

**PLAN COMMISSION**  
**City of Hartford**  
**April 11, 2016**

PRESENT: Chairperson Dautermann, Members Anderek, Stapleton, Regan, Henke, Alderperson Liaison Rusniak

ABSENT: Member Kuepper

ALSO PRESENT: City Planner Justin Drew

**Call to Order** – Chairman Dautermann called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Common Council Chambers of Hartford City Hall, 109 N. Main Street.

**Minutes** - Motion by Regan, second by Stapleton approving the minutes of March 14, 2016. Motion carried.

**Appearances** – There were no appearances.

**Use and Parking Review of a Gymnastics Studio, 610 North Wacker Drive**

*Executive Summary Review:*

In 2013, the City approved eleven contractor tenant units at 610 North Wacker Drive. The tenant spaces would be used as storage and office areas for building and service contractors, which is a permitted use in the M-2 Limited Industrial District. Last year, a gymnastics studio began operating in 5,400 square feet of building #3. Dance studios were allowed by the Plan Commission in the M-3 General Industrial District when the Dream Center was approved in 2004. Gymnastics studios are a similar use, but are not specifically permitted by Code. The Code gives the Plan Commission the authority to approve unspecified uses if such uses are similar in character to uses permitted in the zoning district. Every gymnastics studio in southeastern Wisconsin that Staff is aware of is located within an industrial district. A gymnastics studio needs a lot of space, it needs a building with high ceilings, and it needs to be located in an area with a lower rent structure than retail and office buildings. Staff believes that gymnastics studios are appropriate in industrial areas, and that they should be allowed as a permitted use in the M-1, M-2, and M-3 zoning Districts. Staff's only concern with this particular location is the lack of designated parking. There are up to three classes per day with 20-25 kids attending each class. The lack of designated parking is exacerbated by the presence of other contractor spaces on the same property. These businesses run trucks and vans and delivery trucks to their rented units at various times of the day. This could be a safety concern with so many kids getting dropped off at a time. Staff observed a recent drop-off before a class started. For the 15 minutes before class started, 2-3 spaces were generally available, though there were a few minutes when no spaces were available. Vehicles were not parked as efficiently as possible. The maximum number of vehicles parked along the gymnastics studio space was 12 at one time. Approximately ¼ of the parents dropped their children off without

getting out of their car. The rest remained inside until class started. Parents are not allowed to stay for any classes except the Parent-Tot Class, which is Wednesday morning. The City does not have a specific parking requirement or recommendation for gymnastics studios, and the M-2 District parking requirements are concerned primarily with providing parking for employees. Staff spoke to Planners in other southeast Wisconsin communities where gymnastic studios were present. Most other communities did not have a specific requirement. The gymnastics studio leases approximately 120 linear feet of building frontage. Cars can park in front of all of this space. In addition, a small area in front of the building has been paved for vehicle parking (2 vehicles fit there). If all of the area in front of their leased space were properly striped for parking, 12 vehicles should be able to fit without parking in front of the entrance door. There is also space in front of the building to add 1-2 additional parking spaces. Based upon Staff's observations, 15-16 total parking spaces should be sufficient for the size of the gymnastics studio and the traffic that the studio generates. The parking and drop off situation would also likely be improved if the studio designated 2-3 spots for drop-off only, encouraged parents not to stay in the building until classes start, and stagger the transition times more to avoid drop-off and pick-up at the same time. If the parking plan is approved, Staff intends to continue monitoring the situation, and bring the matter back to the Plan Commission if we receive a pattern of complaints. Thus far, no parking or drop-off complaints have been received.

Staff recommended that gymnastics studios be allowed in the M-1, M-2, and M-3 zoning Districts, and recommended that the Plan Commission require the gymnastics studio to paint 9-foot wide parking spaces in front of their leasable space, to sign 2-3 of the parking spaces for drop-off only, and add 1-2 paved parking spaces in front of the building.

