

City of Verona
Minutes
Plan Commission
February 4, 2019

1. **Call to Order:** Luke Diaz called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.
2. **Roll Call:** Beth Tucker Long, Scott Manley, Mike Bare, Luke Diaz, Sarah Gaskell, and Steven Heinzen. Also present: Adam Sayre, Director of Planning and Development; Katherine Holt, Community Development Specialist; Theran Jacobson, Public Works Director; Jeff Montpas, City Engineer; Carla Fischer, AECOM engineer; and Bryan Kleinmaier, City Attorney. Pat Lytle was absent and excused.
3. **Minutes:** Motion by Manley, seconded by Gaskell, to approve the January 7, 2019 Plan Commission Minutes. Motion carried 6-0.

4. **Discussion & Possible Action – Certified survey map to divide Lot 219 of the Cathedral Point Subdivision in two (2) lots.**

The Applicant is proposing three (3) certified survey maps (CSM) to split lots 219, 220, and 221 of the Cathedral Point Subdivision. Each lot would be split into two (2) lots. The proposed land division will create a twin house on each lot, which is defined by the City of Verona Zoning Ordinance as a “single-family dwelling which is attached on one side to another single-family residence...the two residences may or may not be located on individual lots”. The existing parcels are zoned Mixed-Residential (MR), which is the City’s two-family zoning district. The buildings are currently under construction and the proposed CSM’s will not change the structure, but simply allow for a future ownership change.

The MR zoning district allows twin houses which shall meet the following requirements:

- A minimum one-hour fire separation must exist between the units;
- Individual sanitary sewer and water service must exist between the units;
- Both parcels shall have 10,000 square feet between 2 lots sharing a twin house, with one lot allowed to be as small as 4,000 square feet; and
- Corner parcels must have 80-feet of width, and interior lots must have 35-feet of width.

The proposed CSM meets the City’s Zoning Ordinance requirements.

Staff recommends the Plan Commission recommend that the Common Council approve the certified survey map to split lot #219 of the Cathedral Point Subdivision into two (2) lots with the following condition: A shared wall agreement shall be recorded with the Dane County Register of Deeds.

Motion by Manley, seconded by Heinzen, to recommend to the Common Council to approve the certified survey map to split lot #219 of the Cathedral Point Subdivision into two (2) lots with the following condition: A shared wall agreement shall be recorded with the Dane County Register of Deeds. Motion carried 6-0.

5. **Discussion & Possible Action – Certified survey map to divide Lot 220 of the Cathedral Point Subdivision in two (2) lots.**

Motion by Bare, seconded by Heinzen, to recommend to the Common Council to approve the certified survey map to split lot #220 of the Cathedral Point Subdivision into two (2) lots with the following condition: A shared wall agreement shall be recorded with the Dane County Register of Deeds. Motion carried 6-0.

6. Discussion & Possible Action – Certified survey map to divide Lot 221 of the Cathedral Point Subdivision in two (2) lots.

Motion by Tucker Long, seconded by Heinzen, to recommend to the Common Council to approve the certified survey map to split lot #221 of the Cathedral Point Subdivision into two (2) lots with the following condition: A shared wall agreement shall be recorded with the Dane County Register of Deeds. Motion carried 6-0.

7. Discussion & Possible Action – Site plan review for the Madison Area Youth Soccer Association to construct a synthetic playing field and field improvements at Reddan Soccer Park located at 550 Cross Country Road.

The Applicant is proposing to convert an existing lighted grass soccer field into a synthetic playing field to be used for soccer and lacrosse for Edgewood College. Access to the field will continue to be from the existing parking lot to the north with a ten (10) foot wide concrete walkway to be used by players and spectators. A press box and team shelters are proposed west of the field. Perimeter fencing would encircle the field with netting barriers behind the soccer goal areas. The existing lighting will remain. A public address system would be added as well as shot clocks and scoreboard.

