

REPORT OF CITY PLAN COMMISSION

March 6, 2017 – 6:00 PM

Lincoln Center – 1519 Water Street, Stevens Point, WI 54481

PRESENT: Mayor Wiza, Alderperson Kneebone, Commissioner Brush, Commissioner Haines, Commissioner Hoppe, Commissioner Curless, and Commissioner Cooper.

ALSO PRESENT: Director Ostrowski, Director Lemke, Director Schrader, Associate Planner Kearns, City Attorney Beveridge, Alderperson Doxtator, Alderperson Shorr, Alderperson Oberstadt, Alderperson Dugan, Alderperson McComb, Alderperson Phillips, Alderperson Morrow, Nate Enwald, Brandi Makuski, Ron Glodowski, Eileen Glodowski, Linda Boldt, Carmen Berg, Keith Berg, Eric Lennington, Kent Hall, Tori Jennings, Scott Groholski, Dan St Pierre, Bonnie Foley, Terry Hackett, John Rechner, James Damask, Andrew Halverson, Jason Blenker, Denny Wandtke, Michelle Janowski, Pat Vaughan, Monica Lukasavige, Jeff Lukasavige, Robert Kirsenlohr, Matt Meodl, Susan Morrison, Robyn Godfrey, Jim Lundberg, Roger Hackler, Jenny Burton, Andrew Glazner, Bob Enright, Reid Rocheleau, Steve Lane, and Les Dobbe.

INDEX:

1. Roll call.

Discussion and possible action on the following:

2. Report of the February 6, 2017 meeting.
3. Request from Dave Rowe for a final subdivision plat review at one unaddressed property located at the northwest intersection of Sunset Boulevard and Green Avenue (Parcel ID 2408-27-3004-17). (*The public hearing for this item occurred on February 6, 2017*)
4. **Public Hearing** and action on a request from PI Tower Development LLC for a conditional use permit to construct a wireless communication tower and mobile service facility at 555 West Clark Street (Parcel ID 2408-31-4009-01).
5. **Public Hearing** and action on a request from Ellis Stone Construction Company Inc., representing Scaffidi Motors, for a conditional use permit to construct a automobile service addition within the Wellhead Protection B District at 3733 Stanley Street (Parcel ID 2408-27-2300-24 & 2408-27-2300-25).
6. Remove/modify the 80% natural lot coverage requirement within Parkdale Subdivision, specifically at 1201 Badger Avenue (Parcel ID 2408-36-1200-01), at an unaddressed parcel north of US Highway 10 and East of Badger Avenue (Parcel ID 2408-36-1200-02), and at an unaddressed parcel north of US Highway 10 and East of Badger Avenue, commonly known as Parkdale Park (020240836-02.06). Correction of condition on Certified Survey Map #10311-46-41. *The proposed development activities by Point of Beginning are to only take place at the unaddressed parcel north of US Highway 10 and East of Badger Avenue (Parcel ID 2408-36-1200-02).*
7. Request from Point of Beginning, Inc. for a site plan review of an office development at an unaddressed parcel north of US Highway 10 and East of Badger Avenue (Parcel ID 2408-36-1200-02).

8. **Public Hearing** and action on a request from Point of Beginning, Inc., representing Blenker Companies Inc., for a conditional use permit and site plan review to construct town home apartment buildings at an unaddressed parcel north of US Highway 10 and East of Badger Avenue (Parcel ID 2408-36-1200-02).
 9. Acceptance by the City of Stevens Point of the dedication of land totaling approximately 2.892 acres identified as Outlot 2 on the preliminary certified survey map, located on the north side of the unaddressed parcel east of Badger Avenue and North of Highway 10 (Parcel ID 2408-36-1200-02).
 10. Conceptual project review of the extension of Songbird Lane east to serve potential future development.
 11. Community Development Department Monthly Report for February, 2017
 12. Director's Update
 13. Adjourn
-

1. Roll call.

Present: Wiza, Kneebone, Brush, Haines, Hoppe, Curless, Cooper.

Discussion and possible action on the following:

2. Report of the February 6, 2017 meeting.

Motion by Commissioner Cooper to approve the report of the February 6, 2017 Plan Commission meeting; seconded by Commissioner Curless.

