

Minutes of the Joint Meeting of the Springdale Plan Commission and Town Board at the Plan Commission Monthly meeting on March 28, 2022 at 7 p.m. held in-person at Town Hall and concurrently on zoom. Minutes prepared by Maggie Milcarek, Deputy/Elections Clerk

Approved April 25, 2022

IN ATTENDANCE: Plan Commission: Ellen Bunn, Amy Jester, Jim Hanson, Mike Healy, Wayne Hefty, Denise Sullivan (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.**
- **Minutes of previous meetings**

MOTION: Hanson/Healy motion to approve minutes

Vote: Aye-6, Nay-0

- **A. Amineva/ 30x50 Accessory Building/2800 CTHP/ Sec 9.**

MOTION: Bunn/Sullivan recommend that the Town Board approve the 30x50 accessory building on the 5.5 acre lot at 2800 County Highway P as depicted on site plan.

Vote: Aye- 6, Nay-0

Discussion: Site was staked, PC Chair Jester visited. PC Members discussed that the property is zoned RR4, which means zoning would allow 1 animal unit per acre. PC Members discussed the intended use of the property—the owner has no plans for a business in this location, the building is just for personal use for some animals. The property does not have a building envelope on file. PC Members discussed Dane County zoning permits—the applicant has already gone to Dane County for the process of permitting, wetland zoning and setback. Dane County shoreland zoning conditionally approved the building permit already. PC Members discussed the location of the building in relation to the county road--the building is not off of the county road, it is off of the driveway, which previously existed as a field road. PC Members also discussed plumbing and water access for the building.

- **K. Hoffman/ 36x16 Accessory Building/ 2051 Springdale Center Rd./ Sec 28.1**

MOTION: Jester/Healy recommend that the Town Board approve the 36x18 foot building on skids for storage use.

Vote: Aye-6, Nay-0

Discussion: There are already appx. 1800 sq feet of accessory buildings on the property, which is why this has come to the PC for recommendation. PC Members discussed that with a movable building on skids, the owner needs to adhere to setbacks if they were to move the building to a different location. The property is zoned RR8

- **J. Huseth/ K Hanson/Rezone/ Lewis Rd/ Sec 31. Discussion and report of Dane County recommendation on zoning.**

MOTION: N/A

Vote: N/A

Discussion: The PC Chair reported that Dane County was fine with the RE zoning with the deed restriction and that it would probably fit better given the parcel. The goal of the rezone was to allow for the agricultural uses (row crop) and to prevent any structures from being erected on the land. The Town suggested zoning would accomplish these goals. PC members appreciated the additional information. The reason Dane County initially recommended the UTR zoning was primarily because that zoning would have allowed for no building. They were fine with RE and restrictions.

- **D. Midthun/ Concept Plan Revision and CSM Review and Rezone for residential use / CTH J/ Sec 23.**

MOTION: Sullivan/Healy recommend that the Town Board approve the revised concept plan to reflect a change in the location of the density unit “A” that will stay with the bulk of the farmland.

Vote: Aye-6, Nay-0

Proposed Revision to Concept Plan: Shorten the driveway and Move Location of density unit 'A' from the woodline by Dalik Circle to the end of the tree line. The building envelope shall be 2 ac and spot zoned RR2 because this density unit is staying with the bulk of the farmland.

Concept plan revision approved

March 28, 2022

Option 1 Concept plan for Midthun lands - Approved by the PC 7/26/21

Dane County granted an access point 470 ft south of existing farm driveway = 3 density units; farm drive can add 2 additional density units. Option 1 Concept plan for 5 density units



Development area A - will be the density unit that is to stay with the bulk of the farmland* and so does not need frontage access flagpole - the area for residential development will be spot zoned RR-2 and this density unit will share a driveway with Development Areas D and E. The driveway shown on this map is just to show a drive will cross farmland - the location of the drive is subject to engineering needs and town board approval.

*Because Development Area A will be associated with the bulk of the farm and to eliminate the need for a long flagpole, the original red brick farmhouse will need to be divided off into a small CSM to be rezoned, probably RR2.

Development areas B/C - will share a driveway with the existing farmhouse. Lot C will need to have a flagpole frontage strip of 66' either north of the farmhouse or south of it. These lots shall not exceed 2 ac

Development areas D/E will be tucked into the wooded "cup"; their access frontage strips will be between the houses already existing on J. The development areas shall be in the cup region protected by the existing woods. The lot lines shown on the concept plan are merely to show that the town is okay with these lots including the non-farmable portions of the land but it does not require it to do so (other than what would be required for frontage access)

MOTION: Hanson/Sullivan recommend to the Town Board that the preliminary CSM with the original farmhouse divided off from the remainder of the land and an area for residential development identified as a building envelope is consistent with the concept plan.

