

PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
December 14, 2022
VILLAGE HALL @ 6:30PM

wav file available indefinitely
transcribed by Julie Harms
unapproved minutes' subject to approval

CALL TO ORDER – 6:30 PM /PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/ROLL CALL: Destree, Smith, and Richter -present, with Skinner presiding. Busse, Karow, Perl- absent. Andy Gabbert- Applicant/Renaissance Infrastructure Consulting, Dominic Marlow- Village Planner, Laura Roesslein- Village Administrator, and Julie Harms- Deputy Clerk also present.

MOTION BY SKINNER, SMITH, CARRIED, TO APPROVE PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES FROM AUGUST 3, 2022.

CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW FOR PROPOSED DOLLAR TREE/FAMILY DOLLAR ON PARCELS 85-4-119-211-4880 AND 85-4-119-211-4890.

Marlow- GRAEF has included three potential actions listed below for the Plan Commission to consider:

Design Review Agenda Item: The request of Andy Gabbert, PLA (Applicant) for a Design Review on tax parcels #85-4-119-211-4880 and #85-4-119-211-4890, Village of Twin Lakes, Kenosha County and State of Wisconsin:

(1) *CONDITIONALLY APPROVE* the Application, pending the submission of additional information listed below. NOTE: Plan Commission shall review the below conditions and cross out any conditions that are deemed unnecessary.

(2) *TABLE* the agenda item until additional information is submitted to the Village and the Plan Commission can review and take action at next month's meeting to confirm that any discussed components and/or additional submittals are addressed.

(3) *DENY* the agenda item (pointing out reasons for denial merit).

Possible conditions recommended by GRAEF to include if “conditional approval” of the Design Review is desirable to the Plan Commission:

1. Buildings: Façade Dimensions

a. Applicant shall revise the elevations in the architectural plan to extend façade materials a minimum distance equal to one-fourth (1/4) of the side dimension.

2. Buildings: Architectural Consistency and Coherence:

a. Applicant should remove the stripes across the column details to distinguish them from the rest of the façade design; and/or

b. Applicant should continue the horizontal articulation of the parapet on the primary façade the entire length of the column to match the column details on the secondary façade; and/or

c. Applicant should integrate red brick of similar masonry materials compatible with its surroundings; and/or

d. Applicant should revise the roofline to a gable design more compatible with its surroundings.

3. Buildings: Visibility from the Street

a. Plan Commission to determine the need for additional façade requirements on the northern façade.

4. Landscape: Landscape Design

a. The Applicant shall submit a revised landscape plan including street trees, trees, ground cover and shrubbery in the front setback area and unpaved areas.

5. Landscape: Existing Trees

a. The Applicant shall revise the landscape plan to preserve the existing tree line on the north side of the property; or

b. The Applicant shall provide screening in the form of a fence of landscape buffer on the north side of the property.

6. Landscape: Side Yard

a. The Applicant shall revise the site plan to include an eight (8) foot strip for landscaping or walkway abutting the front one-quarter (1/4) of the building on the north side of the property.

7. Signs: Window Signage

a. The Applicant shall not place restricted signs out of doors or near the inside surface of a window without first applying for and receiving a Building Permit from the Village Building Inspector.

8. Parking and Loading Areas: Parking Setbacks

a. The Applicant shall revise the parking layout to conform to all required setbacks.

9. Parking and Loading Areas: Driveway Orientation

a. The Applicant shall submit a revised site plan such that it avoids a direct, unscreened view from the street to employee parking areas, loading docks, maneuvering areas and permitted outdoor storage areas.

10. Snow Removal

a. The Applicant shall submit all required information regarding snow removal and procedures adhering to the standards contained in the Village Zoning Ordinance.

11. Lighting

a. The Applicant shall submit a Lighting Plan.

Gabbert referenced new revised submittals to the Planner:

1. Buildings: Façade Dimensions

a. Applicant shall revise the elevations in the architectural plan to extend façade materials a minimum distance equal to one-fourth (1/4) of the side dimension.

RESPONSE: Elevations & Plans have been revised as suggested.

2. Buildings: Architectural Consistency and Coherence:

a. Applicant should remove the stripes across the column details to distinguish them from the rest of the façade design; and/or

RESPONSE: Plans have been revised as suggested

b. Applicant should continue the horizontal articulation of the parapet on the primary façade the entire length of the column to match the column details on the secondary façade; and/or

RESPONSE: Refer to Item C

c. Applicant should integrate red brick of similar masonry materials compatible with its surroundings; and/or

RESPONSE: Plans have been revised as suggested

d. Applicant should revise the roofline to a gable design more compatible with its surroundings.

RESPONSE: Refer to Item C

3. Buildings: Visibility from the Street

a. Plan Commission to determine the need for additional façade requirements on the northern façade.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged, revisions thus far have been incorporated into the design

4. Landscape: Landscape Design

a. The Applicant shall submit a revised landscape plan including street trees, trees, ground cover and shrubbery in the front setback area and unpaved areas.

