

Village of Weston, Wisconsin
OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLAN COMMISSION
held on Monday, May 11, 2020, at 6:00 p.m., in the Board Room, at the Municipal Center

AGENDA ITEMS.

- 1. Meeting called to order by Plan Commission (PC) Chair & Village President Wally Sparks.**
- 2. Roll Call of Village PC by Secretary Parker.**

Roll call indicated 7 Plan Commission members present.

| <u>Member</u> | <u>Present</u> |
|---------------|----------------|
| Sparks, Wally | YES |
| Maloney, Mark | YES |
| Cronin, Steve | YES |
| Gau, Duane | NO - Absent |
| Guerndt, Gary | YES |
| Jordan, Joe | YES |
| Meinel, Steve | YES |

Village Staff in attendance: Donner, Higgins, Wodalski, Wheaton, Tatro, Chartrand, Raczkowski, and Parker.

In the audience was Mark Roffers and Mitchell "Buck" Marcott.

3. Introduction of new Commissioner Cronin

Sparks welcomed Steve Cronin to the Plan Commission.

4. Approval of minutes from March 9, 2020 PC/ETZ meeting

Motion by Maloney, second by Meinel: to approve the March 9, 2020, PC/ETZ Meeting minutes.

Yes Vote: 6 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

| <u>Member</u> | <u>Voting</u> |
|---------------|---------------|
| Sparks, Wally | YES |
| Maloney, Mark | YES |
| Cronin, Steve | YES |
| Gau, Duane | NOT VOTING |
| Guerndt, Gary | YES |
| Jordan, Joe | YES |
| Meinel, Steve | YES |

5. Approval of minutes from the March 10, 2020 Special Joint BOT, PC, & CDA Meeting

Motion by Maloney, second by Guerndt: to approve the March 10, 2020 Special Joint BOT, PC, & CDA Meeting

Yes Vote: 6 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

| <u>Member</u> | <u>Voting</u> |
|---------------|---------------|
| Sparks, Wally | YES |
| Maloney, Mark | YES |
| Cronin, Steve | YES |

| | |
|---------------|------------|
| Gau, Duane | NOT VOTING |
| Guerndt, Gary | YES |
| Jordan, Joe | YES |

COMMUNICATIONS

6. Opportunity for citizens to be heard.

None

7. Written communications received.

None

REVIEW OF REZONING & CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT PETITIONS

8. Public Hearing – Project #20200118 – Mitchell & Polly Marcott, 8602 Ryan Street, Weston, requesting Conditional Use Permit to allow for Sec. 94.4.02(1)7 & 8 to be waived and modified, on a property within the AR (Agriculture and Residential) Zoning District, at 8400 Ryan Street (PIN 192 2808 272 0994).

a. Open Public Hearing.

Sparks opened the public hearing at 6:07 p.m.

b. Presentation by Applicant.

Buck Marcott is present via phone call and explained the way his house needs to be set on the property, due to the septic system, he would like his garage doors facing the Village’s compost piles, so will not be visible to the public and will be a quarter mile off the road. He said the issue is this does not meet the 60/40 rule, but since will not be visible is asking for this conditional use.

c. Public Hearing/Public Comment Period.

None.

d. Written Correspondence.

None.

e. Close Public Hearing.

Sparks closed the hearing at 6:12 p.m.

f. Discussion by Plan Commissioners.

The members had no concerns.

g. Staff Report.

Higgins stated his house will be set pretty far back, so it won’t be visible from road. Staff is okay and recommending approval of the CUP. There are some standard conditions placed in the staff report.

h. Action by Plan Commission.

Motion by Maloney, second by Guerndt: to approve CUP #20200118.

Yes Vote: 6 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

| <u>Member</u> | <u>Voting</u> |
|---------------|---------------|
| Sparks, Wally | YES |
| Maloney, Mark | YES |
| Cronin, Steve | YES |
| Gau, Duane | NOT VOTING |

| | |
|---------------|-----|
| Guerndt, Gary | YES |
| Jordan, Joe | YES |
| Meinel, Steve | YES |

NEW BUSINESS

9. Site Plan Approval for Project #20200119 – PGA Excavating Department Operations Facility, 7315 Zinser Street.

Motion by Maloney, second by Meinel: to approve Project #2020019, per staff recommendation.