Motion carried 7-0.

3. Request from Dave Rowe for a final subdivision plat review at one unaddressed property located at the northwest intersection of Sunset Boulevard and Green Avenue (Parcel ID 2408-27-3004-17). (*The public hearing for this item occurred on February 6, 2017*)

Director Ostrowski reminded the commission that the preliminary plat review for this subdivision had been before them the previous month. He explained that the process of the preliminary plat review gave the Plan Commission and Common Council the ability to attach conditions they would like to do, and the last step in that process was the final subdivision plat review, noting that not much had changed since the last review. He briefly noted that any division of land into 4 or more parcels required a subdivision plat, therefore being before them. There would be 7 residential lots with 1 outlot, for a total of 8 lots within the subdivision. These lots would vary in size and come off in several directions between Sunset Boulevard and Green Avenue. After showing the commission renderings from previous developments by the developer, he recommended approval with the same conditions that had been approved at last month's review for the preliminary plat.

Commissioner Curless asked what had been decided for the sidewalks, to which Director Ostrowski explained that they had agreed to have them removed from the conditions based on a recommendation from Plan Commission the month prior.

Motion by Commissioner Curless to approve the request from Dave Rowe for a final subdivision plat review at one unaddressed property located at the northwest intersection of Sunset Boulevard and Green Avenue (Parcel ID 2408-27-3004-17) with the following conditions:

- 1. A hydrant shall be installed along the north side of Sunset Boulevard between the proposed private road (outlot 1) and lot six, or as requested by the Fire Department.**
- 2. A ten-foot utility easement should be added to the lots fronting on Green Avenue and Sunset Boulevard.**
- 3. Swales meeting all City Department of Public Works and Utility Department specifications, as well as those outlined in Chapter 31, shall be installed to control stormwater.**
- 4. A stormwater management plan shall be submitted and reviewed by the City Public Works and Utility Departments.**
- 5. A park fee shall be submitted to the City of Stevens Point in the amount indicated on the most recent fee schedule.**
- 6. Additional minor grammatical errors on the plat, identified by staff, shall be corrected.**
- 7. The private street will need to be named, and appropriate signage shall be installed identifying such street. Street signage shall meet all applicable street signage requirements. All costs associated with the private street shall be borne by the developer.**
- 8. Objections from reviewing agencies shall be satisfied before the plat is recorded.**
- 9. Outlot one (private road) shall serve as access to the unplatted lands west of outlot one and all applicable documentation shall be created and recorded to ensure the lot has access to a private road.**
- 10. The plat shall conform to the provisions of Chapter 20 of the Revised Municipal Code and Chapter 236 of the Wisconsin Statutes. All applicable permits from Portage County, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, the City, and any other authorizing agencies shall be obtained.**
- 11. A final plat per Chapter 20, Subdivision Control Ordinance shall be submitted and reviewed by the Plan Commission and Common Council within six (6) months of the preliminary plat approval date, conforming to the provisions of Chapter 20 and Chapter 236 of the Wisconsin Statutes.**

seconded by Commissioner Brush.

Motion carried 7-0.

- 4. Public Hearing and action on a request from PI Tower Development LLC for a conditional use permit to construct a wireless communication tower and mobile service facility at 555 West Clark Street (Parcel ID 2408-31-4009-01).**

Director Ostrowski explained that the development would take place at 555 Clark Street, a corner lot on the west side of the river that was zoned M-1 Light Industrial. The applicant was looking to place a 125 foot cell tower in the middle of the property within a 75 by 75 square feet area. He further explained that municipalities were limited in their ability to review and attach certain conditions. He briefly reviewed temporary and permanent access points, landscaping requirements, and existing lot properties. He also stated that there were no mapped wetlands on the site that were within the DNR mapped wetlands. In terms of placement, they had initially made the recommendation in moving the facility a little to the east with their initial recommendations in order to assure that orderly development could occur down West Zinda Drive. After the recommendation, the applicant and property owner had expressed their desire to keep the tower within the center of the proper, noting that placement within the middle still worked well in terms of the property owners to the east. Lastly, he explained that they did fairly extensive review in terms of sensitive areas that were required through the process of placing a new tower. That being the case, if there was no evidence of identifiable wetland areas on the property currently, there may be no need for a wetland delineation. Staff overall recommended approval with conditions provided within the staff report.

