foundation requirements for Dane County. Also noting that there is to be no commercial activity in the building.

Vote: Aye-3, Nay-0

Discussion: PC recommended approval. TB had no issues. Building should be contingent on main house foundation going in.

- **J and C Schultz/ Building Envelope Change/ Lot #2 Bruner Rd/ Sec. 10 ACTION**

MOTION: Schwenn/Hefty motion to deny the Building Envelope change for Lot #2 Bruner Rd because it is not consistent with the Land Use Plan and moves the building envelope too far into agricultural field.

Vote: Aye-3, Nay-0

MOTION: Rosenbaum/Schwenn motion to approve revised Building Envelope change for Lot #2-- anything/everything to the south and west of the existing driveway tucked into or including the woods as it is consistent with the Land Use Plan.

Vote: Aye-3, Nay-0

Discussion: Town Board agreed with Plan Commission's recommendation to deny the first Building Envelope Change and approve the second the building envelope change as it keeps the building envelope closer to the woods and out of the ag field, and is consistent with the Town's Land Use Plan.

Schwenn/Hefty motion to adjourn at 8:05 p.m.

- R. Kahl/ J. Zimmer/ CSM review for consistency with Lot Line adjustment approval and rezone due to change of lot sizes/ Lust Rd and 8642 CTH G/ Sec 34.

MOTION: Jester/Hefty motion to recommend to the TB that the prelim CSM is consistent with the approved lot line adjustments from March 2022. These CSM do not in any way alter the building envelopes on the previously approved Kahl concept plan.

Vote: Aye-6, Nay-0

MOTION: Hanson/Jester recommend to the Town Board a rezone of Lot 1 from AT-35 to RM8, Lot 2 from RM16 to RR4 and Lot 3 from RR2 to RM16. As shown on the application. None of these lots are eligible for further division per the town of Springdale land use plan and the rezone of the Zimmer land to RM 16 does not alter in any way the limited family business conditional use permit in effect on this lot.

Vote: Aye-6, Nay-0

Discussion: PC discussed that it was consistent with the approved lot line adjustments from last month and that the zoning allows for conditional use permit.

- **Sign Ordinance Revision - Discussion Only**

Discussion: After the October Town Board meeting two requests for proposed signs prompted a revision to the sign ordinance. Because of the zoning change with Dane County, and the fact that the Town adopted County zoning, it also included the Sign Ordinance. The sign ordinance for the Town could only be more restrictive not less. Anything that the County approved would also have to be approved by the Town. A committee of volunteers from the Township took a look at the sign ordinance to review and amend it, PC members gave initial feedback, and then another small group of PC and TB members took the feedback and made more revisions that would be appropriate for Springdale.

The new definition of a sign was discussed as was the language around prohibiting signs in town except for those advertising ag products/ ag activity. The new zoning requirements for commercial/general/limited commercial home occupations, and limited family business were also discussed. The group also discussed billboards and making sure we are very careful not to allow billboards in town and not allow ground signs, only on premises signs. There are a couple of signs in the Town that are grandfathered in.

The group also discussed lighting for signs: should it be allowed, what are shut off times, safety issues, and ensuring signs are compliant with dark sky ordinance.

PC also discussed the possibility of variances for the ordinance.

- **PC Procedures - Check in on town email addresses - Record retention reminder - Schedule work session**

Discussion:

Everyone needs to set up a town email address. Nobody should be deleting town emails.

PC Chair and TB Chair are meeting new PC members and will set up work session once the new PC members are decided.

MOTION: Healy/Bernstein motion to adjourn at 9:10 p.m.