

CITY OF WHITEWATER  
PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION  
Whitewater Municipal Building Community Room  
May 12, 2014

**ABSTRACTS/SYNOPSIS OF THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE OFFICIAL  
ACTIONS OF THE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION**

**Call to order and roll call.**

Chairperson Meyer called the meeting of the Plan and Architectural Review Commission to order at 6:00 p.m.

Present: Greg Meyer, Lynn Binnie, Bruce Parker, Kristine Zaballos, Karen Coburn, Dan Comfort, Sherry Stanek (Alternate, arrived at 6:25 p.m.). Absent: Cort Hartmann. Others: Wallace McDonell (City Attorney), Mike Slavney (City Planning Consultant).

**Election of Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, Plan Commission Representative to the Community Development Authority, Plan Commission Representative to the Urban Forestry Committee and Plan Commission Representative to the Technology Park Architectural Review Committee.** City Planner Mike Slavney opened nominations for Plan Commission Chairperson. Moved by Parker and seconded by Comfort to nominate Greg Meyer for Chairperson. Nominations were closed. Motion approved by unanimous voice vote for Greg Meyer to be Chairperson. City Planner Slavney opened nomination for Vice-Chairperson. Moved by Meyer and seconded by Coburn to nominate Lynn Binnie. Nominations were closed. Motion approved by unanimous voice vote for Lynn Binnie to be Vice-Chairperson. City Planner Slavney opened nominations for Plan Commission Representative to the Community Development Authority (CDA). Moved by Meyer and seconded by Coburn to nominate Bruce Parker. Nominations were closed. Motion approved by unanimous voice vote for Bruce Parker to be the Plan Commission Representative to the CDA. City Planner Slavney opened the nominations for the Plan Commission Representative to the Urban Forestry Commission. Moved by Meyer and seconded by Comfort to nominate Karen Coburn. Nominations were closed. Motion approved by unanimous voice vote for Karen Coburn to be the Plan Commission Representative to the Urban Forestry Commission. City Planner Slavney opened nominations for the Plan Commission Representative to the Technology Park Architectural Review Committee. Coburn asked what the Technology Park Architectural Review Committee does. City Attorney McDonell explained that the committee is a lot like the Plan Commission but specialized to the Technology Park. This committee takes the place of the Plan Commission for the Technology Park properties. Moved by Coburn to nominate Kristine Zaballos. Zaballos declined. Greg Meyer said he would be interested but didn't know if he would be able to meet when they wanted to meet. City Attorney McDonell stated that a lot of Boards usually check with the members of the committee before they set up a meeting. Moved by Coburn and seconded by Zaballos to nominate Greg Meyer for the Plan Commission Representative to the Technology Park Architectural Review Committee. Nominations were closed. Motion approved

by unanimous voice vote for Greg Meyer to be the Plan Commission Representative to the Technology Park Architectural Review Committee.

**Hearing of Citizen Comments.** There were no citizen comments.

**Approval of the Plan Commission Minutes.** Moved by Zaballos and seconded by Parker to approve the Joint Meeting of City Council and Plan Commission minutes of March 18, 2014 (with the explanation that Zaballos' "no" vote on 19.21.060(e) was due to the fact that the graphic was not available) and the Plan Commission minutes of April 14, 2014. Motion approved by unanimous voice vote.

**Review proposed Certified Survey Map to combine two lots into one lot at 534 W. Walworth Ave. for Land and Water Investments LLC. (Matt Kuehl).** City Planner Slavney stated that the certified survey map was to combine the two lots for the proposed 4 unit apartment building that has been already approved. The City Engineer has reviewed the certified survey map. City Planner Slavney has reviewed it and recommends the Plan Commission approve the certified survey map.

Chairperson Meyer opened the meeting for citizen comments.

Matt Kuehl, the applicant, stated that a stipulation of the approval of their project at 534 W. Walworth Ave. was to have a certified survey done to combine the lots. He would answer any questions the Plan Commission might have.

