City of Mequon

11333 N. Cedarburg Road
Mequon, WI 53092
Phone: 262-236-2904
Fax: 262-242-9655

www.ci.mequon.wi.us
Department of Community Development
Taped and Televised

**PLANNING COMMISSION**
**Regular Meeting**
**Monday, December 4, 2017**
**7:00 PM**
**Christine Nuernberg Hall**

**Minutes**

## 1) Call to Order, Roll Call

**Present:**
Chairman Dan Abendroth
Commissioner Martin Choren
Commissioner John Mason
Commissioner Brian Parrish
Commissioner James Schaefer
Commissioner Rebecca Schaefer
Alderman John Wirth
Commissioner Rick Lemke
Alternate Stephanie Hawley

a) Approval of Minutes from November 13, 2017

b) Minutes from November 13. 2017

**Action**
Ald. Wirth made a motion to approve the minutes from November 13, 2017.
Commissioner Mason seconded the motion.
*Voice vote was taken; vote passed 8-0*

| | |
|---|---|
| **RESULT:** | **APPROVED [8 TO 0]** |
| **MOVER:** | John Wirth, Alderman |
| **SECONDER:** | John Mason, Commissioner |
| **AYES:** | Abendroth, Choren, Mason, Parrish, B. Schaefer, J. Schaefer, Wirth, Lemke |
| **ABSTAIN:** | Hawley |
| **EXCUSED:** | Stoker |

## 2) Public Hearing

a) Ranch Court, LLC for Christine Glass and Bill Frick. The applicant is seeking conditional use grant, preliminary plat and development agreement approval to allow for a single family subdivision consisting of 6 lots for the property located at 2100 W. Ranch Road.

Ald. Wirth recused himself from the public hearing and discussion regarding agenda item 2a – Ranch Court.

**Action**
Commissioner Parrish made a motion to go into public hearing
Commissioner Becky Schaefer seconded the motion.
*A voice vote was called, vote passed 8-0*

Peter Gardner, 2350 W. Ranch Road – resides on the 26 acre property west of the proposed parcel. He has a few questions he would like addressed:

- Can the sewer capacity can handle the additional houses.
- What the effect on the well water will be, the draw down. The water table has been going down
- How the drainage Plan will affect his property and he is concerned about the area around his house
- He is wondering what the minimum house size will be.

Howard Schlei, 1935 W. River Bend Court - stated that he thinks this is a still a bad idea. He has the same concerns as Mr. Gardner regarding the well water. He is speaking on behalf of Mrs. Loren who has a well situation that there is near its limit and there is a history of problems with the aquafers in the area. He hopes that the developer will bring in city water as previously discussed. He feels that there will be issues if private wells are used for the new homes.

Bill Nimke, 2042 W. Ranch Road – lives in the house at the very end of the cul du sac, adjacent to the Frick property. He is opposed to this project and his biggest concern is regarding the placement of the new road that would be located to the west of his property. He would like the roadway to be placed further away to the west away from his property.

Irene Sullivan, 2413 W. Ranch Road is opposed to the project and does not wish to speak.

**Action**
Commissioner Parrish made a motion to close the public hearing
Commissioner Becky Schaefer seconded the motion.
*A voice vote was called, vote passed 8-0*

Asst. Dir. Zader stated that this project was in front of the Commission for a rezoning request to R-3 for a 13-lot subdivision. It was denied by the Common Council and the applicant is back to redevelop the property under the current zoning. A large part of the site is zoned C-2 which requires a Conditional Use Grant (CUG) and 5-acre densities. There is a portion off of Ranch Road that is zoned R-4, ¾ acre. The applicant is proposing 6 lots ranging from 1.04 to 4.83 acres in size.