RESPONSE: Landscape Plan has been revised to include additional plantings as suggested.

5. Landscape: Existing Trees

a. The Applicant shall revise the landscape plan to preserve the existing tree line on the north side of the property; or

RESPONSE: Refer to Item B

b. The Applicant shall provide screening in the form of a fence of landscape buffer on the north side of the property.

RESPONSE: Landscaping has been included along the north side of the property.

6. Landscape: Side Yard

a. The Applicant shall revise the site plan to include an eight (8) foot strip for landscaping or walkway abutting the front one-quarter (1/4) of the building on the north side of the property.

RESPONSE: Landscaping has been included along the north side of the property.

7. Signs: Window Signage

a. The Applicant shall not place restricted signs out of doors or near the inside surface of a window without first applying for and receiving a Building Permit from the Village Building Inspector.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

8. Parking and Loading Areas: Parking Setbacks

a. The Applicant shall revise the parking layout to conform to all required setbacks.

RESPONSE: Parking lot has been shifted to conform to all setbacks

9. Parking and Loading Areas: Driveway Orientation

a. The Applicant shall submit a revised site plan such that it avoids a direct, unscreened view from the street to employee parking areas, loading docks, maneuvering areas and permitted outdoor storage areas.

RESPONSE: Additional landscape has been added along the south building façade to break up view from street. Delivery to the building is through double man doors and is not a traditional dock look. Delivery is only once or twice a week. The majority of the time, the delivery area will be perceived as a parking lot.

10. Snow Removal

a. The Applicant shall submit all required information regarding snow removal and procedures adhering to the standards contained in the Village Zoning Ordinance.

RESPONSE: Snow will be piled and stored along the south parking lot to allow snow to melt into the drainage swale prior to entering into the wetland.

11. Lighting

a. The Applicant shall submit a Lighting Plan.

RESPONSE: A lighting plan has been included with the resubmittal.

Please Note: A revised plan has been submitted to accommodate drainage per DNR requirements. A reduction of pavement and a drainage swale has been added on the south property line and to the east of the building for water quality.

Skinner read into the meeting question's Busse had, as he was absent:

- Loading Zone Location and Configuration – (Figure 18 on page 12 of the Graef Design Review letter)

Applicant/Petitioner should explain the rationale behind the loading zone location in the customer/employee parking lot. Backing and turning movements of supply trucks into and out of the loading zone appear to potentially conflict with movement of arriving and departing customer vehicles and pedestrian activity in the customer/employee parking lot. The size and location of the loading zone needs a second look. **Gabbert stated that most deliveries would be made after hours or on weekends and to avoid major disruption of the wetland this was the best design.**

- Surface Storm Water Run-off into the Wetland- How does the applicant/petitioner intend to effectively manage storm water run-off from the parking lot and building roof drains? Approximately 48% of the lot will become impervious surface. From the design drawings, it appears the surface flow of storm water run-off will be directed from the highest elevation in the northwest corner of the parking lot to a "site discharge point" located on the south side of the property near the storage and refuse disposal area. The applicant/petitioner's Discharge Map (Sheet C5.0) drawing shows surface storm water flow discharged into the wetlands at the rear of the building. How does the applicant/petitioner intend to mitigate the quantity of surface storm water run-off from the parking lot and roof drains into the wetland? Are there plans to retain/detain surface storm water run-off before it discharges into the wetland and potentially into the off-site creek east of the property? **Skinner stated this had previously been addressed.**

- Pedestrian Access - From the design drawings, it appears customer vehicles, delivery trucks and pedestrians will be expected to access the property through a single 37' paved driveway facing Lake Avenue (CTH EM). In the interest of pedestrian safety, the applicant/petitioner may want to consider a separate access sidewalk for pedestrians located north of the proposed driveway. This separate sidewalk will allow pedestrians safer access across the parking lot and into the premises from the Village's sidewalk located in the public ROW. **Gabbert stated that an additional sidewalk would not be an issue.**

Richter stated that he felt that the façade that was submitted did not go well with the surrounding area.



Figure A



Figure B

Richter, Destree, Smith and Skinner all agreed that the look the Village would accept is the below image with red brick and no outside cart storage:



Figure C

Gabbert suggested that he would like the discussion tabled so that he may go back and bring the following recommendations and conditions to the architect.

Skinner stated that the following conditions would need to be met:

1. Façade like Figure C.
2. Pedestrian Sidewalk to be added.
- 3.

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW TABLED FOR FURTHER SUBMISSION

MOTION BY SKINNER, RICHTER CARRIED, TO ADJOURN AT 7:13PM

DISTRIBUTION

Administrator

Clerk

Treasurer

Plan Commission

Building Inspector

Pres/Trustees