*Plan Commission Discussion, Use and Parking Review, Gymnastics Studio, 610 N. Wacker:*

Mr. Drew reviewed the executive summary. Chairperson Dautermann requested discussion. Member Regan asked if Mr. Drew had heard back from the contractor or tenant. Mr. Drew replied that there has been no further input from either. Alderperson Rusniak noted surprise that a gymnastics studio would be located in a manufacturing district and expressed concern for the safety of everyone.

MOTION by Regan, second by Henke to approve use recommendation for the gymnastics studio at 610 North Wacker Drive. Motion carried.

Member Regan asked Jay Schnorenberg, developer, to take the podium for some questions about the parking recommendation. Mr. Schnorenberg assured members that he is aware of recommendations and will take care of them. Mr. Schnorenberg noted that the tenant, owner of the gymnastics studio, was in the audience and is supportive of all recommendations. Mr. Schnorenberg reminded members that most classes are at night after contractors have usually left. MOTION by Regan, second by Henke for approval of the parking recommendation for the gymnastics studio. Motion carried.

**Review of the Certified Survey Map for Lot 16 and Outlot 4 of Red Oak Country Estates Subdivision and Land in the Northwest Quarter of Section 33**

*Executive Summary Review:*

In March of 2016, the Plan Commission recommended and the Common Council approved Mark McCune's proposed annexation of 19.1 acres of land located east of STH 83 and south of the Red Oaks Country Estates subdivision. The stated purpose of the annexation was the

development of single family lots and a multi-family lot. The single family residential portion of the CSM consists of three lots, encompassing Lot 16 and Outlot 4 of Red Oaks subdivision, plus a portion of the recently-annexed property. All residential lots meet area and width requirements for Rs-4. Setback requirements will be reviewed during the site plan approval process. Requested permanent zoning for these lots is Rs-4 Single Family Residential District. A portion of a utility easement within Lot four is proposed to be released. This portion of the easement that cuts across the lot serves a street light on Firefly Trail. The easement and electric wire can be rerouted so that the line runs along the property line between Lots 3-4. The Developer shall grant the City a new easement between lots 3-4 to allow for this reconfiguration. The multi-family residential portion of the CSM (Lot 1 plus roadway dedication) is comprised of the rest of the area annexed in March, totaling 772,534 square feet (17.72 acres). Rm-3 zoning requires a minimum area of 3,111 square feet per dwelling unit and a width of not less than 100 feet at the building setback line. Expected number of units in the multi-family section is 156, within the total square footage provided. Width and setback requirements will be confirmed during the site plan review. The section of property at the southern edge of the property will be dedicated to the public for roadway purposes. Of the total 17.71 acres intended to be zoned Rm-3, it measures .83 acre and is intended to be named Whistle Drive. The Planning Staff recommended approval of the Certified Survey Map for single family, multi-family and road dedication property consisting of Lot 16 and Outlot 4 of Red Oak Country Estates and lands being a part of the Southwest ¼ and Southeast ¼ of the Northwest ¼ of Section 33, City of Hartford, subject to the Developer granting the City an easement between lots 3-4 of the proposed CSM to allow for the rerouting of electric line serving a street light on Firefly Trail.

*Plan Commission Discussion, Certified Survey Map, McCune Property:*

Mr. Drew reviewed the executive summary. Chairperson Dautermann requested discussion. There was no discussion.

MOTION by Henke, second by Regan to recommend approval of the Certified Survey Map for Lot 16 and Outlot 4 of Red Oak Country Estates Subdivision and land in the northwest quarter of Section 33. Motion carried.

**Review of a Rezoning Request for the Lepien Farmland Annexation, STH 83**

*Executive Summary Review:*

Mark McCune has requested the permanent zoning for the recently-approved Lepien Farmland Annexation on State Trunk Highway 83, previously part of tax key number T60823. The property was assigned temporary zonings of Rs-4 Single Family Residential District and Rm-3 Multi-Family Residential District at the annexation approval by the Common Council on March 22, 2016, with the understanding that a formal rezone review and hearing would take place at a later date. The public hearing notice published April 1 and April 8, 2016 provides specific legal descriptions for the different single family and multi family areas, and a certified survey map to be reviewed at a later date will split the multi family area from three separate lots to be created in the single family area. The area requested to be rezoned to Rs-4 Single Family Residential District is located at the northwest corner of the annexed area. On its north side it abuts Lot 16 and Outlot 4 in Red Oak Estates Subdivision, both of which are zoned Rs-4, and a portion of Firefly Trail in the Red Oak Estates Subdivision. On its east side is a portion of tax key number

T60823 that was not annexed. South is the annexed area intended for Rm-3 multi family zoning, and to the west are Town of Hartford residential properties.