Meinel questioned the items being waived in the staff report, and recalls they did all of this last summer. Higgins explained the way the last approval was worded, this had to come back, as the last approval only had a waiver on the façade. Donner confirmed there was a lot of discussion about this, but bringing this back now just clears up any possible confusion.

Higgins explained the applicant is also purchasing property from the Village, and the process requires the Plan Commission approves site plans for any projects on those land sales. He is purchasing 5 acres of land, along the south side of this site, which he plans to combine to this site, via CSM.

Higgins confirmed that the approval tonight should include waivers (stated in the staff report) for the curb & gutter requirement around the paved parking lot, the requirement for bicycle and pedestrian facilities, for the applicant to submit a revised landscaping and lighting plan at the time of construction or expansion of storage yard (can be via staff review) and for the applicant to provide a revised hard surface/storage area plan at the time of construction of the expansion of the storage yard (can be via staff review).

Higgins explained how currently the lighting plan does not meet code, but once the additional 5 acres are attached, it will be fine. The landscaping will be based on the entire property, so we are not too worried about the landscaping plan until that expansion occurs also.

Meinel feels there should be less landscaping requirements with this being in the industrial park. Higgins stated the requirements are less. She explained the landscaping requirements looks at the impervious areas. She stated since he is fencing in the back yard, she thinks he would only need to add some trees along along Zinser Street.

Guerndt stated REVI has sent in the landscaping plan, and noted how Wheaton had notified REVI that the plan was not up to standards. Higgins stated REVI has the red maple trees planned, which are not allowed. Higgins stated the Parks Department is who requested the disallowance of the red maple tree species in the landscaping ordinance, during the 2015 Code update, as we were having issues with those dying off.

Higgins explained where the landscaping should be done on the property. Guerndt commented on how his issues are with the plantings next to the building, and how they will not survive the winter salt. Guerndt commented how he has \$45,000 in landscaping on this plan, and somehow they still do not meet our requirements, and he questioned what how much more he will need when the additional 5 acres is added. Higgins stated there will be some requirement for the general yard area. Guerndt stated there may be a stormwater pond area there. Higgins explained staff did not look at this area, since they will be adding on and

are asking that PC allow the staff to review this later when the expansion occurs. Typically, any property that the Village is selling the land requires PC approval, where normally this would be staff review.

Guerndt asked if anything on his plan does not meet code, if the additional 5 acres was not in play. Donner stated the lighting would not meet code as it shines beyond the property. Donner clarified that the staff recommendation is to allow staff to work with the applicant on this once the 5 acres is acquired.

Jordan questioned if the storage area will need to be paved. Higgins stated it will be gravel and fenced in, so it meets the requirements.

Sparks questioned if this recommendation will require this coming back to PC. Higgins stated it would come back to the Board with Developers Agreement. Higgins stated the site plan could be approved by Staff, if PC desires. Guerndt asked for more clarification on landscaping requirements. Higgins stated this will be further discussed with him once we receive the layout with the 5 acres added. Motion carried.

Yes Vote: 5 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 1 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

| <u>Member</u> | <u>Voting</u> |
|---------------|---------------|
| Sparks, Wally | YES |
| Maloney, Mark | YES |
| Cronin, Steve | YES |
| Gau, Duane | NOT VOTING |
| Guerndt, Gary | ABSTAIN |
| Jordan, Joe | YES |
| Meinel, Steve | YES |

10. Site Plan Approval for Project #20200088 – Willow Estates Multifamily Development, 5420, 5506, & 5510 Willow Street.

Higgins passed out updated plans (attached) and performance standards to the commissioners.

Wheaton stated she had added an additional waiver in regards to security cameras, which is included in the updated handout tonight. She stated there were a few performance standards that they do not meet that the code requires for 31 units: having a manager onsite and security cameras. Their landscaping does not meet the requirements. There is landscaping for the buffer yard provided along the two residential sides, however, there is general yard landscaping numbers included in buffer yard and the code is very specific that the buffer yard is not to include the general yard or hard surface. Another piece that does not meet is the refuse/recycling enclosure dumpster area does not meet the minimum setbacks, as it is proposed to be placed 20 feet from the property line, and the requirement is 30 feet. The enclosure is also planned to be placed in front of the building. Waiver for curb & gutter around paved parking lot and waive the minimum throat length requirement of the driveways.