Edgewood College (“College”) will have first right of refusal to use this field as it is planned to host all home field games for Men’s and Women’s soccer in the fall seasons with Lacrosse games in the spring. The College’s games typically begin no later than 7 p.m. during weekdays and mid-afternoon on weekends weather permitting. Practices could begin as early as 6 a.m. and end as late as 9 p.m. Typically, attendance for the College is less than 100 spectators. However, bleachers could accommodate up to 500 people during NCAA tournaments.

Staff recommends the Plan Commission approve the site plan review for the Madison Area Youth Soccer Association to construct a synthetic playing field and field improvements at Reddan Soccer Park located at 550 Cross Country Road.

Gaskell asked if it is possible to connect the north and south path on site that is to formally connect to the driveway south of that location.

Chris Lay, from Madison Youth Soccer Parks, replied that is something that we would be willing to consider.

Bare asked if there is an attempt inside the fence area to have locked space.

Al Brisack, from Edgewood College, replied that it would remain locked unless reserved.

Gaskell asked if the speakers are directed towards the fields away from the homes and when music will be played.

Lay answered yes, it is pointing away from the existing building projecting eastward. No music will be played at 6 am.

Sayre stated that he shared the site plans with the owner for Noel Manor, who did not have concerns with the project. However, they wanted to make sure the storm water will work.

Heinzen asked if there will there be any attempt to schedule games to avoid conflicts with The 56ers or Verona Soccer Club.

Lay answered that the schedule would have to have games that do not include our tournaments unless it is a Friday evening.

Motion by Bare, seconded by Tucker Long, to approve the site plan review for the Madison Area Youth Soccer Association to construct a synthetic playing field and field improvements at Reddan Soccer Park located at 550 Cross Country Road. Motion carried 6-0.

Manley stated that it is great to have this facility within Verona and growth with it.

Diaz stated that it will be good for Verona.

8. Discussion & Possible Action – Initial Precise Implementation Plan (PIP) amendment review for a proposed 67,148 square foot Festival Foods grocery store to be located at 660 Hometown Circle.

Sayre explained that this property is a six acre parcel located just east of Farm and Fleet.

This project was approved by the Plan Commission in November of 2017 with three conditions. All three of these items have been resolved.

The Applicant is requesting some modifications to the plan. The store itself has shrunk by approximately 719 square feet. The total number of parking spots remains the same, but some are relocated throughout the site. Internally, some changes were made that are not controlled by the City. The liquor store has been moved from the east side to the west side of the store. Staff would like to see a second bike rack closer to the west side door. The Applicant also made some changes to the exterior of the building in keeping with the company's rebranding. The proposed building height is about the same. Staff has requested an additional material, such as stone or brick, at the bottom of the exterior walls to ground the building. The Applicant hopes to gain approvals in March and start construction in early 2019.

Gaskell asked if there is a transition in elevation between the sidewalk and the driveway access.

Grant Duchac, Excel Engineering, replied that the majority of the store frontage is flush for ease of use with carts, but wrapping around the corner, it does transition to a full 6-inch curb. There is a designated crosswalk with a ramp in that area. There are also striped crosswalks from the parking lot to the three main entrances to the building.

Manley stated that he likes the look of the building and is fine supporting this design.

Gaskell asked what we are doing with all the water on this site.

Montpas replied that they have two storm water detention ponds to the east and south that can accommodate the water.

9. Discussion & Possible Action – Preliminary plat for Whispering Coves to create 255 lots located west of County Highway M and south of County Highway PD.

Sayre explained that this property is located within the City's North Neighborhood. The property is along CTH M on the east and CTH PD on the north. This project contains 255 lots and outlots. This project first came before the Plan Commission in January 2018. The property was annexed to the City in August 2018, and the concept came back before the Plan Commission in September 2018.

Staff is supportive of development in this area, but recommends no action by the Plan Commission at this time.

All of the single-family lots have a minimum of 50 feet of frontage. The applicant is requesting a setback exemption to allow for an 8-foot side yard setback in the single-family portion of the development.