Moved by Binnie and seconded by Coburn to approve the certified survey map to combine the two lots for the project at 534 W. Walworth Ave. Motion approved by unanimous roll call vote.

**Review proposed building addition and hold a public hearing for consideration of an amendment to the conditional use permit to expand the area for their "Class B" Beer and Liquor License, to serve beer and liquor by the bottle or glass in their proposed addition and future outdoor café at 108 W. Main Street, Whitewater, Wisconsin for Patrick Monaghan.** Chairperson Meyer opened the hearing for review of the proposed building addition and the public hearing for consideration of an amendment to the conditional use permit to expand the area for their "Class B" Beer and Liquor License, to serve beer and liquor by the bottle or glass in their proposed addition and future outdoor café at 108 W. Main Street for Patrick Monaghan.

City Planner Mike Slavney explained that Patrick Monaghan wants to put an addition on the rear of the building (north side). It will be a one story addition that is less in height than the existing building. The sky exposure plane will be met. They are looking at a gable roof with shingles and horizontal siding. Slavney recommended that they use similar siding as the existing building. There is no parking provided or required; no landscaping requirement; no exterior lighting; and less than an acre disturbed. Slavney stated that the City should get details of how the roof will drain.

Patrick Monaghan, representing the Black Thorne Scribe Pub, explained that he had additional drawings that showed a door on the back of the building on the east wall. They plan to replace the wooden siding on the west side of the building. This replacement siding and the addition will have the same type of siding. The pubs in Ireland are white and black, and does not blend in with red and tan colors. The siding will be as close to the stone color as possible. The roof on the addition will be just a plain shingle. They do not want to install a mansard roof on the back where you can't see it.

The Board voiced concerns of: Will the roof and siding of the addition match the rest of the building?; If there is a door on the addition of the building, will there be lighting there?; What about lighting at the front of the building for the outdoor seating?; Will the dumpster still be at the back of the building? The progress has been very slow. It has been 10 months since the conditional use permit was granted. The ownership of the property has not been transferred.

Patrick Monaghan explained that they will be extending the basement of the building under the addition. The whole area will be buried by the City with their East Gate project. The crest of the road (Main Street) will be higher and a swale will be put between the road and the building. The race will be moved to the north with a 4' circular pipe extending from the building to about 15 feet north of the building. The City will fill in over the top and grade away from the building. They are not sure what they will be able to do as far as the outdoor seating. Monaghan stated that they have committed to an October deadline to be open. They do have an accepted offer to purchase the building. They have recently replaced their architect with an engineer and general contractor. Their engineer is Coldspring Design. They do not have plans now, but the plans will be complete within 2 to 3 weeks.

Assistant City Manager Chris McDonnell stated that this project would not be affected by the East Gate project. The East Gate Project has State approval and DNR approval. Strand Engineering is handling the filling of the floodplain area.

Chairperson Meyer opened the hearing for public comments. There were none. Chairperson Meyer closed the public comments.

Plan Commission Member Coburn asked to include in any acceptance of the proposal that the built-on addition blends well with the existing building.

City Planner Slavney stated that he recommended the tile roof and stone walls. When he walked the site, he saw the whole building. The City Planner's role is to give technical appropriate recommendations. Slavney stated that the City has not received a site plan which is required. Patrick Monaghan had turned in a site plan drawn on a survey with the addition on it. There were no drainage details. Slavney stated the Plan Commission has the ability to approve without those things, but before the permit is issued, a site plan must be submitted; and a condition that requires subsequent technical staff certification that all the plans have been submitted (including elevations, materials, etc.).

Plan Commission Member Stanek stated that the clay tile roof should be on the whole building and the construction should be the same as the existing building.

Patrick Monaghan stated that he liked the building, liked the stone, but does not want to put the fake piece all around the back roof. He had plans to eventually replace the tile roof with a black roof (in the long term). Irish pubs are white with black roofs (black slate). They are just trying to get past stage 1 of this project.