Vote: Aye-6, Nay-0

MOTION: Sullivan/Bunn recommend the Town Board approve the rezone of the old farmhouse lot of 1.552 ac from AT 35 to SFR1 (noting that this lot has no further divisions and plans to have a shared

drive with two future lots) and spot zone an area of 2 ac for residential development from AT 35 to RR2 that will stay with the bulk of the land as depicted on the CSM.

Vote: Aye-6, Nay-0

Discussion: This change was discussed at the last PC meeting thoroughly and was generally supported; however, because there was not a posted a concept plan change as an agenda item the PC was unable to make the recommendation. This building envelope change significantly shortens the amount of ag land needed for a driveway. Still only uses a 2-acre area to be spot zoned for residential development. It is along an edge of trees in the field and is part of an option #1 concept plan. This shared driveway will allow farm access across it in two different places. After the creation of ne new lot and one spot zone area – the concept plan shows 4 additional development areas remaining.

- **Trulen/ CSM consistent with concept plan and rezone for residential use/ 9450 Malone Rd/ Sec 30.**

MOTION: Jester/Bunn recommend to the Town Board that the Trulen CSM is consistent with the concept plan on file with the town.

Vote: Aye-6, Nay-0

MOTION: Sullivan/Hefty recommend that the Town Board approve the parcel of 4.47 ac created by this CSM be rezoned RR2 to reflect its residential use. This lot is not eligible for any further divisions per the Town of Springdale Land Use Plan. The remainder of the land has 2 density units as indicated on the Eggiman concept plan.

Vote: Aye-6, Nay-0

Discussion: PC discussed that this action is dividing off the farm house and there are two density units left. Note: There was a prior CSM for this lot brought before the town; however, the former owner never completed the division at DaneTCounty and it expired. There will be no further divisions of this particular CSM, what is currently Lot 1, which will be part of the Rezone. PC members asked about the driveway for this lot. There is an existing driveway for the original farmstead.

- **R. Kahl/ J. Zimmer/ Lot Line Adjustment/ Lots 2 &4 Lust Rd and 8642 CTH G/ Sec 34.**

MOTION: Bunn/ Healy recommend the Town Board approve the Lot Line Adjustment between Kahl and Zimmer for a forested area of Lot 4. There will be no transfer of Density Units with lot line adjustments. Lot Line Adjustment appears to be consistent with Town of Springdale Land Use Plan.

Vote: Aye-6, Nay-0

Discussion: PC discussed that this lot line adjustment involves no density units and no agricultural land, just woods. The building envelope for Lot 4 remains unchanged. The lot size of Lot 4 is significantly reduced. New lot 4 would be about 6 acres down from 18. Zimmer will pick up an additional 10-12 acres. PC Discussed this is consistent with Land Use Plan.

MOTION: Healy/Bunn recommend the Town Board deny the Lot Line Adjustment of the field portion from lot #2 running from the circle to the top of the cemetery bump out because it breaks up agricultural land and therefore it is a prohibited lot line adjustment according to the town ordinance and it is not consistent with the Town of Springdale Land Use Plan.

Vote: Aye-6, Nay-0

Discussion: PC Discussed that this is dividing an agricultural field. It violates our lot line adjustment ordinance and it is not consistent with the Town of Springdale Land Use Plan because it is going through an agricultural field.

MOTION: Hefty/Sullivan recommend the Town Board approve proposal #3 as drawn, which is a lot line adjustment to include a small portion of Lot 2 behind the Zimmer shed to allow for better access to the shed by Zimmer.

Vote: Aye-6, Nay-0

Discussion: PC discussed the adjustment of the lot line to give Zimmer better access and use of the buildings. Zimmer has two ag buildings one is right on the lot line. The amount of land under consideration is about an acre. This is just the small section behind the shed, the southern most section of Lot 2. PC Members discussed that going straight down from the cemetery would result in a very acute angle for the property and land that would be difficult to farm with big equipment. Other members brought up the point that there are lots of different ways ag land can be farmed so the angle doesn't make a huge difference.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TB FOR THE PURPOSES OF REVIEWING AND ACTING ON AGENDA ITEMS ABOVE AT 8:09 PM

- **Amineva/ 30x50 Accessory Building/2800 CTH P/ Sec 9**

MOTION: Schwenn/Hefty approve the 30x50 accessory building on the 5.5 acre lot at 2800 County Highway P as depicted on concept plan with the stipulation that there will be no commercial activity in this building.

Vote: Aye-3, Nay-0

Discussion: TB discussed and stressed that the building would not be for commercial use.