Higgins stated to Sparks currently no curb & gutter along Willow Street. Maloney questioned the requirement for security cameras. Higgins stated with the performance standards, the bigger the project the more standards are in place. Maloney questioned when this standard was put in the code. Higgins stated this would have been added within the past few years when the multifamily standards were updated (January 23, 2019).

Motion by Maloney, second by Jordan: to approved per the staff report. Question - Higgins stated this is normally not a project that would come before PC, but based on the rezone, and PC requesting this

come back, it did. Donner clarified the curb and gutter on the noses, and Guerndt will clarify with Nick the noses around the buildings. Motion carried.

Yes Vote: 5 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 1 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

| <u>Member</u> | <u>Voting</u> |
|---------------|---------------|
| Sparks, Wally | YES |
| Maloney, Mark | YES |
| Cronin, Steve | YES |
| Gau, Duane | NOT VOTING |
| Guerndt, Gary | ABSTAIN |
| Jordan, Joe | YES |
| Meinel, Steve | YES |

Guerndt returned to his seat from the audience.

There was some discussion on the next item as to whether Guerndt should recuse himself from the discussion. Maloney commented about whether Trustees can vote during Plan Commission and at Board of Trustees meetings. Sparks stated there are legislative functions that this Commission creates, and very limited quasi judicial decisions that the Commission make. Specific hearings introducing evidence witnesses, decisions are unbiased and they have factual evidence reviewable record, written decisions, and the opportunity of appeal. The decisions the PC is making to zoning and plans, those are legislative functions that fall within the Plan Commission. There may be some limited circumstances where it would apply the quasi judicial decision, but those would be extremely limited and extremely rare. Sparks stated we are awaiting a legal opinion, though he feels this will not be an issue moving forward.

11. Introduction of the Draft Public Facilities Needs Assessment for a park and recreation fee on new residential development in the Village and proposed amendments to Chapter 74 Subdivision Regulations & Chapter 94 Zoning Ordinance to make technical changes and respond to state law changes, including adjustments in park and recreation impact fees for residential development.

Mark Roffers stated we are just looking for some initial direction before this gets scheduled for public hearing and action at a later meeting. Roffers then went through his presentation in the packet. This material attempts to guidance summary three things: 1) update with the new impact fee law, 2) address some other State law changes, and 3) address some issues that have been read through experience using the code.

Maloney questioned if this is something mandated by law or something to produce more income? Higgins stated it is mandated by law if we want to continue collecting the fee. State law requires we go through the needs assessment. Higgins stated there has always been a parkland dedication or fee in lieu of the land. Higgins stated the standards are different. Roffers stated there is no legal requirement for the Village to require dedication or fees. Up to the Village to decide if we want new parks or money to upgrade parks or add new parks or not.

Sparks questioned the calculation of fees and who pays for the fee. Higgins answered the developer pays it at the time of building permit issuance. Previously it was at the time of platting. Meinel confirmed that now the fee is being paid by the person building the single-family home, not the developer at the time of development.

Maloney commented when he moved into his house on Leduc Street (Freeman Addition) how there is still a corner vacant lot that was supposed to be a park, but has not been touched.

Donner stated the Park & Recreation Committee, some time ago, stated they did not want to have these small neighborhood parks, and that they'd rather see the larger parks (like Kennedy Park, Machmueller Park, etc.). Donner pointed out the needs assessment is showing we need more neighborhood parks.

Donner explained how we implemented the impact fee. The law requires we have a time period from the time the money is collected, first-in, first-out concept. We have to track that and if we do not spend it within those 8 years, we have to make refunds. If we want to continue collecting parkland it has to be through an impact fee, we can no longer collect a fee in lieu of land.

Donner stated we have been using the fee in lieu of land for park improvements. Higgins stated this was a change in State Law in 2018. Now it has to be used for land.

Guerndt agrees we need to maintain our parks and there needs to be some funds used towards that. Guerndt questioned where Roffers got \$35,000 per acre. Roffers stated based on land sales for land to be developed in the Village. Guerndt feels that price is too high. Guerndt stated he paid just over \$13,000 per acre for Misty Pines. Roffers stated if the Plan Commission believes they the land values are closer to the \$13,000 or \$20,000 per acre, he could use those amounts instead.

Maloney questioned with Machmueller Park, why it was placed on the far end of the subdivision, and not more centrally located for everyone in that subdivision to use. Higgins stated that may have been a Tappe decision based on how the subdivision was developing and the natural wetland feature on that side.