The project included a connection with CTH PD from Street B to the north, and a temporary connection to CTH M to the east. Staff continues to work with the Applicant on traffic and the temporary connection point. Hemlock Drive and Tamarack Way would be extended from south to north. There would also be a connection on the west by Street A. Staff is concerned that when traveling north or south, there are at least two decision points in the roadway, which may not be consistent with the requirement for a clear connection through the development. Bike paths are planned both north-south and east-west. Both CTH M and CTH PD will have bike and pedestrian connections. Sidewalks will be provided on both sides of the street and through cul-de-sac bulbs.

The Applicant is requesting parkland dedication as part of the project. The Parks, Recreation and Forestry Commission reviewed the project at their January 2019 meeting. There was a split vote from the Parks Commission on whether to accept the cul-de-sac bulbs as parkland dedication. The Common Council will have to weigh in on accepting the cul-de-sacs as parkland. Staff does not support cul-de-sac bulbs as parkland. Staff supports the linear parkland and potentially some of the natural conservancy parkland depending on use.

Overall land use is single-family residential. Staff is not sure that the proposed location for the school is the best. Locating the school to the southwest of the proposed location would help alleviate stacking concerns on McKee Road.

The use of retaining walls within the development is a significant issue. These are large walls that will require long-term maintenance. When the walls fail in 20-30 years, the property owners will call the City to complain about the walls falling down. In addition, the upkeep of the walls will be very expensive for the property owners in this area. The walls need to be reduced significantly, if not eliminated for the development.

There are some utility and parking concerns with the street width at 32 feet wide from the curb. If this design goes forward, Staff will recommend parking on one-side or alternate-side parking year round. Terraces should be a minimum of at least 6 feet for snow storage, but the preference is for 8 to 9 feet.

Some of the lands along CTH M were not taken into account from a stormwater standpoint. The intent of this area was to have a regional pond. Staff would like to see the properties along CTH M accommodate the water from this entire 198 acres.

The City did receive comments from neighboring property owners. Comments from the Dreger property included concerns about stacking on CTH M near University Ridge. Bret Backus also provided feedback about the angle at which Street N meets the property line. Backus's letter was provided to the Commission members.

Staff would like to see the Applicant make the recommended changes to the project plan and bring it back to the Plan Commission.

Ron Henshue from Forward Development Group (FDG) addressed the Plan Commission regarding Staff concerns.

The Applicant will add a sidewalk on the south side of the temporary access point.

FDG are flexible, to a degree, regarding the school site. They cannot move it any further to the south due to infiltration in the center of the site. They are willing to move it to the western 40 acres of the project. They are also monitoring Verona Area School District discussions about the need for a school here.

Most, if not all, of the retaining walls for the site will be removed, and cul-de-sac entrances will be amended to 32 feet wide to be consistent with other residential streets. Terraces in those areas will also be amended to the minimum requirement of six feet wide.

Stormwater storage will be expanded to include the east 40 acres closest to CTH M.

North-south Hemlock Road was in the City's Comprehensive Plan. The Applicant likes the current design for the road, as it splits the traffic, creating traffic calming. A straight north-south route creates higher speeds and encourages people to use it as a cut-through.

Regarding the cul-de-sac parks, the Applicant prefers that they be referred to as pocket parks. Pocket parks can be in a green space or within a cul-de-sac. They have tried to develop a park system to be used by all ages, not just children. Each of the pocket parks are designed to have different amenities. They are looking at the four largest pocket parks for park credit. There are 13,000 linear feet of trail in the development designed for interconnectivity. The vision for the conservancy is trails around the park, boardwalks within the park, and plantings that encourage birds and other wildlife, making it a destination area. They are resistant to change the parks design.

Pedestrian crossings are designed at 22 feet wide to provide traffic calming. In addition, pedestrians only have to look one-way at a time to cross. The wider the crossing, the more dangerous it becomes.

Heinzen asked Henshue if there is any parking at the conservancy park, if there could be parking on Street C, and when it does develop, will there be a designated parking area.

Henshue replied that it isn't designed for parking, but parking will be available as the commercial center and senior multi-family develops.