Aldersperson Kneebone asked for clarification that while they couldn't prohibit placement, they could suggest it, to which Mayor Wiza stated that they could in this case.

Director Ostrowski stated that there was an ability to regulate location. He explained that prior to placing a new tower, they needed to review if a colocation could be possible. If it was determined that they could not, the city could not prohibit the construction of new tower so long as it met requirements.

Mayor Wiza explained that the company had achieved utility status which put them in a different category for review.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing open.

Eric Lennington (Chicago, Illinois), with Ton 80 Realty Services, Inc. and representing the applicant, made himself available for questioning, noting that they could expand on the wetland portion and had no issues with the prohibited barbed wire condition.

Kent Hall (200 Pine Bluff Rd) noted that while 125 foot tower was not very tall and didn't pose an issue for migratory birds, he was concerned about the proximity to the river, to which Mayor Wiza assured Mr. Hall that it was quite a ways from the river.

Kent Hall (200 Pine Bluff Rd) inquired about lighting on the tower, to which it was stated that the representative would address questions after the public hearing.

Aldersperson McComb (District Nine) noted that the tower would be going in her district, as well as being aware of the limitations regarding the local government's control over the cell phone tower placement. She expressed opposition for the site choice of the tower, citing potential issues in declining neighborhood values. She stated that she was also speaking on behalf of a constituent who had concerns with it being close to a long-established neighborhood.

Susan Morrison (473 West Karner St) expressed strong opposition for the development, citing potential concerns for her neighborhood. She didn't think that personal gain of an individual property owner should go over the whole neighborhood.

Robyn Godfrey (2116 West River Dr) agreed with Ms. Morrison and expressed strong opposition to the development, stating that a 125 foot tower was high enough to affect wildlife, and that it would affect property values of those that already lived there. She felt the tower was unnecessary.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing closed.

Mayor Wiza asked the applicant to come forward to address concerns brought forth by testimony.

Eric Lennington (Chicago, Illinois) stated that in terms of lighting, the FAA was not requiring any lightning. In terms of location concerns, he assured that alternatives had been pursued and that looking for a location took between three to four months. He explained that their goal was to increase the capacity of the network for users in residential areas since there was a need there. He noted that there had not been an appraiser in the country that had stated that property values were negatively impacted by a cell tower, but that the National Association of Realtors had concluded that new purchasers were looking for that type of infrastructure because they want their cellphones to work.

Commissioner Curless asked how tall the towers were at Bukolt and Goerke Park, to which Parks Director Schrader had confirmed that the lights at Goerke Park were about 100 feet tall and the tower was about 140 feet tall.

Commissioner Curless noted that there hadn't been complaints about them.

Commissioner Haines asked how high the proposed landscaping would be at the time of planting, to which Director Ostrowski clarified that the new plantings would have to be at least three feet high at planting.

Susan Morrison (473 West Karner St) stated that anything 125 feet tall was not sustainable and would become a hazard. She also noted that the lights at Goerke Park were accepted since it was a field with no expectation of being a natural space. She further stated that while a lot of people didn't live on the west side of the river, everyone would share the burden to keep cellphones running in the town. Lastly, she mentioned that there were several lots available for placement.

Aldersperson Kneebone stated that she had a hard time thinking that the proposed location that was near a neighborhood was the only location the tower could go in, and that she was not comfortable with it.

Mayor Wiza clarified that the applicant hadn't stated it was the only place, but the best place, and that they had spent three to four months in that search.

Commissioner Brush agreed with Aldersperson Kneebone in wanting to see alternative sites that they may choose from. He stated that it was a sensitive location due to the residents nearby.

Mayor Wiza understood the concerns, but explained that they couldn't just place the cell tower anywhere else, and that it also required an acceptable agreement between property owners. He asked if the applicant could speak on the process in order to give them an idea on how a site was selected.

