

BELLEVILLE PLAN COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 13, 2011

7:00 p.m

Belleville Village Hall, 24 West Main Street

Chairman Terry Kringle called the meeting to order. Members present were: Donna Moore, Lance Williston, and Howard Ward. Absent: Larry Enlow, Ben O'Brien and the vacant trustee position. Professional staff present was Bill Preboski. Visitors: David Fahey, Dennis Grosse, Scott Jones, Mary Gehin, Jean Christensen and Teresa Pelton.

Motion by Donna Moore, seconded by Lance Williston to approve the June 8, 2011 minutes as printed. Motion carried.

Matt can not make the next regular meeting and we need him to attend so the next meeting will be either Tuesday, August 16 at 7:30 or Monday, August 22 at 7:00.

Site plan review for Community Bank Redevelopment at 25 W. Main St.

Visitor David Fahey, representing Belleville Community Bank, presented a site plan for a proposed bank in the present Independent Insurance Building located at 25/27 West Main Street. It will be a full service bank with a drive up on the east side of the building. David Fahey addressed the concerns from Kevin of MSA in a letter dated July 8, 2011 sent to Mary Austin. The concerns addressed were:

Grading & Erosion control: Grading and erosion control measures will be addressed.

Stormwater: OK

Site Plan: Underground tanks have been removed on 6/29/11 and documentation of the process is being completed. A complete report is being drafted to summarize the facts that there was no leakage. Ed Short had a problem with the front property pins. They do not line up with anything. They chose to use the property line that is the farthest north and stay behind that.

Entrances: Easement agreement has been drafted for the use of the drive-up window and signed by Steven & Terry Meyer. It will remain a one lane drive with no change to the traffic pattern.

Utilities: No change from the past.

Lighting: It will be unchanged.

Landscaping: The landscape plan submitted meets all the requirements.

Parking: This property is on Main Street and probably never conformed to the parking requirements. There probably wasn't any requirement at the time the business was established. Terry suggested the Plan Commission wave the parking requirements but they need to go through the variance procedure. The requirement is 12 stalls. They would have 5 stalls which include 1 handicap stall so they would need to apply for a variance of 7 stalls through the Board of Appeals. **Motion by Lance Williston, seconded by Howard Ward to recommend to the Board of Appeals to grant an exemption for parking for the Belleville Community Bank due to the fact that the building they are taking over**

previously had inadequate parking and the Belleville Community Bank is actually adding 5 parking spaces that were not there before. **Motion carried. Motion by Howard Ward, seconded by Lance Williston to approve the site plan for the Belleville Community Bank at 25 West Main Street. Motion carried.** David Fahey reported that the tank removal was clean and presented a letter from Dennis Grosse of Resource Engineering Associated in reference to this dated July 12, 2011.

CSM for Outlot #1, Scott Jones property

Scott Jones presented a new CSM changing the old Outlot 1 into a new Lot 1. He felt this would help to either sell or improve this parcel. He has been working with MSA on the erosion control and grading plan because he wants to add some fill to this lot. They spoke to CARPC, they stated they had no jurisdiction over them because they were not proposing utilities. Jason Paukner of Jewell Associates Engineering submitted erosion and grading plans to MSA. Kevin stated an erosion net needed to be put along the bank of the fill area and a silt fence along a small sedimentation pond just to make sure no dirt gets into the Sugar River. All of Kevin's concerns were addressed. The DNR needs to approve this also. The DNR requires 2 permits. They have the 216 but have a couple of items to complete for the Chapter 30 permit. Terry questioned whether or not the PC requires an erosion/grading plan when they submit a plat. Normally it is required when someone puts an improvement on the lot when the site plan is submitted. **Motion by Lance Williston, seconded by Donna Moore to approve the CSM for Scott Jones property and to note the grading and control plan has been approved by MSA. Motion carried.**

Discussion and possible response to Joe Parisi letter to Paul Soglin and response from Scott McDonell

This is about CARPC. County Executive Parisi calls for CARPC reform & prioritizing FUDA (Future Urban Development Agreements). A successful FUDA process will layout a clear roadmap for local units of government to work out differences over future growth and should be done on a countywide basis. He is asking local municipalities to complete the FUDA development process, prior to applying for additional urban service area/sewer service extensions is one of the goals. Dane County Supervisor Scott McDonell says this would essentially establish a moratorium on community expansion until long-term planning can take place. Bill Preboski stated he thought they were smart given the fiscal situation that there might be a fee associated with applications which defray the county as a whole. He would want more info on the 20% vacant lots definition. Bill suggested we contact our representative to keep us informed on this as things come up. **There is no action at this time.**

Village taking ownership of property at the north end of Harrison St.

