

**Village of Holmen  
Planning Commission Minutes  
March 26, 2013**

Village President Proctor called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:30 PM on Tuesday March 26, 2013. Present were commission members Proctor, Johnston, Ebner, Dunham and Horvath, along with advisory members Olson, and Heinig; members Szak and Evenson were excused. Also in attendance were Gene Olson, Steve Hoesidy, Matt Brigson, Eric Eade, John & Bonnie Reiple, Barb & Mel Alsobrooks, Nichole Plomedahl, Michael & Nancy McGuire, Diane Holte, Tom Lyons, Richard Beyer and Jean Burgess.

Motion by Dunham, seconded by Horvath to approve the minutes of the February 26, 2013 meeting - carried unanimously.

**Public Hearing**

#3 – Beyer Planned Unit Development Petition along Sand Lake Road.

Motion by Ebner, second by Horvath to open the Public Hearing - Carried unanimously.

Mel Alsobrooks – 505 Freedom Street would like to see what the site plan looks like and what the building configuration will look like.

Mike McGuire – 1810 Pinecrest Avenue is also concerned with the location of the building.

Eric Eade – 1910 Pinecrest Avenue would also like to see a site plan and asked what each of the units would be valued at.

Matt Brigson - 501 Freedom Street asked if screening was going to be by use of fencing or landscaping.

Tom Lyons – Project Architect, produced a plan that indicated where the proposed building and drive would be located. The existing house will remain and the drive will access Sand Lake Road. A turn-a-round will be located in the drive between the proposed building and the existing house. The proposed building will be 6 identical single story, slab on grade, 2 bedroom units with a 2 car garage for each unit. The existing tree lines on the north and east are intended to remain to provide screening for the existing development. The proposed units are intended to be owner occupied, marketed for the elderly and/or retired.

Richard Beyer – Developer, explained that he had met with staff on a number of occasions to come up with a plan that would be acceptable for the site. His intent was to duplicate the existing development on the north side of Grant Street on the west side of Sand Lake Road. He has been looking for something for his mother and has not found anything that he likes and designed the proposed units to try and meet that need. He also provided background related to how the original owner of this property worked with the developer of the Georgetown Subdivision to create a mutually beneficial exchange of land in the development of the subdivision.

Mel Alsobrooks asked if a buffer could also be added on the south side of the building.

Eric Eade asked what the planned square forage of unit would be.

Matt Brigson also asked if additional buffering could be added.

Motion by Dunham, second by Horvath to close the Public Hearing - Carried unanimously

### **Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

### **Agenda Items**

#### **#5 – Possible Action and Recommendation on Beyer Planned Unit Development (PUD) Petition and Site Plan & Architectural Review (SPAR) of the full PUD Submittal.**

Administrator Heinig provided background related to development process to this point. The parcel is currently designated to be R-1 zoning, so a plan was prepared that would maintain that zoning density while protecting the existing residential development to the east. There will be no access allowed from Pinecrest Avenue. The creating of a PUD eliminates the setback requirement between the units, essentially creating a zero lot line type configuration. The plan is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, however there are two items that should be addressed. Landscaping or fencing should be provided along the periphery of the project to create screening for the surrounding residential area. The plan that was submitted did not include the required masonry as defined in the Village standards for projects of this type.

Member Horvath asked what the anticipated value of each unit would be. The units are comparable to those being built along Cherry Lane and will probably be in the \$169,000 range.

Member Dunham supports the masonry requirement and feels that addition is necessary.

Member Ebner asked how the screening issue should be addressed.

Motion by Johnston, second by Horvath to open the floor to the public for additional comments – Carried Unanimously.

Mel Alsobrooks was concerned with the estimated value of the units and also reinforced his concerns regarding screening on the southeast corner of the development.

Eric Eade indicated he would prefer natural screening as opposed to fencing.

Matt Brigson was also concerned with the value of the units and stated he would prefer natural screening.

Richard Beyer explained that the value of a property is also dependent on the maintenance and appearance. His preference for screening would be to use a natural landscaping.

Eric Eade asked what type of development could be done on this property without going through this type of permitting process. Administrator Heinig responded that the property would allow for development of 2 to 3 residential lots, but would require some creative thinking to accomplish that.

Nichole Plomedahl asked if there would be any changes to the Village detention area along the southern edge of the proposed development.

Motion by Horvath, second by Dunham to close the public comments – Carried Unanimously

Director Olson indicated there were no plans for modifications to the detention area, other than regular maintenance items.

Motion by Horvath to recommend approval of the PUD, with the addition of the masonry component requiring 50% on the front and 20% on the sides, as well as use of berming and natural screening for the adjacent properties. The motion was seconded by Johnson – Carried Unanimously. A copy of the submitted plan is attached to the minutes.

#6 – Certified Survey Map for 604/606 Tamarack Trail.

This C.S.M. was prepared by Dick Berg for Lot #2 of the Pine Ridge Subdivision. This process is consistent with the recently adopted ordinance.

Motion by Horvath, seconded by Ebner to recommend approval of the C.S.M. - Carried unanimously.

#7 – SPAR Board – Action and Consideration of County Materials Site Plan & Architectural Review (SPAR).