Eric Lennington (Chicago, Illinois) explained that there were multiple criteria that a property had to meet to be considered such as having ample space to house the facility, willingness from property owners, and how the local jurisdiction would feel about it from a permitting and zoning perspective. He pointed out that the prevailing state law suggested that local municipalities couldn't tell them where to place a tower.

Commissioner Brush asked why the item was on the agenda when there were so many constraints in terms of review, to which Mayor Wiza explained that it required a conditional use.

Commissioner Brush stated that they didn't seem to have any discretion, to which Mayor Wiza confirmed that they had conditions to review, and that if the commission felt those conditions were not met, they had the authority to not allow the conditional use.

Director Ostrowski agreed that there was limited review authority, but that it was still considered a conditional use within the zoning ordinance. He explained that there had to be other negative impacting criteria, not just issues with aesthetics. He also noted that towers close to residential areas have always been a point of contention when going up initially. As previously mentioned, a recent state law had limited the ability to review them, but that there were also current measures in the state legislature that could give back some of that review criteria.

Mayor Wiza noted that the 14 standards of review were outlined beginning on page 41 of their staff packets.

Commissioner Curless commented that he didn't think the towers would have an effect on property values, but asked that they keep in the wetland delineation condition.

Motion by Commissioner Curless to approve the request from PI Tower Development LLC for a conditional use permit to construct a wireless communication tower and mobile service facility at 555 West Clark Street (Parcel ID 2408-31-4009-01) with the following conditions;

- 1. Barbed wire shall be prohibited from being installed on the chain link fence surrounding the tower and structure.**
- 2. A wetland delineation shall be completed on the property to determine the existence of any wetlands. The tower or the mobile service facility should not impact any wetland areas.**
- 3. Applicable City permits shall be obtained (building, right-of-way, etc.).**
- 4. Any other pertinent requirements from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) shall be met.**

seconded by Commissioner Hoppe.

Motion carried 6-1, with Alderperson Kneebone voting in the negative.

- 5. Public Hearing** and action on a request from Ellis Stone Construction Company Inc., representing Scaffidi Motors, for a conditional use permit to construct an automobile service addition within the Wellhead Protection B District at 3733 Stanley Street (Parcel ID 2408-27-2300-24 & 2408-27-2300-25).

Director Ostrowski explained that Scaffidi Motors, located just off of Stanley Street and Green Avenue, were looking to construct a 6,000 square foot addition on the side of their building, as well as placing a 10,000-gallon waste oil tank that would be used to heat the building. The property required a conditional use to be granted due to being in the Wellhead Protection Zone District B. He noted that the neighboring property to the southeast was also owned by them, and that they were requiring them to combine the properties because the addition would start to impact both lots. He further explained that they had an existing conditional use and that all repair and sales occurred on the property, noting that the use would continue, but be expanded with their addition and waste oil tank. He went on to review the proposed site plan of the addition and location of the waste oil tank. They would not be adding anymore bulk storage areas within the facility, just adding the service bays. In regards to the waste oil furnace tank that would be used to only heat

the facility, he explained that it would be protected by bollards to prevent someone from backing into it, and that there would be no dumping of waste oil on the outside. Notably, he reviewed condition 5 in which they were requiring a double walled tank with a visible and audible warning system. Lastly, if there were any significant changes to the chemicals stored on site, such as quantities or service to the facility, they would reserve the right to add additional conditions for the protection of the ground water supply. Overall, they recommended approval with conditions that we in the presentation.

Commissioner Curless asked if the DNR still had rights to make them clean up the site if there was a spill, to which Director Ostrowski confirmed that they did.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing open.

Andrew Halverson (3201 Stanley St), Executive Vice President of Ellis Construction, stated that senior architect Jay Johnson, Joel Brison, general manager at Scaffidi Motors, and a representative from Black Gold Environmental Services, were available to answer any specific questions about the technical approach to the project or questions regarding the containment mechanisms around the tank.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing closed.