Herb Blaser owns a small parcel of land on the river at the end of North Harrison Street. Parcel #106/0508-343-8870-2 described as outlot 14 which he wants to donate to the Village. There is a grave marker there, but they don't think there is a grave. This would be an access to the river. There is a big storm sewer that comes out there also. Suggestions for the property were: a roofed shelter/picnic table, handicap fishing pier and possible some flowers and vegetation. At the present time it is zoned residential and in the future, when added to the outdoor recreation plan or park and open space plan it should be rezoned. **Motion by Howard Ward, seconded by Lance Williston to recommend to the Village Board that the PC feels there should not be a problem obtaining this property and it might be advantageous once it is obtained to determine what the use is going to be and determine what type of zoning it should be. Motion carried.**

Village use of old clinic

The Village Board is the one to decide if they want the PC to look into this and if they do, what the uses of this building might be. Then it should come to the PC to determine if it fits into our plan. Howard Ward stated they are not donating this to the Village. We do not have an asking price at this time and communicated that we do not have any money to do anything with for at least 2 years or more. They talked about a possibility of renting the building. They talked and it was brought up that maybe between the taxes on it and taxes on the new clinic, they could be used to offset the rent. That is as far as they got because they wanted to make sure before they went any further that the Village was actually interested in purchasing the building. The PC concern would depend entirely on what the use will be. It has been talked about it being used as a library, community center, police dept or other future uses and if would fit into our comprehensive plan. The clinic owns the clinic building, land and the duplex house at 3 & 11 West Pearl Street. They do not own the parking on the north side of the building. It does not have a full basement. The clinic is 1500 sq. feet. Useable space as a library, it is less than what they presently have. Any new use should consider what additional cost the renovation will be.

Proposal for Intergovernmental Agreement between the Village of Belleville and the Town of Montrose.

Bill Preboski presented a draft colored map for Planned Land Use/ETJ Land Use. Information gained from this map is the land use defined by the 2 shades of green that come from the Town of Montrose Comprehensive Plan. They do not have any development areas, but have policies for development which are called limited development. The 3 areas they have on their plan are the existing public lands, resource areas which are primarily the flood plains and wetlands and possible steep slopes along the river. The land East of Remy Road which the Village is looking at, should not all be classified resource protection even though it is shown that way on their plan. The rest of the Town is basically Agricultural Preservation. The map shows all the housing units by a red dot and also the platted areas. The Village limits are shown in grey and the red is the urban service area. The urban service area shows areas in the village and also some future areas in the town. The ETJ is outlined with a black line which is ½ mile limit from the Village. This corresponds with the language both in the Village's Comprehensive Plan which talks about controlling development with the half mile, and the language in the drafts of the agreement with the Town of Montrose. The Town does not say how they are going to enforce restrictions from development in the half mile area that are not being proposed in the agreement for the Village to develop. At the present time the Village might not have eyes on future expansion at a future date beyond the agreement; the Village would not want development of those areas to be messed up by scattered development. It was asked why are we only looking at the ½ mile and not the 1 ½ mile. Terry said we are trying to define 2 areas. One is an area where growth will take place in the future without any objections from Montrose. There is an area from Little Lakes Road with the 3 houses on it, there is a line in our description that goes straight across over to the river and it follows the river down to HWY PB. Then going east when it gets to HWY 69 it follows the curve until it gets to the southern boundary of the property right on the curve and then to the bike trail and follows the bike trail which is the red Urban Service Area line to Third Avenue east to Remy Road and follows Remy Road to Green County. In our definition it also picks up the property the Village is thinking about buying from Don Fahey. It then follows the county line west and follows the boundary of the school district west and then back to PB. This is the area where future expansion would take place without objection by Montrose. The half mile is where we will come to some kind of agreement with Montrose and set up a joint zoning district. We do not want some types of development to occur in that area. We would not object to anything beyond that ½ mile to 1 ½ mile. The Village would give up this right with this agreement. Bill made some changes to the ETJ ordinance in a document date 6/10/11. Regarding the issue of ETJ authority, it is not very effective right now, but it is still useful to have and it would help the Village be informed about what is happening out there. Items of concern from the 6/3/2011 draft version of the Intergovernmental Agreement between the Town of Montrose and the Village of Belleville are:

The change of the names of all the different areas. The confusion comes from page 2 Joint Planning Area and Extraterritorial Zoning Area. Instead of calling it the extraterritorial zoning area because it gets confused with the 1 ½ mile, the area Matt is calling the extraterritorial area is the defined area, the one we mapped. Bill suggested we should change 1.3 to 1.2 and at the end of line 57 Extraterritorial Zoning Areas (.) put a period. 1.3 would then become the defined areas on the inside of the ½ mile as the ETJ joint planning area and within this area there are specified areas that the Village may expand to as the Future Village Development Area (FVDA) and also the preservation area. When the Village and Montrose discussed this, they only discussed the future development area. This document forces Montrose to come up with joint zoning for the area. In the ETJ plat review, the first ½ mile, there is not enough teeth in it. Bill said if we adopt the section ETJ Plat Review in the Land Division Ordinance, there is not any teeth in this, but within the ½ mile area as part of the agreement with the town, there would be teeth because they are signing an agreement. And in the agreement, they have agreed to work with the Village on the planning and future development of the 3 areas that in some future date could become part of the Village. The rest of the ½ mile Montrose will strictly control but they are not saying this in the agreement. Is this saying we don't trust Montrose? We should write down what their Comprehensive says. If for some reason they decide they want to do something in this area, the joint planning committee should first take a look at it and determine if this fits the plans and make recommendations to the respective boards. In 1.3 strike the word zoning and 1.3.1 would the FVDA consists of 3 areas identified on Exhibit A. In 1.3.2, the town agriculture preservation area is the area consistent with the policies in the 2010 Town of Montrose Comprehensive Plan. Lance suggested putting it all together under one. *Final for 1.3: Joint Planning Area: The Town and Village do hereby create a joint planning area consisting of the Town Territory located within ½ mile of the corporate limits of the Village of Belleville. The Joint Planning Area consists of 2 areas. The future Village development area consisting of the land described in Exhibit A and the rest of the area is subject to the policies of the Town of Montrose Comprehensive Plan as it is at the present time.* In the Proposal for Intergovernmental Agreement between the Village of Belleville and the Town of Montrose, remove 2.9.2 Extraterritorial Zoning. Terry pointed out on page 2: 2.4 line 81 should be June 1. Annexation request was eliminated. Terry said we needed to put something back in that says we are not going to annex territory. The old 3.1 becomes 3.2 and insert Matt's 3.1. Matt removed the old 4.4 and put it in someplace else. He also removed 5.2, 5.2.1, 5.2.2. and 5.2.3. We might have to come up with a compromise with this. In 6.1.1 removed the definition of development. Bill suggested adding 6.3 and use 6.5 of the old draft. Removed 6.4, Current Land Use Plans. 6.5.1, 6.5.1.1 and 6.5.1.2 were removed. Section 7: Pre-existing agricultural practices was entirely removed from the new document. Terry thought something needs to be in the new document about this. There was a discussion of how many meetings need to be held per year. At the present time it is once a year, but more can be called for. 10.2 and 10.2.1 were removed. In section 11, the formulation and preparation of such amended Comprehensive Plans shall be pursuant to the procedures herein was removed from 11.1. In the new agreement 5.3 says the Town shall not challenge any annexations to the Village of any lands in the Extraterritorial Zoning Area (future growth area). Montrose does not want to give this up. They will have their say since it has to go to the Joint Planning Committee before anything can happen. Right now if someone wanted to sell land to the Village and annex their land, they have nothing to say about it. Terry will send his notes to Bill Preboski so he can make a new draft.

Motion by Donna Moore, seconded by Howard Ward to adjourn. Motion carried.

Typed from tapes, Mary Austin