The C-2 district does not have many standards and conditions for single family dwellings; so a number of conditions have been added to the CUG, which are listed in the staff report:

- No fill or development even in the 100-year floodplain.
- No land disturbing activities within the Environmental Corridor.
- Due to no water extension, SEWPRC Environmental Corridor requirements are no longer applicable but there were added as conditions of the CUG.
- The dwelling on Lot 6 must have the house located in front of the wetland near the front of the lot and cannot seek a fill permit from the DNR.
- No more than 5% of the lot can be covered by building and structures.
- The single family dwelling minimum is 1800 sq. ft.
- Language added regarding approval for one additional garage.

Regarding the questions asked from the public, Asst. Dir. Zader stated that there will be wells as the City Water Utility Commission issued a waiver allowing the applicant not to bring city water to the site. The DNR is solely responsible for approving the wells and the city does not have any involvement in the issue.

The applicant is including an out lot to keep the roadway further away from the homes. This is a private drive and will not be built like a typical road. It will be similar to a residential driveway, 14 feet in width.

Asst. City Engineer, Bridget Henk, stated that sanitary sewer is governed by SEWPRC and MMSD. They verify the calculations that there is enough capacity in the system and the preliminary conversation indicates that there is enough capacity.

Regarding storm sewer and storm water management, the development must met the City of Mequon MMSD and DNR storm water standards. This means that they cannot make the storm water any worse than it currently is. The will need to supply storm water management for this development because they are adding more than a ½ acre of impervious surface.

Asst. Dir. Zader stated that the conditions of the approval are listed in the staff report and there is a development agreement included as well.  They are allowed to build one home as a spec home prior to final plat. Staff does recommend approval according to the conditions in the report.

The applicant, Fred Bersch, stated they have not yet submitted a detailed storm water plan but the storm water management ponds will most likely be located on Lot 1. They do not expect to shed any additional water to the west towards Mr. Gardner's property.

Mr. Bersch expressed that he feels these are desirable lots as they are walkable to many of the amenities offered by Mequon. He feels that the homes built on Lots 1 and 2 will be similar to those in the neighborhood. Lots 3, 4, 5 and 6 will most likely have larger homes as the lots range in size from 3 ½ to 5 acres. They will be neighborhood subdivision homes and they will be good quality homes.

Asst. Dir. Zader stated that he put an update to condition #2 in regards to setbacks on the dais for the commissioners. The plat has all the setbacks shown but the condition did not get updated in the staff report.

Commissioner Becky Schafer asked about the process for obtaining the city water waiver.

Asst. Dir. Zader explained that typically the cost of bringing the city water based on the number of dwellings is the deciding factor in whether or not to grant a waiver.

Commissioner Mason asked about the private drive and whether it will be large enough to accommodate fire services.

Asst. Dir. Zader stated that a policy was adopted years ago that as long as it is four lots or less, it can be a private driveway. Once it is over four lots, it must meet the city standards for a roadway.

Commissioner Parrish stated that he likes the design and he acknowledges that the neighbors are not that that happy about it but he feels that it is a good compromise. His concern is the water issue.

Mr. Bersch explained that it is an economic issue not for the developer but for the utility has they were worried about having a dead-end utility line only for 6 lots that would need to flushed out and maintained, to ensure water quality, on a regular basis.

Asst. City Eng. Henk explained that during the permitting process for the wells through the DNR, if it is discovered that any of the existing neighboring wells are running low and that by adding a well on any of the proposed properties that would affect that aquapher, they would require the new wells to be deeper to access a different aquapher.

Mayor Abendroth stated that there is no information that this section of the city has any aquapher issues.

**Action**
Commissioner Mason made a motion to approve the item based on the conditions listed in the staff report.
Commissioner Lemke seconded the motion.

Mayor Abendroth added an amendment that the language provided by the City Attorney on page 23 relating to the CUG itself be included in the motion.
The amendment was accepted.
*Roll vote was called, voice passed 8-0*

| | |
|---|---|
| **RESULT:** | **APPROVED [8 TO 0]** |
| **MOVER:** | John Mason, Rick Lemke |
| **AYES:** | Abendroth, Choren, Mason, Parrish, B. Schaefer, J. Schaefer, Lemke, Hawley |
| **EXCUSED:** | Stoker |
| **RECUSED:** | Wirth |

**3) Regular Business**

a) Highlander Estates Addition #2. The applicant is seeking final plat approval for Phase III (45 lots) of the Highlander Estates 111 single family lot subdivision located immediately south of Brighton Ridge and Knightsbridge subdivisions between Swan Road and Wauwatosa Road.

