

**VILLAGE OF DRESSER
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
MONDAY, MARCH 16, 2015**

The meeting was called to order by Bryan Beseler at 7:03 PM. Roll Call was taken: Bryan Beseler, Elina Kuusisto, Sandy Bassett, Jim Thanig, and Karl Beaupre. Paul Koski and Ann Mikl were absent. Also present Attorney Tim Laux, Jodi A. Gilbert-Clerk, Bryan Raddatz(Fatboy), Scott Peckman, 2 representatives from the VFW, and 2 other people from the public. No other public or press was in attendance.

Public Comments: Beseler called for public comments. Nothing was stated.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR SCOTT &
NATALIE PECKMAN**

Beseler called to order the public hearing at 7:04 PM. The public hearing will be tape recorded per Beseler. Public Notice was published on 3/5/15 and 3/12/15, given to residents and posted at the Village Office, US Post Office, First National Community Bank, and Dresser Food & Liquor. Beseler called for Roll Call: Bryan Beseler, Elina Kuusisto, Sandy Bassett, Jim Thanig, and Karl Beaupre were all present. Ann Mikl and Paul Koski were absent. Announcement was made that there was a Quorum. Review of the Conditional Use Permit Application from Scott & Natalie Peckman took place. Peckman started by saying that the fill on the Site is to be put under the building for site prep. Raddatz stated doing something aesthetically for 3 feet on the west side we did not include it and it was added expense we did not want to do. The half glass in the door is not required by the State. Instead of a privacy fence we propose to do a Tree Screen. It will look a lot better. It is drawn in, but it is a rough drawing. We will position it once the building is there. Peckman stated also once we get into the building the container size would drop to a 20 foot container instead of the 40 foot container that is there now. Beseler stated it will be on the East side of the building. Tucked in there and have a Tree Screening. Beseler continued what about lighting dusk to dawn. Is one light sufficient for that area. Raddatz stated our feeling at this time it is. Based on a previous project I did in St Croix Falls they were concerned with light pollution. It is very adequate from our opinion. If down the road more is needed when we get the permit to construct a sign we may put a light on the sign if needed. Beseler suggested how about exterior spots on the building itself. Raddatz stated that may be an option. Wanted to get the parking lot lit initially. Beseler stated this is always a fun legal issue. He read Section 17.24 Conditional Uses Sub(3)(g). Tim enlighten me on how strict or lack we can be to fulfill the chapter requirements. Laux asked on what issue. Beseler stated on the bottom 3 feet - Laux stated so on the West elevation bottom 3 feet material to be used. Beseler stated I would like to ask the rest of the commission to see if they would like rock or false looking rock/brick. Laux stated the purpose of the Chapter is to adopt minimum requirements. These are supposed to be minimum requirements. I think if you had more description in your particular zone description then maybe. Highway Commercial – B2 – there is no specific guidelines on architectural design. If there were then yes, but we don't have any so the answer is no. I would say no. Now in Site Plan Approval in