The area requested to be rezoned to Rm-3 Multi-Family Residential District comprises the remaining portion of the annexed area. On the north it abuts the requested Rs-4 zoned area and a portion of tax key number T60823 that was not annexed. East and south of the area is the rest of the non-annexed T60823 land. West is STH 83, and Town of Hartford residential properties. The property meets the area requirements for both Rs-4 and Rm-3. The City will continue to work with the developer to maintain setback and other zoning requirements upon development and buildout. Staff recommended approval of the rezoning request for the Lepien Farmland Annexation located west of STH 83.

*Plan Commission Discussion, Rezoning, McCune Property (Lepien Farmland LLC):*

Mr. Drew reviewed the executive summary. Chairperson Dautermann requested discussion. There was no discussion.

MOTION by Henke, second by Stapleton to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the Lepien Farmland Annexation. Motion carried.

**Concept Plan Review of a Multi-Family Residential Development Located North of the Terminus of Liberty Avenue**

*Executive Summary Review:*

Lynch and Associates has submitted a concept plan for seven multi-family residential buildings on a 15 acre site north of WalMart. The lot is currently in the Town of Hartford. The proposal includes 7 multi-family buildings, each with 12 units. In order to facilitate the proposed development, the City of Hartford 2030 Smart Growth Plan would need to be amended, the property would need to be annexed to the City, the property would need to be rezoned to Rm-2 Multi-Family residential, a development agreement would need to be negotiated and approved, a Certified Survey Map approved, and a Conditional Use Permit for a Planned Unit Development along with a Site Plan would need to be approved.

The property is surrounded by the Rubicon River to the north, undeveloped town land to the west, the Libby Lagoon to the east, and Wal-Mart to the south.

The proposed multi-family buildings would be arranged around both sides of an extended Liberty Avenue. Three of the buildings east of Liberty Avenue extended would be arranged around a circular private driveway.

The proposed Multi-Family buildings would have the following setbacks and lot coverage:

- **45 feet** from the proposed extended Liberty Avenue Right-of-Way
- **70 feet** from the western property line
- **390 feet** from the eastern property line
- **25 feet** from the northern property line
- Lot Coverage would be approximately **12.4%** of the 15.0-acre site, below the 25% maximum allowed by Code in the Rm-3 District.

The adopted Smart Growth Plan identifies this area for commercial development. The density proposed for this development would be 5.6 units per acre. Staff supports a change to the Smart Growth plan to allow for higher density residential development in this area. Multi-Family development remains the dominant portion of the residential development market in southeastern Wisconsin, and demand for additional multi-family development is high. Also, the land is

separated from the existing commercial development (Wal-Mart and a retail strip center) and its location north of the large Wal-Mart stormwater pond and south of the Rubicon River make it tucked away. Staff does not believe that the land is viable for commercial uses. Its location, however, does make it attractive for high density residential development. It is very near a number of commercial and retail establishments. It is also near the Dodge Industrial Park, the largest employment center in the area. Eventually, Liberty Avenue will extend to the western leg of Liberty Avenue in the Dodge Industrial Park, and the proposed development will bring this closer to reality. The proposed 12-unit structures are allowed in the Rm-2 Multi-Family District as a Conditional Use.

The Developer proposes two bedroom apartments arranged in 12-unit structures. The proposed buildings would be two stories tall. The buildings would have attached garages. Further review of building design and materials would happen as part of a site plan review.