Asst. Dir. Zader stated that this approval is for the last phase, 45 lots, of the Highlander Estates subdivision. The engineering department is certifying all the improvements and they have been working on the punch list, but staff is comfortable recommending approval at this time, based on the conditions in the report.

The applicant, Kevin Anderson, thanked the Commission for their support with this project and for the support of the Parade of Homes. He stated that item #6, regarding installing the light pole at the Swan Road is not in their control (WE Energies is responsible for installing the light pole). He explained that per the Development Agreement Exhibit B, #9(j), it states that the applicant is responsible for the cost of the installation of the light pole but not for the actual installation of the pole. They have already paid for the cost of the installation. The installation is coordinated by the city with WE Energies. Mr. Anderson requested that the City Attorney review this language and this discussion be considered by the Common Council.

Mayor Abendroth asked the applicant if language changed to "as soon as possible' would be acceptable and Mr. Anderson responded that it is acceptable as long as it is not a condition required for signature of the plat.

Asst. City Eng. Henk stated that staff is comfortable striking this condition as the applicant has provided proof that they have paid for the installation cost of the light pole and that they are in the queue for WE Energies.

Ald. Wirth stated that as part of the preliminary plat there was some striping for the bike path that was supposed to be completed.

Asst. City Henk stated that there are still a number of minor items on the punch list that need to be completed and that they are working on these.

__**Action**__

Ald. Wirth made a motion to approve the item with the elimination of item #6. He stated that if there is still outstanding punch list items not yet completed by the time this item needs approval from the Common Council that a different conversation may need to be had.

Asst. Dir. Zader stated that if there are still outstanding items that an escrow could be put in place.

Commissioner Choren seconded that motion.
*Voice vote was taken, voice passed 8-0*

| | |
|---|---|
| **RESULT:** | **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS [8 TO 0]** |
| **MOVER:** | John Wirth, Alderman |
| **SECONDER:** | Martin Choren, Commissioner |
| **AYES:** | Abendroth, Choren, Mason, Parrish, B. Schaefer, J. Schaefer, Wirth, Lemke |
| **ABSTAIN:** | Hawley |
| **EXCUSED:** | Stoker |

b) Homes by Chapel Hill, LLC for Adams. The applicant is seeking specimen tree removal approval to allow for the removal of 1 specimen tree for the property located at 13448 N. Northwood Road.

Asst. Dir. Zader stated that City Forester crafted the staff report. It is a request for the removal of one specimen tree. The City Forester reported that it is a very nice White Pine in very good condition. The suggestion is to reduce the wetland setback. It is currently zoned for a 50 ft. setback but if the setback is reduced to 30 foot then the house could be positioned to avoid the specimen tree.

There was some miscommunication at the time of the CSM, the surveyor put 50 feet setback as a default and was never told anything different. Alice Thompson, who did the wetland delineation states that a 30 foot setback should have been the requirement. Because it is on the plat at 50 feet that needs to be honored, but staff supports the recommendation in Ms. Thompson's letter to reduce that wetland offset to a 30 feet requirement. There is a no-mow buffer between the wetlands and the building to filter any potential runoff from the site into the wetland area. Ms. Thompson also recommends putting some boulders along the delineation line so that it remains marked over top. If the Commission wants to add this as a condition it can be included. Staff recommends the waiver and to reduce the setback to save the specimen tree.

Commissioner Jim Schaefer stated that he walked the site and he also prefers that the house be position closer to the wetlands and away from the back lot line.

**<u>Action</u>**
Commissioner Jim Schaefer made a motion to approve the waiver and deny the tree removal.
Commissioner Parrish seconded the motion.