Page 2 of 3 – Plan Commission Meeting March 16, 2015

Section 18 there are some guidelines laid out for us. Most applicable is aesthetics – building plan have to be laid out, which they have done. Landscaping is part of the plan which is included. Beseler stated there is green space and the trees. Section 18.105(3)(i) – exterior finish materials which must be metal or masonry, or a material approved by the Building Inspector and the Plan Commission. Up to this point no, but now yes. The standards are listed that have to be met. They have currently proposed metal – metal or masonry or approved by the plan commission would fit in there. Raddatz stated we are not asking for anything different then what is required. How do the rest of you feel? Bassett stated if the price is that high and if they plan to sell flowers there are other ways to make it look pretty. Laux stated you have to take these things under consideration. The Plan Commission shall consider the following etc... Consider those issues and make a determination. Beaupre asked what color are you looking at. Peckman stated a neutral color. Tan/Brown or maybe Grey/Blue. Peckman showed a picture where they got this design idea from and it is a two tone color. Beaupre stated I like the way that looks and I understand the cost. I could go both ways. How much to put a false stone on. \$800.00 for just 3 feet per Raddatz. The problem is if you go there you should also do the North side. It is just cost prohibited. Peckman stated we haven't received all of the final numbers and in the end we may add it. The parking lot will not be paved. Gilbert clarified that they had taken into account the hook up fees for water and sewer. The water and sewer would be connected on the back side of the property. The sewer would connect into the main. The water will need to have a curb stand put in for shut off purposed in the future. The driveway is already approved from the State. Is there any easement through the VFW property for another driveway. No was stated. There is a water/sewer easement from the VFW property. Beseler stated we looking at Site Plan Approval. We are not only looking at the existing purpose, but what may be served there in the future. We don't want another vacant building. We want something constructed on an appealing manner. We want to attract business. I wrestled with this when a sum of money makes or breaks a business do they really have a sound business plan. Is \$800.00 going to break a project? Not that I am dead set that it needs to be there. I am fine. I may consider another light though. Any other Public Comments. The VFW representatives stated we had an interest in finding out how our driveway was going to be used in this project. We have now found out that they have a driveway into the business. We were also concerned about the water line, which I think you have answered our questions. Our other concern is run off from storm water. We already have a lot of run off in our parking lot. Raddatz stated we can't put water on someone else's property. We had concern about all of the current fill. Raddatz stated the fill is going to the foundation. We are going to dig out 2 feet and when we are all done all of the fill will be gone. Is there a storm water plan – onto green space. Raddatz stated it can go to the West. All of the current dirt area will be green space for buffer. It is low land in there anyway. Any further discussion.

Motion Beseler/Bassett to approve a Conditional Use for the construction of a retail building in a B2 Highway zone for the property located at 520 State Highway 35. Laux stated this is for retail commercial use. The previous conditional use permit was terminated. It listed hours of operations. Do they want to continue with those hours of

Page 3 of 3 – Plan Commission Meeting March 16, 2015

operation. Raddatz stated I don't know. With hours of operation you are limiting potential. Bassett stated if this was in a residential zone then yes, but this is a business district. Laux asked do any of the other businesses have limits of operations in that zone. From a legal stand point there are hours on liquor sales, but I don't think it applies to the bank, the coffee shop, the chiropractor etc... Peckman stated women get nuts on plant sales we may open early. Is there any other discussion to the Motion on the floor. Roll Call Vote to approve a Conditional Use Permit Application for Scott and Natalie Peckman for a highway-oriented business – commercial retail business. All members of the Plan Commission present voted yes. Motion Carried. The public hearing was adjourned at 7:43PM per Beseler/Beaupre. All in Favor. Motion Carried.

Site Plan Review – Scott & Natalie Peckman/Bryan Raddatz – FB Contractors, Inc. for a new building to be constructed at 520 State Road 35 North took place. Beseler stated OK now back to the Site Plan. Kuusisto stated in the future I feel that it would be easy enough to change the front appearance. The other thought is that maybe in the future it wouldn't fit. We could add or subtract it in the recommendation to the board.

Motion Kuusisto/Basset to recommend to the Village Board that they approve the Site Plan as proposed for Scott & Natalie Peckman for a new building to be constructed at 520 State Road 35 North. All in Favor. Motion Carried. This will come back on the April 6th Village Board Meeting.

Any Other Business. Beseler stated we can't talk about it, but I am going to get some wheels spinning. The Town of Osceola's Plan Commission is meeting tomorrow. They are discussing a potential Cooperative Boundary Agreement with the Village of Dresser. What it is and how it works. Our board would ask for a recommendation from our Plan Commission. It is an opportunity for the two municipalities to talk about future plans between the two communities. That can include future zoning, annexation, sub-divisions. What comes along with that is that in an annexation into the Village we are in the driver street. We are currently required to repay 10 years of property taxes. If one of the conditions is put in the agreement that repayment plan goes away. In the future we see Dresser running this direction and follow that plan. So it is a 6 month planning phase. They pass a resolution and we pass a resolution by both boards. There are 3 types of agreements. Osceola is talking about a cooperative one which would work the best. They last over 10 years. This is an opportunity to hash out future growth of both municipalities. I have passed out some materials and all of this comes from the WI Department of Administration. There is no bias information. I am just getting some things out there for people to look at.

Motion Beseler/Bassett to adjourn at 7:50 PM. All in Favor. Motion Carried.

Jodi A. Gilbert, Clerk/Treasurer

These minutes have not been approved.