Plan Commission Member Comfort suggested installing a metal roof on the addition to match. Moved by Comfort to have the applicant bring information back to the Plan Commission when they are ready. Motion died for lack of a second.

Plan Commission Member Coburn stated that this project needed to move forward. We need to move to coordinate in some way. She would like to see some assurance of blending the existing building with the addition.

City Planner Slavney suggested that the gable roof on the addition be a black metal roof (with a slate type look) would be in reach of the project. He also suggested EFIS, a stucco look instead of siding.

Plan Commission Member Zaballos suggested a modification to Planner recommendation #3 and that the Planner ensures that the conditions are met.

City Planner Slavney suggested that the Plan Commission give the applicant approval to do a slate looking roof on the existing building now so they will not have to come back at a later date.

Moved by Meyer and seconded by Comfort to approve with the City Planner recommendations with 3a, 3b, & 3c. as modified and that the Planner ensures that all the conditions are met.

The conditions are:

1. They need to provide a real Site Plan, showing the outdoor seating area and boundaries of the site as they will be after the current city project in the area.
2. Provide a Drainage Plan which must be approved by the City Engineer.
3. Provide new Building Elevations showing exterior materials that are approved by the City Planner:
  - a. Showing exterior lighting for the addition.
  - b. There seemed to be a consensus that a black metal roof that emulated slate was the best choice for the addition and for the entire building in the future.
  - c. There also seemed to be consensus that something emulating white stucco (EIFS) would be an acceptable alternative to the proposed horizontal siding on the addition, and to the existing diagonal siding on the current building.
4. The Site Plan, Drainage Plan and Building Elevations must be approved by City Staff prior to issuing any permits.
5. Final inspection to confirm installation as approved in said Plans, prior to occupancy of the addition.

Ayes: Meyer, Comfort, Parker, Binnie, Zaballos, Coburn, Stanek (Alternate). No: None.  
Absent: Hartmann. Motion approved.

**Public hearing for consideration of a change of the Zoning Ordinance regulation, to enact proposed amendments to the City of Whitewater Municipal Code Title 19, by: a. Amending Section 19.15.070 concerning lot coverage in the R-1 (one family residence district) to clarify that the maximum impervious surface lot coverage allowed is 30%; b. Amending Section 19.18.070 concerning lot coverage in the R-2 (one and two family residence district) to clarify that the maximum impervious surface lot coverage allowed is 30%; c. Amending Section 19.21.070 concerning lot coverage in the R-3 (multifamily residence district) to provide that the maximum impervious surface lot coverage allowed is 60% unless otherwise approved by the Plan Commission by conditional use.** Chairperson Meyer opened the public hearing.

City Planner Slavney explained that this amendment will help clarify the standard for people using the code. The R-3 with a flat percentage will be helpful with new development. He stated that the other advantage for a straight percentage all encompassing is that it will improve the planning for stormwater management. Slavney stated that he has done many zoning rewrites (30+) for different communities. These numbers are very typical. For impervious surface limits, these are good numbers.

Plan Commission Member Coburn was concerned of the 60% maximum impervious surface lot coverage allowed in an R-3 Zoning District. R-3 is located near other residential areas. She was also concerned with the drainage and the water table.

In addressing Plan Commission Member Coburn's concern to change from the yard requirements recommended by the Plan Commission, Assistant City Manager Chris McDonell stated that the new yard and coverage requirements mesh with the ones Plan Commission recommended to the City Council at the March 18, 2014 Joint meeting. Assistant City Manager McDonell gave examples of three recent developments: 165 N. Tratt Street at 61%; 158 N. Prince St. at 57%; and The Element on N. Prince St. at 46%.

