

MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE SPRINGDALE PLAN COMMISSION AND TOWN BOARD AT THE PLAN COMMISSION MONTHLY MEETING ON FEB. 22, 2021 Approved March 22, 2021

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting was held via Zoom on the computer or via telephone. The Notice of the Meeting with instructions to access the meeting via the internet or telephone was posted in the Town Hall bulletin board in the Town of Springdale, on the Town of Springdale website townofspringdale.org and via the Town-wide email distribution list. Individuals needing reasonable accommodations to access the meeting contact the Plan Commission Chair at 608-618-1448 at least three (3) business days in advance of the meeting.

IN ATTENDANCE: Rich Bernstein, Mike Healy, Jim Hanson,, Amy Jester, John Rosenbaum and Denise Sullivan. (A quorum is present.) Town Chair Mike Fagan Absent: Ellen Bunn, Richard Schwenn

CALL TO ORDER: by PC Chair A. Jester at 7:02 p.m. as a Zoom meeting via Internet or telephone. FYI: During the meeting, attendees will be asked to mute their speakers/phones, unmute their speaker/phones when you wish to speak and identify oneself by name before speaking. A voice vote will be called unless the vote is not unanimous. Then, a roll call vote will be called.

NOTICE OF THE MEETING: pursuant to Wisconsin Open Meeting Law was confirmed. The final agenda was posted on 2/18/2021 at the Town Hall and on the website as required by law.

MINUTES: MOTION by D. Sullivan/ J. Rosenbaum to approve the draft minutes of the 1/25//2021 meeting of the PC as amended to add motioners and to change a typo. Motion to approve as changed carried unanimously by voice vote: 5-0 ayes, no nayses, 1- abstention (M. Healy).

K. CAMPBELL/ REZONE /SHARPES CORNER ROAD AND COLBY /SEC. 32.

MOTION by M. Healy/ D. Sullivan to recommend to the town board approval of the rezoning from RR1 to RM 16 and RM16 to RR1.

Discussion: Motion should have happened procedurally last month with the CSM recommendation. There is no change of use, merely moving the existing zoning with the lot. Move to approve the switch of zoning from RR1 to RM16 and RM 16 to RR1 as depicted in the zoning application map.

Vote: Motion to approve carried unanimously by voice vote: 6-0, 6- ayes, no nayses.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TB FOR THE PURPOSES OF REVIEWING AND ACTING ON AGENDA ITEMS ABOVE.

CALL TO ORDER THE TB DURING THE JOINT MEETING OF THE PC AND TB by Town Chair Mike Fagan at 7:10pm for the purposes of discussion and action on the agenda item above recommended to the TB for approval by the PC. In attendance M. Fagan, J. Rosenbaum. Absent: R. Schwenn.

NOTICE OF THE MEETING: pursuant to Wisconsin Open Meeting Law was confirmed by PC Chair A. Jester.

K. CAMPBELL/ REZONE/SHARPES CORNER ROAD AND COLBY /SEC. 32.

MOTION by J. Rosenbaum/M. Fagan to approve the small parcel in the SE corner rezone from RM16 to RR1 and to rezone the former RR1 lot location to RM 16.

Motion to approve carried Fagan – aye, Rosenbaum-aye 2-ayes, zero-nayses.

Next Steps: Dane County will hear the rezone application

ADJOURN THE TB DURING THE JOINT MEETING OF THE PC AND TB: MOTION by M. Fagan/J Rosenbaum. Motion to adjourn carried 2-0: Rosenbaum and Fagan -ayes, no nayses

A. AND N .CARRICO - CONCEPT PLAN/ HWY G/ SEC 25.

MOTION by J, Rosenbaum/ D Sullivan to approve an option 1 concept plan on the Carrico lands with a Lot 1 of 4.0 ac. And a building envelope of the entire lot, Lot 2 adjacent to lot 1 and 1.5-2.25 ac depending on driveway configuration with the entire lots as the building envelope and the remainder of the parcel as lot 3 with a building envelope as depicted on map.