The plan proposes an extension of the Liberty Avenue Right-of-Way north of its current terminus. The Right-of Way would travel north, then angle towards the northwest. This layout would facilitate the continued expansion of Liberty Avenue towards the northwest, and Staff supports the proposed layout. The City always insists on at least two access points (or the potential for two access points when additional development occurs) to ensure proper emergency access. The plan will meet this requirement when the east and west ends of Liberty Avenue connect. In the interim, the buildings flank both sides of the proposed Liberty Avenue extension, and emergency access is satisfactory. Private sidewalk is shown. However, sidewalk on both sides of the Liberty Avenue Right-of-Way are not shown and shall be required.

Sanitary sewer and water main are located in the Liberty Avenue Right-of-Way directly south of the property. The water main extension could not be looped unless and until the east and west ends of Liberty Avenue connect. As a result, if there were a water main break in this area, water service would be down for all 84 units until repairs were complete. The City Engineer and Utility Director did not expect this to be an issue but wanted to make sure that everyone was aware of this. As a preliminary grading plan has not been prepared at this point, Staff is not sure if sanitary sewer will work on gravity in this area, or if a lift station will be required. Staff recommended approval of the Concept Plan for multi-family residential development located north of the terminus of Liberty Avenue, subject to inclusion of five-foot wide sidewalk on both sides of the Liberty Avenue Right-of-Way extension.

*Plan Commission Discussion, Concept Plan Review, Multi-Family North of Liberty Avenue:*

Mr. Drew reviewed the executive summary. Chairperson Dautermann requested more information on why the property was no longer viable for commercial use. Mr. Drew explained that it is too far back from STH 60, and doesn't have the desirable frontage. Mr. Drew noted that the location could work for an office use but there is no real market for large scale office buildings in Hartford. Alderperson Rusniak indicated his agreement with Mr. Drew and expressed his support of the concept and location near the industrial park. Member Anderek asked for clarification on what needed to be amended – the mix? Mr. Drew gave more information about the Smart Growth Plan and noted that as written, plan amendments are required for changes rather than providing a range of recommendations within the Smart Growth Plan. Member Regan asked if there was a clear timetable for when Liberty Avenue would connect to the Industrial Park area. Mr. Drew noted that there has not been interest in connection before this and so it has not been discussed. Member Regan asked about the range of rents to be

charged. Mr. Drew noted that preliminary information indicates a range of \$1200 - \$1300 for the two bedroom/two bath units, but reminded members that that information could change.

MOTION by Anderek, second by Henke recommending approval of the concept plan for multi-family development north of the terminus of Liberty Avenue. Motion carried.

### **Site Plan Review – Ewald Ford Addition**

#### *Executive Summary Review:*

The property, located at 5788 STH 60, is surrounded by other commercial property to the east, State Forest to the south, and Town manufacturing to the north and west. Ewald Ford proposes an 11,300 addition to the north end of their existing 22,300 square foot building. The addition would house 10 new service stalls, a car wash, a break room, a tool room, a bathroom, and an equipment mezzanine. The addition would dramatically increase the size of their service departments. The addition would be 20 feet tall, and would include five overhead doors on the east elevation, seven overhead doors on the west elevation, and one overhead door on the north elevation. The façade would be composed of a split-faced concrete masonry unit knee wall and metal siding as well as transom windows above the overhead doors and break room. The addition would be setback 75 feet from the west property line, 335 feet from the east property line, and 410 feet from the north property line and would meet applicable setback requirements (25 feet). The proposed addition would increase lot coverage to approximately 6.7% of the 11.55 acre lot, well below the 30% allowed by Code. The proposal would create paved parking areas north and east of the existing building. These areas are currently gravel. In total, the site would have 339 parking stalls.

A new dumpster enclosure is proposed north of the building addition. It will be constructed of split-faced concrete masonry units to match the building addition.

A photometric plan was included. New lighting is proposed north of the building addition and southeast of the existing building for the new paved parking areas. In addition, new lighting is proposed for the extended private drive that parallels STH 60. The lighting proposed along this private drive is near the STH 60 Right-of-Way. The photometric plan does not extend far enough to see if the lighting will negatively impact STH 60. As a result, Staff will require that the applicant submit additional photometric plan information prior to building permit issuance. The proposed additions will result in an increase of impervious surface (approximately 0.73 acres), which should not impact storm water drainage.