Sayre commented that Staff is comfortable with 22 foot wide pedestrian crossings throughout the development, and is not requiring a 32 foot wide road at those points.

Gaskell stated that she would be more comfortable accepting the pocket parks if there was a larger recreational space within the development. There is no recreational space in the City north of Cross Country Road. She is also concerned that the school site being accessed only by local roads may cause traffic issues. Maintenance of the conservancy park should be a consideration, as well. At this time, the City does not have a maintenance standard in place for conservancy land.

Bare, Parks, Recreation and Forestry Commission Chair, clarified the motions from the Commission. There was a good deal of conversation about whether or not the cul-de-sacs should be accepted as parkland, and whether the linear park should be accepted as full parkland dedication. There is a good argument that the natural conservancy park should not be accepted as parkland based on the City's ordinances, but the Commission would like to see it preserved and protected. The concern is what amount of credit should be given for this type of undefined parkland in our ordinances. Another concern by the Commission is the lack of a larger neighborhood park. The cul-de-sacs lend themselves to be used only by the neighboring properties.

Heinzen asked how many acres of parkland there would be if we didn't count the natural conservancy and pocket parks. The pocket parks would be difficult to get to for the people living in the northern part of the development, so he would have trouble counting them as parkland. He also asked what the natural conservancy park looks like today, and if it already has some aspects of a conservancy park. He would consider accepting the conservancy park as parkland.

Sayre replied that he can't speak to what is there today. The land has been farmed for many years. He estimated the area of pocket parks at 1.2 acres, the conservancy at 9.5 acres, and the linear park at 8.2 acres.

Henshue stated that it is currently a wetland. They would do a complete restoration to the kettle. It isn't in a native state today.

Heinzen stated 16.7 acres of the development is currently dedicated to parkland, and asked how this development would compare to other developments in the City if the 1.2 acres of pocket parks comes off of that number.

Sayre stated that most developments pay a fee. It depends on how many units will come out of this development. There will be 222 single family units, but we don't know the final number of units there will be. Most neighborhoods are approximately one-half parkland. The parks plan did not identify a large park on this property because there is a 5-acre park as part of the Kettle Creek North subdivision to the south. There is also potential future parkland to the west in the quarry.

Diaz stated that he thinks the side yard setback exemption is fine. He would like the City to look at more grid patterns in subdivisions going forward, as it makes for better traffic flow. He also likes the proposed bike and pedestrian path, and believes they should be connected to the school. He would be in favor of the natural conservancy park if the kettle is restored, and agrees that a natural conservancy designation will be needed. The retaining walls must be removed or reduced. He would like to see parking restricted to one side of the street instead of switching sides every other day. He likes the villas and hopes they return, as it is good to have a variety of housing types.

Gaskell stated that in the proposal that the Commission saw on September 28, 2018, there were 378 single-family homes and now we are looking at 222 single-family lots. Where does the difference come in?

Sayre replied that the 378 number included the 43 villas and 286 single-family. The villas are on hold due to Staff concerns regarding street widths in that area of the development.

Tucker Long thinks that the trail is good, but the school site needs to have a connection to the trail from Street F. Street G looks narrow for the trail and she is concerned about how close the trail is to storm water management areas. She also asked if the multi-family is still happening near Street A.

Sayre replied senior and multi-family housing could occur there. This would be submitted as part of the rezoning process.

Tucker Long asked how the wall will cross the walking path near Street I.

Sayre replied that there are two walls that are stepping down along the path. You can get to the trail by going around the wall. The developer is looking at pulling that cul-de-sac back toward the south.

Bare asked the developer if they have seen the letter from the Backus property and, what response they have about the connectivity issue with the new street and storm water on that property.

Bill Dunlop, JSD Professional Services, replied that they are going to change the alignment of the street south. This is a disaster analysis, and we typically analyze it based on back to back flooding. There would actually be an improvement in the water surface elevations in the kettle compared to what they are now.

Bare stated that there seems to be a discrepancy with what the developer and Staff are saying about the storm water management.