The applicant, Craig Caliendo representing Homes by Chapel Hill, stated that they prefer the 30 foot setback and to save the tree.

Commissioner Mason asked whether there is any concern about the house flooding.

Mr. Caliendo responded they will be certain to mark the seasonal high ground water and ensure that the footings are above that level. He stated they will most likely be back for a fill permit request.

*Voice vote called, vote passed 8-0*

| | |
|---|---|
| **RESULT:** | **DENIAL [8 TO 0]** |
| **MOVER:** | James Schaefer, Commissioner |
| **SECONDER:** | Brian Parrish, Commissioner |
| **AYES:** | Abendroth, Choren, Mason, Parrish, B. Schaefer, J. Schaefer, Wirth, Lemke |
| **ABSTAIN:** | Hawley |
| **EXCUSED:** | Stoker |

c) Christ Church. The applicant is seeking master sign plan approval to allow for an expansion for the property located at 13460 N. Port Washington Road.

City Planner, Pa Phouala Vang, stated that the applicant was recently before the Commission to expand their existing facility and they are back for approval for a master sign plan. They are proposing 1 monument sign, 5 directional signs and 1 sign on 1-43. They have 1 existing monument sign. The monument sign they are proposing meets all the technical and height requirements of the sign code. Staff noticed that the previously approved monument sign is a different color of the base and the materials and it is recommended that either the exiting sign or the proposed sign be changed so that there is uniformity on site. The setback for the monument sign per code is that it must be set back 10 ft. from the property line, the driveway or the right-of-way. Port Washington Road is to the south and requires a 65 ft. ultimate right-of-way. The applicant is proposing to place the sign roughly 70 ft. from the center of the roadway. This would require a 5 ft. setback waiver which staff does support.

The 5 directional signs proposed do meet the height requirements per the sign code although the do exceed the area requirement. The applicant has indicated that they have multiple parking areas and entrances into the site and the request for the larger size is to ensure that visitors to the site are correctly directed to the correct areas. Staff is supportive of this request. These signs should also match the colors selected for the monument sign.

The proposed sign for I-43 is 42” in height which exceeds the 24” height limit for channel letters facing I-43. They also proposed a sign at 36”. Staff feels that the 36” sign is visible from the highway and is not overwhelm the elevation. Staff is supportive of the 36” sign. This is contingent upon their approval of rezoning to IPS as I-43 signs are only allowed in certain zoning districts.

Staff recommends the approval of the master sign plan subject to the 36” lettering reduction and the 5 ft. setback waiver.

The applicant, Andrew Petzold, stated that they have been working diligently with staff to establish an acceptable master sign plan for Christ Church. He stated that the 5 directional signs (which will be 4” in height and 7.5 sq. ft. in area) will match the monument sign. The challenge has been to find the legible and appropriate size for the wall size facing I-43. They feel that the 42” size sign is appropriate for the size for the scale and massing of the wall and is the most legible from the highway. Mr. Petzold stated they hope that the Commission will agree to allow them to install the 42” letters as they feel anything smaller is not visible from the highway.

Commissioner Choren stated that he does not feel there is a big difference between the 36” or 42” sign from the highway. He feels that the 42” is too large when viewing it from the parking lot and prefers the 36” as suggested by staff.

Ald. Wirth stated that he didn’t see an address on the renderings and he wants to ensure that will be included. The applicant confirmed that it will be. Ald. Wirth stated that he does not feel that the 42” sign looks disproportionate but he feels that the conditions of the sign code need to be examined.

Mr. Petzold stated that the rendering is difficult to see the difference but that it is a strain to see the lettering at 36”from the highway and they much prefer the wall sing be 42”.
Commissioner Jim Schaefer stated he agrees with Commissioner Choren that 42” may be a little more legible from the highway it is too big up close and is not supportive of that size.

Commissioner Mason stated there is an error in the staff report on item #4 that reads I-42 but should be I-43.