Sparks confirmed this fee is to purchase park land, and how we have park land that we can't even develop. It would make more sense if we could use the funds for the Prohaska Park.

Higgins clarified at the time a single-family home is to be constructed the fee would be paid for at time of building permit issuance. A question came up if a home were to burn down or be demolished if the owner would need to pay another parkland dedication fee at time of building permit. Roffers stated in that case they would not be responsible. Also, if someone converted a single-family home into a duplex, they would only be responsible for 1 fee not 2. But if you construct a new duplex there would be 2 fees.

Guerndt questioned if there is no way that the money can be used for existing park updates, just for purchasing land. Roffers stated can be used to expand existing parks or add on to them. Roffers commented how some communities have a Park Improvement Fee. Guerndt stated he does not see the community wanting 1 or 2-acre parks as the community does not have enough money to put playsets on them all. Roffers stated in those cases, you collect what you can from that development and buy land adjacent to it to build a large enough park.

Maloney feels a little 2-acre park, with no equipment, just a bench a lot of trees, and open space would be nice too. Sparks commented a small dog park is nice too in some neighborhoods.

Sparks commented if we are going more to higher single-family density, that there needs to be some outlets for them. He does not want to put an impact fee just to buy parks, but the maintaining or expanding what we have.

Donner questioned the fees that can be used for improvements to parks. Roffers stated we would have to redraft the impact fee study by placing improvements we would like to see in parks and divide that capital expense by how much residential development we think will be available to contribute to that, on the assumption that is fully attributable to the new residents or general population. We would have to designate a certain percentage of the funds towards people who are here and the remaining percentage towards the people who will come here. He stated this study is based the cost of land to serve the new developments. The ordinance is set up to either use that money for land or for improvements. Before we implement the ordinance we may want to get the Village attorney to review. Roffers commented on how some apartment developments could put in a clubhouse of some kind with a pool, where they maintain that. The Village could give credit towards that.

Sparks questioned if parkland fees were used for the Prohaska park or Mashuda park. Donner stated he would have to check. Sparks does not want to raise what they have to pay, but some sort of split for maintaining these parks.

Higgins stated to Meinel that legislation came from the developers and landlords bill of rights laws at the State level and where they want to know the costs up front.

Higgins stated we can keep the fees at \$244. This has to go to public hearing yet. Maloney proposed we go to \$600 for single family, \$400 for duplex, and \$300 for multi-family.

Guerndt feels the numbers are not matching and that we need to get them closer to Wausau. Guerndt questioned if in 24 years, can this come back in 5 years if these numbers aren't working out? Higgins stated would have to do another assessment. Guerndt questioned what is Village doing for maintaining these parks?

It was explained we need to update the study to include using the fees for park maintenance. Donner stated we are restricted on how we can collect our needs for maintenance, it needs to come from the general tax roll. Capital improvements we can borrow for, but we also have the ability to use parkland impact fee.

Guerndt feels if we are charging a parkland fee, we should use it.

Sparks would like to see this fee included to put something into our parks. He would like to see a split so we can use some for property acquisition and some for infrastructure.

Meinel would like to see the fees reasonable. He wants a clear understanding of what the other communities are charging. Roffers stated we have to base our fees on what our needs will be, not just follow what other communities are doing.

Sparks asked Roffers to address being able to develop some of the existing parkland (like Prohaska Park) and come back so we can find a reasonable rate that we should be charging.

Donner confirmed they want Roffers to look at the two components on the maximum fee. Determine the balance between park land and park improvements. Based on the needs assessment look at what we can justify charging.

Roffers stated you could charge a single fee, based on whether single-family or multi-family.

Cronin questioned how we can compete with other communities with the fees presented. Higgins stated the study gives the maximum rate and we can ultimately decide the rate to be charged.

Guerndt questioned what other funding sources are other communities (like Wausau) using.

Sparks commented on how we will draw people from other areas into our parks.

The Parks Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (CORP) looks at surrounding areas and what is available. We have to look at what is going on around us.

12. Discussion of future land use & zoning designations for Industrial/Business Park Properties south of State Highway 29.