Motion by Horvath, second by Dunham to approve the plan as submitted.

Member Dunham questioned using the front area for material storage and asked if that was permitted for this type of project. The area in the front of the proposed building will be used as a display for different types of designs using the materials available. These designs might include patios, Bar B Q configurations and other vignettes, not for material storage.

Member Horvath expressed concern regarding the type of fencing used on the adjacent property.

Member Dunham moved to add an amendment to the original motion to add decorative fencing to replace the existing security fencing on the adjacent property, Second by Horvath.

Member Horvath was concerned that the replacement of the fence, as suggested in the amendment would add a significant cost to the project. Member Ebner suggested modifying to only include a portion of the fence to be replaced. County Materials would prefer to maintain the security fencing to keep people out of the site. They did not feel a decorative fence would accomplish that goal.

A vote on the amendment failed unanimously.

The board then took a vote on the original motion – Carried unanimously. A copy of the submittal is attached to the minutes.

#8 – Possible Action and Recommendation on Creating TIF #3 and any Preliminary Requirements Pertaining to such Action.

Administrator Heinig provided the history regarding the possible creation of the new TIF. The area would extend from McHugh Road, southerly along Holmen Drive to the Hwy 53 interchange. The area would encompass approximately 400 acres and include traffic signal improvements at the intersection of Holmen Drive and Hale Drive, a future bridge that would link that intersection to the Remington Hills Subdivision. A possible Roundabout at the intersection of Gaarder Road and Main Street, along with improvements to Holmen Drive as defined in the Corridor Study that was recently adopted. There have been inquiries by developers regarding this area and staff feels the potential for additional business development here is very high. A large portion of the property will need to be annexed to the Village before the plan can be fully developed, but we have had meetings with land owners regarding this. The projected increase in valuation could be as high as \$100,000,000, but for the plan, was developed using a more conservative number of \$55,000,000. There are expensive aspects of the development that can only be completed with the creating of a TIF to help finance that construction.

Member Dunham asked if this could also include screening for the existing development adjacent to the off ramp for Hwy 53 – along Crooked Avenue. Although this was not initially considered in the plan development, we could look at adding that beautification aspect. Member Dunham also asked why the extension of Hale Drive and the additional stop lights at that intersection rather than using the lights already in place at the Gaarder Road intersection. First, there is an existing need to address potential safety issues that we have at the Hale Drive intersection today. In looking at the future connection to the Remington Hills subdivision, staff has tried to position the bridge in the most advantageous location to keep costs down. The preliminary location appears to be the optimum area to provide the shortest span and the cost for that bridge is anticipated to be around \$4,000,000. The intersection with Gaarder Road will be linked through the area to provide additional connectivity for the development. Member Dunham also asked if we could make improvements to the existing bike path access from the existing bridge across Halfway Creek. Although grades may still be steep, we can take a look at the area and see if improvements can be made and evaluate if paving would help.

Member Ebner was concerned with how a TIF impacts the existing residents of the community. Since this is TIF #3 what is the status of the two other districts. TIF #1 was closed in the 1970's and included the existing industrial area near Commerce Street and North Star Road. TIF #2 is the future development area to the north, near Hwy 35 and was created with good intentions, but coincided with one of the worst economic development timetables in recent time. The Village has spent money for the extension of sanitary sewer and water to that area to facilitate development, but has not made additional investments yet. The clock is ticking on that TIF and we have seen interest from different developers that may help to get that area moving. The possibilities related to TIF #3 are very real and we anticipate quick return on the investments.

Motion by Dunham, second by Horvath to recommend approval of Planning Commission Resolution No. 1-2013 – Carried Unanimously.

#9 – Possible Action and Recommendation on Amendments to Fencing Ordinance and Requirements for a Fencing Permit.

Administrator Heinig explained this was the first look at modifications to the existing ordinance that was quite vague. The modifications include reducing the height of permissible fences along with restrictions on the types of materials allowed. These changes would apply to new projects and would not significantly affect existing residential areas.

Member Dunham questioned whether a fine should be included under item #11(d). Administrator Heinig did not include that in this version, but will research that.

Member Horvath does not appreciate having this much detail and requiring a permitting process. The original version was simpler and he felt would be more easily understood by the general public.

Member Johnston asked if a fee would be required for the permit. The fee would probably be in the \$20 - \$50 range and defined through the Village fee schedule that is adopted with the budget each year. Member Johnson likes the fact that there is some sort of standard that is being established and would like to see the fee set at the lower end of the range given.

Member Ebner would like to see more enforcement of the ordinance and would also like to see the fee set at the lower end of the range.

Member Dunham added that the ordinance has information that helps to define a number of circumstances and feels there is a benefit to having standards set.

Member Horvath stated he did not feel this was an appropriate process and did not feel there was a need for the permitting process.

Motion by Dunham to proceed with the Ordinance, amending #11(d) to address the penalty issue, and recommend approval, pending the Public Hearing to be held at the May Village Board meeting; second by Ebner – Carried with a vote of 4 to 1, with Horvath casting the negative vote.

Motion by Horvath, seconded by Ebner to adjourn at 8:35 PM - Carried unanimously.

Dean K. Olson  
Director of Public Works