



Meeting: **Intergovernmental Zoning Steering Committee**
Date/Time: **Wednesday, February 27, 2014, @ 5:00 P.M.**
Location: **Village of Kronenwetter Municipal Center
(1582 Kronenwetter Drive) – Board Room**

DISCUSSION NOTES

Village of Weston Members Present: President Loren White, Plan Commission Member, Mike Stenstrom, and Citizen Member Joe Jordan. Plan Commission Member, Mark Maloney was excused.

Village of Kronenwetter Members Present: President, Geraldine Kowalski, Trustee, Dan Lesniak and Citizen Member, Ken Pozorski. Plan Commission Member, Matt Hildebrandt was excused.

Town of Weston Members Present: Plan Commission Member, Mark Thompson. Chairman, Milt Olson, was excused.

Technical Staff Members Present: MDRoffers Consultant, Mark Roffers, Village of Weston Planning & Development Director, Jennifer Higgins, Planning & Development Intern, Jared Wehner, Village of Weston Administrative Specialist, Valerie Parker, Building Inspector Scott Tatro, Village of Kronenwetter, Community Development Director, Randy Fifrick, and Village of Kronenwetter, Planning Technician Kristen Johnson, were all present.

Roffers began the meeting at 5:05 p.m. He began the meeting with Agenda Item 2.

1) DISCUSSION AND REVIEW OF DRAFT ZONING ORDINANCE ARTICLES 6 – 13, AND ARTICLE 17

Roffers then went through each article, beginning with Article 6: Overlay Districts. It was explained these overlay districts will help reduce the amount of overlays in the ordinances. Roffers stated we are also trying to eliminate the need for PUD's (Planned Unit Development) overlays. Therefore, in some cases the proposed D Design overlay districts cover specific pre-existing developments approved as PUDs.

Higgins stated some of these overlays shown in this draft zoning code will be renamed to reflect the specific developments, such as Weston Center, Renaissance Development, Cross Pointe Corporate Park, etc. She stated we need to handle the planned unit developments (PUDs) already created. It was explained the new code will have more flexible standards towards mixed uses and setbacks, so several of the existing overlays and PUD's in general will no longer be necessary.

Stenstrom asked if it would make more sense to have a "Trail Overlay" versus a "Mountain Bay Trail Overlay" district. It was explained to Stenstrom this overlay is specific to the properties in Weston which are located adjacent to the Mountain-Bay Trail/Railroad Corridor.

Pozorski wondered if Kronenwetter is missing out on a trail overlay. Higgins stated our reason for this is for the businesses along the trail, no setbacks for the trail. We created the district to allow all businesses along there to expand along the existing setback, since the current zoning would not allow them. Roffers indicated that this district could be generalized if there are other existing or potential "rail-to-trail" situations in Weston or Kronenwetter.

White stated staff is more familiar what is going on and handling these than the Board and Plan Commission. He would defer these to staff's ability and knowledge.

Roffers presented the Wellhead Protection Area Overlay District. White commented he was surprised by some of the uses allowed within the recharge areas. Roffers explained some of those uses are allowed only by conditional use. He explained you do not want to disallow everything, as you may lose the ability for potential businesses in logical areas. Roffers would prefer to have a defensible district, which is not too restrictive, than to have a strict district that is not regularly enforced. Lesniak suggested to keep in mind areas of future wells. Roffers commented wellhead protection standards are required when new wells are built, and this is a response to that state requirement.

Roffers presented the Airport Height Limitation Overlay District, which takes into consideration Central Wisconsin Airport and the Wausau Downtown Airport. This simply prevents very tall structures which may interfere with the flight path. The WISDOT Bureau of Aeronautics governs the maps for these areas.

Roffers stated he will be inserting Articles 7, 8, & 9 (Floodplain, Shoreland, & Shoreland-Wetland) at a later time, based on information provided by Village staff.

Roffers then presented Article 10, Building & Site Design Standards. A discussion of the single family housing variety standards took place, and the Committee members were not in support of this section. They felt this would be difficult for staff to keep up with, and too restrictive on developers and new owners wanting to build.

Kowalski commented on mistakes in the page number scheme within the Articles. Roffers stated he will fix these.

Roffers then brought up the proposed design standards for multi-family and non-residential buildings. He pointed out there is a section for waiver or modification to the standards. White brought up Weston's current zoning code requires a minimum of 60% brick. The reasoning behind that was so we do not have pole buildings all over the Village. It was explained this new zoning instead only allows certain materials. The members agreed the term "pole buildings" should be replaced with "steel sided buildings" or something similar. The restriction should pertain more on how these buildings are finished than constructed, as pole buildings can have brick exteriors.

Roffers pointed out he pulled several of the proposed standards from the Weston Business & Technology Park covenants, so those covenants can actually be repealed once the new ordinance is adopted if desired.

Roffers presented the proposed standards for large (25,000+ square feet) retail and commercial service developments.

White questioned there are many businesses who want their proposed building to fit their corporate logo. Roffers stated it is a matter of community tolerance. White is concerned we may lose businesses if we do not allow flexibility in the building standards. The new Dunkin Donuts was used as an example, but Higgins stated this standard would not apply to them, because their building square footage is less than 25,000 square feet.