Commissioner Becky Schaefer asked for clarification on the waivers and changes made.

City Planner Vang explained that the waiver for the 42” lettering is also a waiver for the area of the sign and the height requirement. 36” meets the sign requirement.

**Action**
Commissioner Mason made a motion to approve the master sign plan excluding the I-43 wall sign.
Commissioner Jim Schaefer seconded the motion.
*Voice vote was taken, vote passed 8-0*

**Action**
Commissioner Mason made a motion to approve 42” wall sign facing I-43.
Commissioner Jim Schaefer seconded the motion.

*Roll call vote was taken, vote failed 4-4 (No: Becky Schaefer, Lemke, Jim Schaefer, Choren)*

**Action**

Commissioner Mason made a motion to approve 36” wall sign facing I-43 per staff recommendation.
Mayor Abendroth seconded the motion.
*Voice vote was taken, vote passed 8-0*

| | |
|---|---|
| **RESULT:** | **APPROVED [8 TO 0]** |
| **MOVER:** | John Mason, Commissioner |
| **SECONDER:** | Dan Abendroth, Chairman |
| **AYES:** | Abendroth, Choren, Mason, Parrish, B. Schaefer, J. Schaefer, Wirth, Lemke |
| **ABSTAIN:** | Hawley |
| **EXCUSED:** | Stoker |

d) MSI General for Charter Manufacturing Company, Inc. The applicant is seeking building and site plan amendment approval for a 2,682 sq. ft. expansion to the existing building for the property located at 12121 N. Corporate Parkway.

City Planner Vang stated that addition to the building is on the northeast corner. They will remove the existing parking lot in that area which will remove 25 stalls. The applicant is proposing an 8-stall area as part of the project. The proposed plan meets the open space and floor area ratio with the addition. They will remove the landscape and replace it after the construction is complete. The new addition will match the brick and color of the existing colors. Staff is supportive of the project and recommends approval subject to the conditions in the staff report.

**Action**
Ald. Wirth made a motion to approve subject to the conditions in the staff report.
Commissioner Choren seconded the motion.
*Voice vote was taken, vote passed 8-0*

| | |
|---|---|
| **RESULT:** | **APPROVED [8 TO 0]** |
| **MOVER:** | John Wirth, Alderman |
| **SECONDER:** | Martin Choren, Commissioner |
| **AYES:** | Abendroth, Choren, Mason, Parrish, B. Schaefer, J. Schaefer, Wirth, Lemke |
| **ABSTAIN:** | Hawley |
| **EXCUSED:** | Stoker |

e) Steckling Builders for Guo Medical Office. The applicant is seeking building plan amendment approval for changes to the exterior building materials and a new entryway for the property located at 10624 N. Port Washington Road.

City Planner Vang stated that the entire building is undergoing construction and renovations to accommodate the new user which is a specialty surgical office. The applicant is proposing the cedar be replaced with a stucco style Hardiepanel siding which will be beige with a hunter green roof. The new entryway will consist of aluminum frame windows on the first and second levels and limestone veneers will cap the end of the entryway. Staff is supportive of the proposed materials for the siding but is recommending additional brick be incorporated and that the limestone vertical caps be replaced with brick. Staff does not support the green metal panel be utilized and recommends a material that is more similar to the proposed siding or a material that does not contrast as much. Landscaping will wrap around the building. The applicant has indicated that they are willing to meet some of the staff recommendations and they will address concerns from neighboring tenants. There was a letter from the tenant to the south that expressed concern that the building does not match the surrounding buildings. Staff recommends that a revised color be utilized that is more in line with the neighboring buildings, possibly a burgundy or maroon color. Staff also recommends that the green roof be changed to a color that would better compatible to the recommended building color.

The applicant, Tom Meiklejohn, stated that they are willing to work with staff to talk about the colors and the brick or stone facades. The colors will more earth tone colors. They will most likely use a Hardiplank siding which is similar to the apartment complex to the north. The cedar on the building has been deteriorating and needs to be resurfaced. Landscaping will all need to be replaced and they will work with staff on this as well as the lighting.