Motion by Commissioner Haines to approve the request from Ellis Stone Construction Company Inc., representing Scaffidi Motors, for a conditional use permit to construct an automobile service addition within the Wellhead Protection B District at 3733 Stanley Street (Parcel ID 2408-27-2300-24 & 2408-27-2300-25) with the following conditions;

- 1. The lots proposed for the building addition shall be combined to create one contiguous lot.**
- 2. A landscaping plan meeting all applicable zoning code requirements shall be submitted and reviewed/approved by the Community Development Department.**
- 3. A stormwater management plan shall be submitted and reviewed/approved by the Department of Public Utilities.**
- 4. All above ground chemical storage tanks shall be at minimum double walled, and have an alarm system incorporated into them to notify appropriate personnel if a leak occurs.**
- 5. Visible and audible warning systems/alarms shall be installed for the interstitial areas of the tank.**
- 6. Catch basins, such as a metal pan or concrete curb, shall be installed around every fill point including the indoor oil waste dispense area and pump, to catch product that may drip during the transfer process.**
- 7. In the event of a spill or leak on the property, the property owner agrees to clean up the spill or leak below the Maximum Contaminant Levels as listed in the Drinking Water Standards. The owner agrees to notify the Director of Public Utilities immediately in the event of any spill or leak.**
- 8. No underground tanks shall be installed.**

9. Bulk storage of all chemicals on site shall occur within a 100% containment area such as a concrete curb basin or tub to provide a second/third containment measure against leaks or spills.
10. Cracks and joints that open on dispensing areas or catch basins, if any, shall be filled and fixed immediately to avoid the infiltration of hazardous chemicals.
11. A spill prevention, control, and countermeasure plan shall be in place prior to the operation of the facility and shall be submitted to the Department of Public Utilities for filing and enforcement.
12. In the event that a significant change occurs to chemicals, quantities, storage, or service at the facility or on the property, the Department of Community Development and Utility department shall be notified, which may trigger a review of the Conditional Use Permit by the City and the establishment of new conditions for the purpose of protecting the groundwater supply.
13. All costs associated with the conditions within this resolution shall be at the expense of the operator and/or owner. All required reports relating to sampling, analysis, and/or testing shall be provided to the City upon completion of such sampling, analysis, and/or testing.
14. If any equal or superior alternative exists over any of the conditions, as determined by the Director of Public Utilities and the Director of Community Development, City of Stevens Point personnel shall have the ability to modify such condition(s).
15. The conditional use permit shall expire within two years after final occupancy date, upon which it shall be reviewed by staff and extended for successive two year periods.
16. The piping connections have a 'dry break', spring-loaded valve system installed at the connection point to prevent the flow of oil through the connectors when uncoupled.
17. The exterior valve controlling flow of oil through the pipe system be locked when not in use.
18. A leak-proof pan be installed under the pipe connection points.
19. Fresh oil and waste oil tanks be constructed indoors. Any oil tank be protected with crash protection if any vehicle could have access to the area. If the waste oil tank is outdoors, the tank shall be protected by crash protection and shall be protected from vandalism and protected by containment structure.
20. The tanks be supplied with overfill protection.
21. The City be allowed to inspect the oil storage and filling areas as needed.
22. All other petroleum-based materials such as anti-freeze shall be stored indoors.
23. Any changes to storage or handling of petroleum materials shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to construction.

seconded by Alderperson Kneebone.

Motion carried 7-0.

6. Remove/modify the 80% natural lot coverage requirement within Parkdale Subdivision, specifically at 1201 Badger Avenue (Parcel ID 2408-36-1200-01), at an unaddressed parcel north of US Highway 10 and East of Badger Avenue (Parcel ID 2408-36-1200-02), and at an unaddressed parcel north of US Highway 10 and East of Badger Avenue, commonly known as Parkdale Park (020240836-02.06). Correction of condition on Certified Survey Map #10311-46-41. *The proposed development activities by Point of Beginning are to only take place at the unaddressed parcel north of US Highway 10 and East of Badger Avenue (Parcel ID 2408-36-1200-02).*

Mayor Wiza clarified that this agenda item would be for the sole purpose of correcting an error that was found.