Roffers explained Article 11 Landscaping and Preservation Standards and how this is organized. He stated these standards would apply to multi-family, commercial, and industrial uses, not agricultural or residential. He also pointed out this affects new construction, not existing. White confirmed these standards will give people flexibility and a bargaining point with their plans. Roffers stated the idea is a landscaper would base the landscape plan on 4 or 5 components (street frontage, paved areas, building foundations, sometimes bufferyards, and general yard areas). He then presented illustrations of these components. He showed the table in the proposed code which lists points given for specific plants and trees. Pozorski questioned how stormwater management comes in to play. Roffers stated credit should be given for rain gardens, bio filters, outfalls, swails, etc., if not just planting in lawn. There was discussion on locations for snow storage, in relation to locations of landscaping. Roffers explained there are snow storage provisions also in the code.

Kowalski felt there is too much landscaping required in the draft ordinance, where businesses who see these standards may opt to locate elsewhere. She commented on how existing landscaping in the Weston Business Park would never meet these standards.

Roffers pointed out there is a clause in the beginning of this section which gives conditions to grant exceptions to the standards, and that Higgins pointed out businesses should be more inclined to put in more greenspace, as the more greenspace available, the less they would ultimately pay in stormwater fees. Roffers also noted that perhaps the standards ought to be reduced for industrial developments from what is presented, and that he would explore that.

Jordan suggested to use his businesses' development plan to see where they would fit within this point system if he had to follow it.

Stenstrom questioned how this applies to phased developments, and you would not have to landscape the phased area. Roffers suggested that implementation of the standards ought to be phased for phased development project (the ordinance can be more explicit in this regard).

Roffers then presented Article 12, General Performance Standards. He brought up the topic of fences, and discussed the proposed list of prohibited fences. Electronic and barbed-wire fences came up, and it was stated if an Agricultural property abutted a residential property, these fences would still be allowed on the agricultural property.

Roffers briefly went through the articles on swimming pools, firewood storage, exterior storage, and outdoor recreational vehicle storage. Higgins stated most of these standards are monitored by neighbor complaints staff would receive, and reflect current ordinances.

Comments came up with regard to the access and driveway standards. White is concerned this may make hardships on some driveways (with regard to driveway widths). Roffers stated he can build in some flexibility to this section. Some discussion took place on the surfacing of driveways. It was explained the requirement of paved driveways would not apply to existing driveways, unless improvements are being made. Gravel drives would be allowed for rural residential properties whose driveway is over 50 feet in length.

During the discussion of off-street parking and traffic circulation standards, Stenstrom feels the bicycle parking requirement is not necessary. The purpose of this section to create a more bike-friendly community was explained, but Roffers would see if there is some language for flexibility.

Roffers briefly went through the off-street loading standards.

With regard to the exterior lighting standards section, there was some sentiment that the Weston Plan Commission wanted the measuring standards based on lumens and not foot candles.

There was brief discussion on the vibration and noise standards. The members shared stories of complaints they received from people feeling vibrations or hearing noise from businesses great distances from their property. Roffers explained that the types of complaints of vibration and noise are really not addressed in either the existing or proposed zoning ordinances, but instead might be handled through the general nuisance code.

Roffers brought up the remaining standards of Article 12.

2) **PROJECT TIMELINE REVIEW**

Roffers discussed the timeline for the zoning code update. This is the 4th Steering Committee meeting held, and he anticipates this committee meeting once more, in April, to review the final sections. After the April meeting, he then plans to start working with Kronenwetter separately from the Village and Town of Weston, as the groups will be to a point where the municipality needs start differing. Over the next few weeks, staff will start mapping and applying the new zoning districts to get a better sense of how the districts will look.

Roffers then moved to Agenda Item 3.

3) **DRAFT PUBLIC OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE**

Roffers discussed his overview of the proposed zoning ordinance update. He put together a list of 11 key factors in how the proposed zoning ordinances will improve the Villages' regulatory structure. He then also showed an example of how the articles will be laid out. Roffers then explained how Weston staff are creating cards or individual sheets for each zoning district, which will easily guide people on what is allowed in a particular district they are interested in. Roffers stated he will present a revised version of this at the April meeting.

Kowalski verified that there will be hyperlinks within the electronic version of the zoning code that gets you to the districts fast. It was stated simple flash cards could be made available for people coming in, which White suggested there should be a disclaimer at the bottom of each card indicating that it may not have all of the rules.

Roffers then moved back up on the agenda to present the draft zoning code (Articles 6 – 13 and 17).

4) PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one from the public in attendance.

5) NEXT STEPS / NEXT MEETING

Roffers suggested that the committee review the article on signs at the April Steering Committee meeting as we have run past our 2-hour meeting time period. He anticipates once beyond the article on signs and the process section of the code, the rest of the zoning code will go quickly, as there were not a lot of lengthy discussion on the remainder of the zoning code at staff level.

This meeting concluded at about 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Valerie Parker,
Administrative Specialist, Village of Weston