Ald. Wirth stated that he is concerned about this building. He feels that it doesn't look like it fits in with the neighboring area. He feels that this is a major facelift and the proposed materials are a significant departure from what is in place in the surrounding area. He feels that staff has so many recommendations for changes and the final product has not been proposed. He feels that this should be tabled until the applicant can work with staff and submit final colors and materials.

Commissioner Choren also feels that this building causes concern. He stated that he does not feel that the material is right for this building. He visited the site and there is more demo work done than should have been done. He would also like to table the item until the applicant can bring back revised materials and colors for the Commission to review and vote one.

Commissioner Jim Schaefer concurs that he does not approve of the proposed materials. He stated that he is willing to work with applicant and staff to find a compromise that works.

Commissioner Parrish agrees that the item should be tabled. He understands there are challenges with the building in front of it and it will take work to find a long term solution that is acceptable. He would like to see the applicant bring back some revised plans after working with the architect and staff.

Mr. Meiklejohn stated that it is classic 1980's building that needs to evolve and they need to find a way to fix the issues of the building. They are willing to work with staff to revise the plan.

**Action**

Commissioner Choren made a motion to table the item.

Commissioner Jim Schaefer seconded the motion.
*Voice vote was taken. Vote passed 8-0*

| | |
|---|---|
| **RESULT:** | **TABLED [8 TO 0]** |
| **MOVER:** | Martin Choren, Commissioner |
| **SECONDER:** | James Schaefer, Commissioner |
| **AYES:** | Abendroth, Choren, Mason, Parrish, B. Schaefer, J. Schaefer, Wirth, Lemke |
| **ABSTAIN:** | Hawley |
| **EXCUSED:** | Stoker |

f) Jeremy LaSage for Patrick & Elizabeth McDonald. The applicant is seeking consultation regarding rezoning from B-3 (Office and Service Business district) to P-1 (Park and Recreation district) to allow for a group camp for the properties located at 10512 N. Cedarburg Road and 4828 W. Donges Bay Road.

Perry Robinson, 4811 W. Donges Bay Road – lives across the street from the LaSage's. He is opposed for these reasons:

- **Environmental** – he feels that this is not a natural fit and will change the character of the neighborhood. The proposed project is large and would be impactful; more traffic, more noise, more people, more deliveries, waste removal
- **Site Appropriate** – he feels this is not the appropriate area for a youth camp in the middle of a residential area/neighborhood.
- **Spot Zoning** – the parcels to the north are zoned R-4, to the west is zoned B-3 and to the south is zoned R-3.
- **Negative Impact on Property Value** – he has not had time to have his property appraised but he does not feel a youth camp abutting his property would increase the value of the homes surrounding the proposed project
- **Future Development** – hard to know what will happened but is there market research to support this project and if approved to P-1, what other activities could be incorporated on the site (outdoor music venue, etc).
- 

Michael Radmer, 10436 Cedarburg Road – he feels that this project would negatively impact the neighborhood. He hopes that the Commission will listen to the residents that will be directly impacted. He does not feel that this is the appropriate location for a youth camp and that more discussion needs to take place.

Richard Mueller, 10529 N. Burning Bush Lane. He is the President of the Bayberry Fields Home Owners Association and has received several calls expressing opposition to the proposed project but after more in depth conversations the subdivision is in support of this project. They feel that the proposed site is an eyesore and has been for some time.

Ken Jacobson, 10527 Riverlake – he lives directly east across the river from this property. He explained that there is a 40 acre conservancy there that is part of the Riverlake Association that is greatly used by the residents. He has concerns about troubled youth being brought to the camp and close to his neighborhood. He is concerned about the noise coming across the river. He said that there is strong opposition from his neighborhood.