No change in utility service is requested. If the proposed car wash necessitates a change in water service, Ewald Ford will need to work with Hartford's Water Department. Staff recommended approval of the site plan as submitted for the Ewald Ford Addition, 5788 STH 60, subject to Staff review and approval of additional photometric plan information.

#### *Plan Commission Discussion, Ewald Ford Site Plan:*

Mr. Drew reviewed the executive summary. Chairperson Dautermann requested discussion.

Member Henke asked if the road parallel to STH 60 goes to the property line. Mr. Drew noted that the road does go to the property line and Ewald owns the next property.

MOTION by Rusniak, second by Stapleton approving the site plan for the Ewald Ford addition, 5788 STH 60. Motion carried.

**Site Plan Review Amendment – Hartford Flex Center, 2250 Constitution Avenue**

*Executive Summary Review:*

In 2014, the Plan Commission approved a Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan for the Hartford Flex Center at 2250 Constitution Avenue. The 2.54-acre property is located in the M-4 Industrial Park District, and lies within the WP-1 Wellhead Protection Overlay District surrounding Municipal Well # 15. The applicant has now submitted an amended site plan that changes the layout and appearance of the buildings, but not the proposed use or use characteristics. The previous plan showed four structures with a total area of 40,000 square feet, with visitor parking east of the building fronting Constitution Avenue. The new plan shows seven buildings with a total area of 37,300 square feet. All of the proposed buildings are now oriented north to south.

The structures would meet street setback, side setback, lot coverage, and building height requirements for the M-4 district.

The previous plan showed one building with an office, two vehicle bays and storage units, while the other three buildings housed only storage units of various sizes. The new plan eliminates the office, and all buildings are proposed to house only storage units of various sizes. The street-facing façade of Buildings A, B, C, and D along Constitution Avenue would be composed of a brick wainscot topped with horizontal hardiplank and red metal panels. Two windows would be present on each street-facing façade. This is similar to the materials used for Countywide Extinguisher. The street-facing façade of Buildings D and G along Goodland Road would be composed of metal siding. The previous plan called for a façade composed primarily of a brick-patterned cement panel accented by architectural metal panels. The Code requires the use of masonry materials on all street-facing facades. However, the Plan Commission has approved metal paneling on street-facing facades (at least on a long-term temporary basis) if the metal façade is screened by coniferous plantings. 46 arborvitae are proposed for the approximately 375 foot length of the buildings along Goodland Road.

The HADC (Hartford Area Development Corporation) Architectural Committee has not reviewed the façade for the buildings. Staff recommended that the Plan Commission approval be conditioned on the HADC approving the façade for the buildings.

A driveway is proposed between buildings C and D on Constitution Avenue. The driveway entrance meets the code standards for width and side yard setback. The plan shows no parking spaces. The tenants would park in front of their rental unit. The parking lot would be paved.

The grading plan calls for directing stormwater from the edges of the property and the parking lot towards the north side of the property. From there, it would be directed towards a regional stormwater management pond northeast of this property. Municipal sanitary sewer, water, and electric utilities are available from Constitution Avenue. None of the buildings are proposed to have sewer and water service. No exterior dumpster is shown on the plan. Aside from the arborvitae, no additional landscaping is shown on the plan. The previous landscape plan showed numerous decorative shrubs and ornamental trees planted near Constitution Avenue. Unless a new landscaping plan for this area is proposed, the approved landscaping plan will stand. Light sconces will be mounted approximately every 40 feet to the sides of the buildings facing the interior driveway. As a result, Staff did not require a photometric plan. Staff recommended approval of the Site Plan Review Amendment for the Hartford Flex Center at 2250 Constitution Avenue, subject to HADC approval of the façade of the buildings.

*Plan Commission Discussion, Hartford Flex Center:*

Mr. Drew reviewed the executive summary. Chairperson Dautermann requested discussion.