- **K. Hoffman/ 36x18 Accessory Building/ 2051 Springdale Center Rd./ Sec 28.4**

MOTION Hefty/Schwenn approve the 36x18 accessory building on skids at 2051 Springdale Center Rd that will not be attached to the ground. The building will be for residential storage only and not for commercial activity.

Vote: Aye-3, Nay-0

Discussion: TB discussed that this building would be on skids and nobody saw any problem with the building.

- **J. Huseth/ K Hanson/Rezone/ Lewis Rd/ Sec 31.**

MOTION Rosenbaum/Schwenn approve the Plan Commission recommendation to rezone this 8.42 acres from At-35 to RE with the condition that the permitted use of " Nonresidential buildings or structures accessory to any permitted use" and conditional use of "caretakers residence" are excluded via a deed restriction.

Vote: All voted aye

Discussion: No further discussion on this agenda item.

- **D. Midthun/ Concept Plan Revision and CSM Review and Rezone for residential use / CTH J/ Sec 23.**

MOTION Rosenbaum/Hefty approve the revised concept plan as recommended by the Plan Commission to reflect a change in the location of the density unit “A” that will stay with the bulk of the farmland.

Vote: Aye-3, Nay-0

MOTION: Rosenbaum/Hefty approve the preliminary CSM with the original farmhouse divided off from the remainder of the land and an area for residential development identified as a building envelope as it is consistent with the concept plan.

Vote: Aye-3, Nay-0

Discussion: Town Board members discussed that the preliminary CSM is consistent with the concept plan.

MOTION: Rosenbaum/Hefty approve the rezone old farmhouse parcel lot of 1.552 ac from AT 35 to SFR1 with no further divisions and spot zone an area of 2 ac for residential development from At-35 to RR2 that will stay with bulk of farmland.

Vote: Aye-3, Nay-0

- **Trulen/ CSM consistent with concept plan and rezone for residential use/ 9450 Malone Rd/ Sec 30.**

MOTION: Rosenbaum/Schwenn approve the Trulen CSM as it is consistent with the concept plan.

Vote: Aye-3, Nay-0

MOTION: Rosenbaum/Schwenn approve the rezone of the parcel from At-35 to RR2 for residential use. This new lot is not eligible for further division per the Town of Springdale Land Use Plan.

Vote: Aye-3, Nay-0

Discussion: Town Board discussed that the CSM is consistent with the concept plan, the rezone of the parcel and no further divisions per the Land Use Plan.

- **R. Kahl/ J. Zimmer/ Lot Line Adjustment/ Lots 2 &4 Lust Rd and 8642 CTH G/ Sec 34**

MOTION: Hefty/Schwenn approve the Plan Commission recommendation that reconfigures the original lot 4 and transfers an area of woods from Kahl and Zimmer. The lot line adjustment appears to be consistent with the Town of Springdale Land Use Plan.

Vote: Aye-3, Nay-0

Discussion: Town Board members discussed they have no issue with lot line adjustment. It is trading wooded land for wooded land.

MOTION: Hefty/Schwenn deny proposal number two transferring a portion of the ag land from Lot 2 to Zimmer as recommended by the Plan Commission because it breaks up agricultural land and is not consistent with the Town of Springdale Land Use Plan.

Vote: Aye-3, Nay-0

MOTION: Rosenbaum/Schwenn approve the lot line adjustment to include a portion of Lot 2 behind Zimmers shed as shown in proposal #3 as recommended by the Plan Commission.

Vote: Aye-3, Nay-0

Discussion: Town Board members discussed that there is minimal amount of farmland involved in this lot line adjustment.

Schwenn/Hefty motion to adjourn at 8:30 p.m.

- **PC Procedures**

- **Update on town email addresses and new domain:** PC and Town staff switching to .gov emails. There is a time scheduled if help is needed with Mad City Tech.
- **Discussion of PC membership number/makeup:** 2001 Ordinance calls for 8 residents and 1 TB member to be on the PC. PC Members discussed that it is good to have a larger group for leeway for obtaining a quorum. Bunn suggests total of 7.

PC Members discussed if the Town Board member be a voting member or a non-voting member. They could rewrite the ordinance stating that as long as we are having joint TB and PC meeting, we do not need to have a TB member on the PC. May not be necessary to have a TB member on the PC if we continue the structure as is. Then we could have 7 PC members who are residents. Members agreed it was good to have an odd number. Legally we are not allowed to have 9 members on the PC. It is recommended that it only be 7 members because of a town of our size. It has to be a minimum of 5. PC and TB discussed that it feels like it is best to have 7 regular citizen members on the PC and not TB members. TB needs to make decision on this.

- **Schedule work session:** Monday nights work. Third week of April is tentative.

- **Jester/Sullivan motion to adjourn at 8:43 p.m.**