David Cruxsdale, 10550 Cedarburg Road –lives adjacent to the northern portion of the proposed site. He stated that it took a very long time to get rid of the dilapidated barn that was located at 10512 and it is finally gone. He is supportive of that property being redeveloped as well as the proposed limited agricultural use there. He is opposed to any congestion, noise or commercial activity there. They value their privacy on their property and they do not want the proposed activities (zip lining, kayaking and commercial use) in that area. He is supportive of certain aspects of the project.

Cheryl Bragstad, Riverlake Association – President of the Riverlake Homeowners Association. Their initial reaction is opposition to the proposed project. They are concerned about the noise as it is a very quiet neighborhood. They have developed the conservancy area and it is used by many of their residents. They are worried about the commercial uses: kayaking being open to the public, wedding receptions held there, zip lines. They do not feel this is an appropriate fit for the neighborhood.
Asst. Dir. Zader stated that he has talked to Mr. LaSage over the past few months and he suggested that he come for a consultation in front of the Commission in order to receive feedback as he knew the project would raise many questions. There are three separate parcels; the parcel Mr. LaSage currently owns zoned B-3, 2 vacant pieces zoned R-4 and R-4/FFO, B-2. These are sandwiched between private homes. He feels that it is important for Mr. LaSage to hear the feedback from the neighbors as well as the Commission before moving forward with a rezoning recommendation to P-1 zoning. He explained that most P-1 zoning is used with the public parks but there is language in the code that allows for private recreational facilities. There are two specific conditional uses in the P-1 zoning that would apply: group camps and nature centers. If the project goes forward staff would most likely also recommend a PUD/Overlay which would address some of the concerns from the residents that spoke to control the uses through the PUD process.

He stated that there is a question whether it is an appropriate site for the P-1 zoning. On one hand the river is conducive to this time of use but on the other end of the spectrum this is an established neighborhood. He feels that the Commission needs to evaluate whether this is an appropriate site for the proposed project. The applicant did submit a business plan that detailed some of the uses but it is not completely clear, but it is fine for this consultation.

The applicant, Jeremy Lasage, stated that his proposal is a brainstorm of what is possible and that he is looking for feedback. He has had success with retreat centers in other locations. He explained they do not pursue troubled youth but they would like to make an impact locally. They would like to build a barn in front, a greenhouse and then a retreat center along the river.

Commissioner Choren stated that this reminds him of the family far. He does have concern about the traffic brought to the area. He asked how it works with counselors and the maximum group size on site at a time.

Mr. LaSage answered that many of the counselors are the parents of the children attending. They are very strict with rules and curfews and quiet time. They operate from a Christian perspective but everyone is welcome as the program is agricultural in nature. The group size varies, but they are usually around 50.

Ald. Wirth stated that he is not familiar with the concept of a youth group retreat center so he is not aware of what the negative issues would be. He is concerned about the property itself as it located in the middle of other residential homes. He feels that if it gets rezoned it orphans some homes but he has concerns about this zoning configuration. He would need to know much more about the exact operations and impacts to make a sound decision but he is skeptical.

Commissioner Lemke stated that he is familiar with agricultural camps but this proposal uses much more high impact activities. He is very skeptical and he does feel that this does not fit this area.

Commissioner Parrish feels that it is a well written business plan and would be great in a more rural area. He feels that a day camp may be acceptable but the high impact activities are not the right fit in this neighborhood.
Commissioner Becky Schaefer stated that she feels the same as Commissioner Parrish and that this is not the right site for this project. She supports that agricultural exposure and applauds the applicant for reaching out to the neighbors.

Mayor Abendroth stated that he feels that this is a wonderful concept but it is the wrong location. He feels that a rural area is more appropriate. He does not like the idea of squeezing this in between residential homes.

**4) Announcements**

The next meeting is January 15, 2018.

**5) Adjourn**

**Action**
Commissioner Choren made a motion to adjourn.
Ald. Wirth seconded the motion.
*Voice vote was taken. Vote passed 8-0*

Respectfully Submitted,

*Jac Zader*