Carla Fischer, AECOM, stated that they are working through the comments with them. What Bill said is correct regarding the back to back test. In the future, we have to be careful about how the area to the south develops. This kettle spills onto the property to the south.

Manley asked what is the park dedication impact fee.

Sayre replied \$2,400 per single-family lot and \$1,700 per multi-family unit.

Manley stated there are valid reasons to pay the fees, but we need to make sure there is meaningful park space available to be used. He likes the north-south linear trail. To restore the kettle as natural conservancy is nice, but the reason why we are looking at putting an elementary school here is because this area would likely attract younger families with children. We would need facilities have active recreation areas. He believes the area in the 40 acres in the east that is removed from this submittal is important to the broader picture of this development. We as a City have lost some good commercial areas. We only have so much area left for development of good quality commercial space. This piece of the development is important for this area and is an important factor in the broader development.

Bare believes Staff's recommendation to take no action on this tonight is a good idea. There are issues we need to address. We have street access questions, parkland issues that require policy level discussions, and retaining walls that need adjustments. This should go back to the drawing board.

Diaz clarified no action means it would not go before the Council.

Sayre explained that there is a time period during which the Commission must act on the preliminary plat, or they would have to get an extension from the applicant.

Diaz asked if the developer's intention to make changes to the retaining walls would be legally enforceable without it being in writing.

Structural walls would significantly change the plat and design. This would need to be addressed to the development agreement, as Staff is uncomfortable with conditional approval of such a large change.

Manley stated in the original Kettle Creek subdivision, the de-facto playground in Kettle Creek North uses the elementary school. Is there an opportunity to put a park in the site of the school in this development?

Sayre replied we did have a park dedicated in Kettle Creek North just south of the water tower that has been absorbed by the school. We would want agreements with the school district for using parkland for school uses. There would need to be a very tight agreement between the parties.

Diaz stated that he likes this project and wants it to move forward.

Manley asked for clarification on the 90-day deadline and if these issues that can be resolved to be presented for March.

Sayre answered realistically it would be April to allow enough time.

Henshue stated that they are okay with no action and hope to get this done early with it going to the Plan Commission in April.

10. Reports and comments from the Planning Department

a. Discussion regarding the 2018 housing permit data.

Sayre stated that permit numbers are down slightly from 2017 for single-family. There were 55 new single-family houses, 6 duplexes (3 twin lots), and one multi-family with 32 units (Legacy at Noel Manor), and Sugar Creek Commons will start in the spring. For 2019, we have Hometown Grove, Kettle Creek North and potentially Whispering Coves. Interest rates and construction costs have gone up, so it is becoming more challenging for projects to happen.

Gaskell asked about the status of the housing study from the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC).

Sayre replied his understanding was that the housing study was put on hold. We were not happy with what we got from them. We have not asked them for anything further. The Comprehensive Plan rewrite is on our radar for 2020-2021. There may be some sort of housing study function to go along with that. He added that the Zoning Code rewrite proposals will be coming to the Plan Commission in March.

b. Update on development projects.

Heinzen asked if there was an update on the bike store that was supposed to go in across from Gus's Diner.

Sayre replied that there is a disagreement between the landlord and tenant on that project.

Tucker Long asked at what point storm water management requirements and disaster planning are re-evaluated.

Sayre replied that is a much bigger discussion. We could have Carla Fischer from AECOM speak to this at a future meeting.

Montpas stated the back to back 100 year flood test was a CARPC requirement for this development because it is a kettle. We are seeing more flooding because the frequency and intensity of rain events is higher. As those requirements increase, developers and the City adapt to the changes in rules. The Department of Natural Resources determines what the requirements are for most things. Storm water management systems are not designed to handle a 750-year flood, which was believed to have occurred here last summer.

11. Reports and comments from the Plan Commissioners

There were no reports or comments from the Plan Commissioners.

12. Adjournment

Motion by Bare, seconded by Tucker Long, to adjourn at 8:13 p.m. Motion carried 6-0.