Higgins stated originally this would have been done in the corridor plan project that we began in March. She stated Roffers is working with Ryan Barz of AECOM, who is the sub for the transportation portion of Weston Avenue corridor plan to collect some of the data. Originally, we were going to come back to meet with him on the initial data collection. Roffers was going to start talking to property owners along Weston Avenue for those

individual interviews, but due to COVID, the schedule has been moved back. Because we had a land sale and prior to the COVID issues, the Board had decided to sell or no longer use the Mashuda property for parkland, which was shown on the comprehensive plan map as recreational. So, in order to do a rezone on this property, she has to do a comprehensive plan map amendment and also rezone the property. Now is a good time to discuss what we want to see for zoning in this area (Zinser Street all the way to County Road J, south of STH-29). She went over the different zoning districts in that area. She discussed the inside of the park being GI, due to the storage standards. Higgins stated how with the new zoning code, we turned a lot of things into CUP's so we can look at what they are doing there.

Jordan stated he would like to see the properties in there used for light industrial first, as that is the hardest use to get, versus someone who decides to put in a large restaurant and takes up 5 acres of the business and industrial park.

Higgins discussed the districts that commercial entertainment is permitted in. Jordan would like to see it zoned light industrial, with the potential of other uses.

Higgins explained to Guerndt that the reason we ask potential businesses/tenants what they are doing (through operational plan) is so we can determine if they are a permitted use by right or if they need to come through as conditional use.

Jordan stated the primary thing is to allow for light industrial and to allow exceptions for some of those other uses.

Higgins stated the Weston Business & Technology Park was originally BP (the same as hospital complex). When we changed the code in 2015, we changed the zoning districts to reflect the uses.

Right now the Mashuda property is recreational. We have to change the future land use map/comprehensive plan to light industrial. The members agreed for light industrial, which also allows for business park uses.

Guerndt questioned if Norcon purchases property in the Business Park South, if they will meet zoning.

Sparks questioned if we could carve out a section from the Mashuda property for a park and parking. Guerndt stated some of their stormwater may run into that pond. Sparks feels we should either make that area a small park or we sell it.

Higgins showed the members the land Guerndt is purchasing. She showed the area that we can keep as parkland, and what we can change to light industrial.

Higgins stated we do not need to make a decision tonight, but to change future land use map for those properties to industrial. We do not use the business park district anymore. Most uses in the business park are light industrial.

Higgins discussed other changes to the comprehensive plan that will need to be made.

Guerndt discussed the Wiznewski property (SW Corner) across from the golf course, how they are trying to sell as residential, but the ground water is about 3 – 4 feet there, and it would be best suited for LI.

Roffers will lead discussion on Weston Avenue in the coming months.

STAFF REPORTS

13. Acknowledge Report re: March and April 2020 Staff-Approved Certified Survey Maps and Site Plans.

Motion by Maloney, second by Guerndt to acknowledge Item #13.

Yes Vote: 6 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

| <u>Member</u> | <u>Voting</u> |
|---------------|---------------|
| Sparks, Wally | YES |
| Maloney, Mark | YES |
| Cronin, Steve | YES |
| Gau, Duane | NOT VOTING |
| Guerndt, Gary | YES |
| Jordan, Joe | YES |
| Meinel, Steve | YES |

14. Acknowledge Report re: March and April 2020 Building Permits.

Motion by Maloney, second by Cronin to acknowledge Item #14.

Yes Vote: 1 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 6 Result: PASS

| <u>Member</u> | <u>Voting</u> |
|---------------|---------------|
| Sparks, Wally | YES |
| Maloney, Mark | YES |
| Cronin, Steve | YES |
| Gau, Duane | NOT VOTING |
| Guerndt, Gary | YES |
| Jordan, Joe | YES |
| Meinel, Steve | YES |

15. Acknowledge Report re: March and April 2020 New Business Occupancy Permit Issuance.

Motion by Guerndt, second by Maloney to acknowledge Item #15.

Yes Vote: 1 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

| <u>Member</u> | <u>Voting</u> |
|---------------|---------------|
| Sparks, Wally | YES |
| Maloney, Mark | YES |
| Cronin, Steve | YES |
| Gau, Duane | NOT VOTING |
| Guerndt, Gary | YES |
| Jordan, Joe | YES |
| Meinel, Steve | YES |

16. Update on 2020 Project/Tasks for Plan Commission.

Higgins stated this is a standing item to update the PC where we are at based on projects hanging out there. Some will continue to be on hold until we are able to have more public participation and involvement. She gave the example of the Schofield Avenue Corridor Plan and how we had a full room for that discussion. We can't do that while the COVID-19 restrictions are in place.