Background: A. Carrico recently purchased lands owned by W. Hefty and others. The land has no farmhouse and does not have a concept plan on file. According to town records in 2002 exclusive of right of way - 73.544 ac with no farmhouse, Option 1 (1:25) 2 d.u. + 1 for the remainder of land. A. Carrico was granted a single access point directly across the neighbors driveway on HWY G. Carrico presented a revision of the concept plan based on discussion at the pre application meeting. Lot two was reduced in size to 2 ac to reduce the amount of farmland used to better meet the goals of the land use plan.

Discussion: Discussion and questions included but was not limited to:

1. Concern about proposed driveway location running parallel and right beside HWY G. Safety issue of headlights running along HWY. Needs more research to determine if safety concerns warrant a driveway relocation. Landowner concerned about lot 2 being surrounded by driveway on two sides and hwy on third if drive moves to the east.
2. As presented the concept plan had a 66' strip of land between lots 1 and 2. The PC expressed desire to move these lots together to not leave unfarmable strips.
3. Discussion about relocating lot 2 to the eastern most corner of parcel - agreed that this would increase the amount of farmland used for driveway and would need a lot of engineering/ DNR permits.
4. Why not put lot 2 south of lot 1? Natural drainage path to the south of parcel 1. Applicant expressed desire to maintain favorable views from lot 1.
5. Discussion about location of lot 1 on ag field - M Healy felt that the land use plan guides us to keep lot lines out of ag fields. The Land Use plan states: *"Building envelope(s) shall not be located in the middle portion of an agricultural field unless the middle portion of the field is not suitable for productive agricultural fieldwork. If building envelope(s) must be located on agricultural land because other locations are not possible, it is desirable to locate them near the edges of agricultural fields and/or to use the least productive soil as determined by soil types."* A Jester felt like this lot is on the edge of the ag field and meets the guidance of the land use plan by keeping the building envelope/lot out of the middle of an ag field. Additionally, it is located along an existing boundary - Hwy G and keeps the most farmland together by not using more land for driveways. The Land Use Plan states: *"To the extent possible, lot lines shall be located to follow previously existing natural or man-made boundaries, such as roads, fence rows, woods, waterways, streams, or similar boundaries. If lot lines must cross agricultural fields because other boundaries are not possible, it is desirable to locate them in such a way so as to maintain the maximum size agricultural fields in one contiguous parcel."*
6. M. Healy suggested amending motion to specify that building envelopes for the lots should be moved closer to the edges of the fields or tucked close to the woods. Discussion included that "close to" is hard to enforce - suggestion withdrawn.

Vote: Motion to approve carried unanimously by voice vote 6-0, 6 ayes, no naves

See approved concept plan attached to minutes.

Next Steps: Town Board Chair Mike Fagan to talk with Dane County about driveway and talk to Adam prior to getting CSMs drawn.

PC PROCEDURES:

Discussion of site visit notification for PC members, questions to ask applicants in concept plan discussions, and to whom to direct citizen zoning questions. Discussion of attaching approved concept plans to meeting minutes - decided yes and posted to the website with minutes. Discussion of density unit calculation based on plan adoption date as it relates to town abandoned roads. All agreed language of the Land Use Plan clear on this matter. Any changes would require a Plan amendment, further discussion, and a public hearing. PC pointed out we are happy to discuss matters with any town residents.

Motion to Adjourn. M Healy/ D Sullivan. Motion to approve carried unanimously by voice vote: 6-0 ayes, no naves. Adjourned at 8:48

Approved by PC on Feb 22, 2021
 Amy Jester - PC Chair



Carrico Concept Plan - Option 1
 2 new density units, 1 development area for remainder of land
 Lots 1 and 2 entire lot is building envelope, Lot 3 building envelope as shown on map