City Attorney McDonell stated that there had been a lot of debate with no final solution. The interest is in establishing certain standards with the hope to make everything mesh – stormwater issues, esthetics, and in general of how lots can be developed. This is a work in progress. This is the City Engineer's recommendation for right now. McDonell explained that whether the percentage is 10 or 60 per cent, the drainage still has to flow in directions that will not affect other properties and must be able to be handled by the stormwater infrastructure.

The Board voiced concerns of the esthetics of having parking lots in the front yards of homes; oversight of not including the R1-X and the R-4 residential districts; the Plan Commission recommendations for yard requirements were not included in the City Council Agenda information.

City Attorney McDonell stated that Councilmember Lynn Binnie raised all the issues of the Plan Commission at their meeting.

Chairperson Meyer closed the public comment.

Moved by Parker and seconded by Meyer to recommend to City Council to enact the proposed amendments to the City of Whitewater Municipal Code Title 19 for Section 19.15.070, Section 19.18.070, and Section 19.21.070 concerning lot coverage and to clarify the maximum impervious surface lot coverage. It was also recommended to add the standards for the R-1X Zoning District (similar restrictions as the R-1 Zoning District) and the R-4 (Mobile Home Park) Zoning District (as all one property at 30%). Ayes: Parker, Meyer, Binnie, Zaballos, Coburn, Comfort, Stanek (Alternate). No: None. Absent: Hartmann. Motion approved.

**Conceptual review of proposed apartment building for 1014 W. Main Street.** Ryan Hughes handed out plans to the Plan Commission members. 1014 W. Main Street is on the corner of W. Main Street and N. Prince Street, formerly known as the Olsen Funeral Home. They were trying to do something with the R-3A Overlay Zoning and wanted to get started in order to be able to start construction as soon as possible. Their goal is to have a quality that pleases everyone and to offer amenities that are not offered anywhere else in the city. With the new student services building and visitor center for the University being moved to Prince Street, the entrance to the University would bring traffic down Prince Street. His proposal would enhance the area.

Isaac Wallace, from Dimension IV, explained that this apartment building would have 22 5-bedroom units. There would be eleven parking spaces on the surface and 56 spaces in the garage. City Ordinance requires 3 per unit or 66 parking spaces. They have 10 percent open area including the balconies and patios. They have 59% total impervious site. The building has many features including fire department accessibility and fire risers in the stairs. There will be 2 or 3 different masonry being used on the building and some fiber cement panels or siding.

Chairperson Meyer opened for public comment.

Bob Freiermuth, who owns property next door, stated that the higher density near campus is exactly what you want. This proposal sets the bar for higher quality development. The university is looking to eventually have 1800 additional students and will need a place for them to live. This development will add well to what is already there.

Chairperson Meyer closed the public comment.

Board Members appreciated that this developer is doing things appropriately and appreciates what they have put in at this point. They requested the developer keep in mind the use of bicycles and storage. They asked that the Main Street view of the building is not underestimated when being drawn up. The residents here are used to the old city character of the existing building. It was requested that the burning bush be replaced with a substitute. It is a great project; it is what we need and where we need it.

Ryan Hughes requested further input from the Plan Commission if they came across something in the process of review of the plans they received at this meeting. He asked if the Plan Commission would object to them coming back requesting a PD (Planned Development).

City Planner Slavney explained that this is a custom zoning district (formerly the City's PCD - Planned Community Development Zoning District) which applies to just the property for which it is approved. These are applied for because the developer is asking for flexibilities in the zoning requirements. Slavney requests that any flexibilities are made explicit in the application. It makes things easier for all.

City Attorney McDonell stated that there would not be a vote by the Plan Commission on this project at this meeting. The Plan Commission has given a lot of input.

**Informational Items:**

**Future agenda items:** There were none at the time of this meeting. City Planner Slavney stated that at the next meeting we may be under the new overlay standards.

**Next regular Plan Commission meeting – June 9, 2014.**

Moved by Comfort and seconded by Binnie to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved by unanimous voice vote. The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:30 p.m.

---

Chairperson Greg Meyer