17. Updated Workplan for Weston Avenue Corridor Plan Project.

Higgins stated this item has been pushed back a month. There will be a web meeting to start talking about this with Staff and MDRoffers in the next few weeks.

MISCELLANEOUS

18. Next meeting date

a. **Tuesday, June 8, 2020 @ 6pm – Regular Meeting.**

19. Future Meeting Topics

a. **Continued discussion of needed amendments to Chapter 94 Zoning.**

b. **Unfinished Business – Discussion and possible recommendation to the BOT on the petition to vacate an unimproved portion of the Dominika Street right-of-way laying south of Mary Lane.**

Donner stated he has had a hard time getting a meeting with Paul Duerst. Donner stated he will call Joe Buska to see if he has been contacted by Duerst.

Meinel commented that it seems Duerst is avoiding us, and maybe it is time for us to speak to our attorney.

Donner stated when he talked to Buska back in January, he was in favor of that being reserved for right-of-way as he wants to retain access to land he has back there as well.

c. Chapter 14 Ordinance Amendment re: Addressing Flag Signs.

Higgins stated there is a draft Chapter 14 available. Staff needs to review and will bring back to you.

20. Remarks from Staff, Committee, and Commission Members.

Higgins stated the building inspectors are very busy with Weston and Kronenwetter construction projects.

Nothing from Commissioners.

ADJOURNMENT

21. Adjournment of PC

Motion by Maloney, Second by Meinel: to adjourn at 8:28 p.m.

Wally Sparks, Plan Commission Chair and Village President
Jennifer Higgins, Director of Planning & Development
Valerie Parker, Recording Secretary

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Public Mtg/Date: | Plan Commission, May 11, 2020 |
| Description: | Discussion and Action on Willow Estates Multifamily Development; Developer's request of Waivers for Site Design Standards (Project #20200088) at 5420, 5506, and 5510 Willow Street |
| From: | Jennifer Higgins, Zoning Administrator Emily Wheaton, Assistant Planner |
| Question: | Should the Plan Commission approve the request to waive the site plan design standards requested by the applicant? |

BACKGROUND

Updated 5/11/20 due to additional information being submitted.

Gary Guerndt and Tim Ciszewski (Platinum Investments, LLC) are proposing building a three building multi-family dwelling complex on 2.35 acres of land on Willow Street. Each building would contain 12 units of various sizes for a total of 69 bedrooms. After review of the submitted items, Staff have found the following items do not meet the Zoning Code:

- There is a performance standard for a manager or maintenance person residing on-site for developments of more than 31 units. No on-site person is planned.
- There is a performance standard that security cameras be located in parking lots and at entrances for developments of more than 31 units. No cameras are planned.
- A bufferyard is provided, however general yard trees are placed in the buffer yard. Code states that bufferyard landscape is separate from the other components of the landscaping calculation.
- The dumpster is located 20 feet from the front property line. It is required to be 30 feet from front property line. It is also located on the front side of the principal structure.
- Curb and gutter is not denotated for the parking lot on the site plan.
- The minimum permitted throat length of the driveways shall be 20 feet. However, there are parking spaces within this 20 feet.

Staff is in the process of finishing review of the building materials and lighting for the property.

As a note, Staff approved and signed the Certified Survey Map for the combination of the existing three lots that this project is being proposed on on May 4th, 2020. The CSM is waiting to be picked up at the Municipal Center. A building permit cannot be issued for this project until the CSM is picked up and recorded with the Register of Deeds.

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Attached Docs: | Site Plan, Landscaping Plan, Building Elevations, Staff Site Plan Review Form |
| Committee Action: | None to date |
| Fiscal Impact: | None |
| Recommendation: | |

RECOMMENDED LANGUAGE FOR OFFICIAL ACTION

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION

I move to [approve / deny] the site plan for Willow Estates with the following items waived/approved:

- Waive the curb and gutter requirement around the paved parking lot
- Waive the requirement that the dumpster be located no closer than 30 feet from the front property line as well as in front of the primary building
- Waive the requirement that there be a manager or maintenance person residing on site
- Waive the requirement that cameras be installed in the parking lot and at building entrances
- Waive the minimum throat length requirement of the driveways
- Approve the landscaping plan as presented

ADDITIONAL ACTION: Notify applicant of [approval / denial] [Staff]