Member Regan asked if a copy of the previous landscape plan is available. Mr. Drew did not have a copy of the plan but noted that plantings were extensive and appropriate. Member Regan asked if applicant is aware that the previous plan will need to be followed. Mr. Drew stated that applicants received copies of agendas and executive summaries. Chairperson Dautermann asked why the applicant was being allowed to deviate from the masonry requirement. Mr. Drew noted that the decision is up to the Plan Commission. He noted the planting screen along Goodland Road, and reminded members that Trade Tech had received a similar approval because they intended to expand in future from that wall. Chairperson Dautermann noted that he would not be voting in favor of this request due to the masonry requirement and lack of a current landscaping plan submittal. Alderperson Rusniak asked about Jay Schnorenberg's buildings at 730 North Wacker, which have metal-sided walls. Mr. Drew explained that the masonry was a requirement in the Dodge Industrial Park, not a zoning requirement. Mr. Drew asked for feedback from members if submittal was not approved. Are the facades along Constitution acceptable? Member Henke stated that the facades were acceptable, but he would not be voting for this proposal at all until the HADC had reviewed it. In his opinion masonry is necessary.

MOTION by Henke, second by Stapleton to table Hartford Flex Center site plan review, 2250 Constitution. Motion carried.

Member Regan asked about informing appropriate parties. Mr. Drew noted that he would pass along comments and recommendations to the developer and the HADC.

**Discussion of an Ordinance Amending Portions of Section 13.0320, 13.0321, 13.00322 and 13.0323 Pertaining to Height Restrictions in the Manufacturing/Industrial Districts**

*Executive Summary Review:*

Last year, the City approved an Ordinance change to allow taller buildings in the B-3 General Business (Downtown) District. During the Council review of this ordinance change, Council members indicated that Staff should conduct a similar analysis of height restrictions in the Manufacturing/Industrial Districts.

The M-1 District currently allows a height of 45 feet. The M-2 District currently allows a height of 35 feet. The M-3 District currently allows a height of 35 feet. The M-4 District currently allows a height of 45 feet. In addition, the Plan Commission can waive the height requirement for architectural projections, mechanical equipment and necessary mechanical appurtenances.

Staff again discussed the possibility of increasing height restrictions with the Fire Chief and Water Utility Director. The Fire Chief indicated that there were no local height requirements from a Fire Department perspective. The Water Utility Director commissioned a building height water pressure study for industrial areas of the City. The study showed that adequate water pressure as a function of building height varied widely throughout the industrial areas, but in most areas, a height of at least 60 feet was possible with required water pressures. In addition, a review of other communities' codes showed a large spread of allowable heights (35 feet to 70 feet). After review and discussion, Staff believed that greater structure heights can safely be allowed in the City's industrial districts. The primary constraint appears to be the height allowed by water pressure, which varies widely within the industrial areas. Staff recommends that the base heights allowed in the industrial districts remain the same. However, Staff recommended allowing buildings taller than that allowed by Code, as a conditional use after review by the Plan Commission. This would allow the City to make decisions on building heights in industrial areas

based upon building height water pressure studies, the proximity of residential properties, the heights of surrounding buildings, and the proximity of fire hydrants.

*Plan Commission Discussion, Height Restricts in Manufacturing/Industrial Districts:*

Mr. Drew reviewed the executive summary. Chairperson Dautermann noted that it makes sense to review requests on a case-by-case basis. Alderperson Rusniak recommended a maximum, noting that applicants could request unreasonable heights. Chairperson Dautermann responded that the Plan Commission could refuse those requests. Mr. Drew noted that the maximum allowed in other communities is 65 feet, with one instance of 75 feet for mineral extraction uses.

MOTION by Regan, second by Anderek to recommend a conditional use option for buildings taller than code allowance in the Manufacturing/Industrial districts. Motion carried.

**Adjournment** – Motion by Henke, and seconded by Stapleton for adjournment. Motion carried. Meeting was adjourned at 7:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Justin Drew, City Planner

Compiled by Char Smelter, Planning Secretary