Director Ostrowski pointed out that agenda items 6 through 9 were all related in some form, but they wanted to start off by clarifying what the 80% preservation requirement was in part of the conversation that occurred back in December regarding the Point of Beginning development. He began by stating that the proposed Point of Beginning and Blenker developments were not going to be filling in any delineated wetlands, nor where they within the public park. The property in question, an unaddressed parcel north of US Highway 10 and East of Badger Avenue, was not owned by the city, but rather, owned by a private entity known as Parkdale Development. Giving some brief history, he explained that Parkdale Development had dedicated roughly 20 acres of land to the city, with the rest of the area being privately held. The confusion began in 2012 when there had been a request to split lots 1 and 2 of the original 2004 CSM. When that occurred in 2012, there was a condition that was placed on the map that stated the lot should be maintained by the owners or occupants so as to provide 80% of the area in a natural and undisturbed area for the protection of the ground water supply. That restriction could be modified or removed at the sole direction of the City of Stevens Point. The important thing to note, he explained, was the original condition was written to reference multiple lots, thus applying to both lots 1 and 2 of the original CSM. When looking at the lots cumulatively, the total area would be about 35 to 36 acres of land. So, that is where they would look at maintaining the 80% natural area from the combination of lot 1 and lot 2, not solely on lot 1.

Mayor Wiza described the parcels on the maps shown in detail for clarification.

Director Ostrowski further explained that the original 2004 CSM contained lot 1 and lot 2 which totaled about 36 acres for the entire split. In 2012 when the Schierl gas station came in, they split the original lot 1 into three individual lots: lot 1 was the gas station, lot 2 was the remaining portion that would be kept by Parkdale Development, and outlot 1 which would be the area for the private drive north of the gas station. This is where the error occurred in condition 2 as it referenced that 80% of the area of lot 1 of the prior CSM in 2004 shall remain in a natural state. That was incorrect. It should have said 80% of lots 1 and lot 2 shall remain in a natural state, thus leading to the confusion in looking at the development with an incorrect condition that should have not been placed and that the condition should have referenced the 2004 CSM lots in total. He also reiterated that all the proposed developments would still meet the 20% requirement, therefore the restriction would not have to be lifted. He recommended approving and correcting condition 2 on the CSM that was done in 2012 to correctly reference the original 2004 CSM lots in total.

Mayor Wiza stated there was confusion since both times that it had been brought before the commission, they had been referring to lot 1 and 2 even though there are really three lots.

Commissioner Curless asked for clarification if lot 1 and lot 2 encompassed the 36 approximate acres from the original CSM in 2004, to which Director Ostrowski confirmed that it did.

Commissioner Haines asked for clarification if they no longer had to remove or modify the 80% restriction, to which Director Ostrowski confirmed that they did not, and that they were only looking to correct the condition that was placed on the 2012 CSM to reference the 2004 CSM in total, not as an individual lot.

Mayor Wiza added that the body could still recommend modifying the condition.

Commissioner Haines asked if it would not be clearer to reference lot 3 on the 2012 CSM.

Director Ostrowski confirmed that it would, but that it didn't work that way. He explained that when they do a CSM, they look at the area being split. Since they had 2 lots on the new CSM, they couldn't go to lot 3 and 4 because would indicate that there were 2 other lots that were a part of the CSM which there wasn't.

Mayor Wiza further explained that in 2004 they had taken one parcel and split it into lot 1 and lot 2. In 2012, they took lot 2 of that original CSM and split it again. Since it hadn't taken into account the entire original parcel, they would still have two lots that they were splitting that one into.

Commissioner Brush asked for the definition of CSM and when they were changed, to which Mayor Wiza explained that it stood for Certified Survey Map and they were done whenever they are requested.

Commissioner Curless agreed that they should make the correction in order to reference the 2004 CSM.

Mayor Wiza opened up the floor for comments.

John Rechner (5847 Clark St, Town of Hull) expressed concern in worsening the traffic conditions at the intersection of Badger Avenue and Highway 10. While he preferred not to see a development across from his residence, he was not opposed to expansion, and asked for assistance in doing something about the state highway for the safety of the public, noting that the intersection could use lights.

Mayor Wiza extended an invitation for further discussion regarding Mr. Rechner's concerns.

Heidi Oberstadt (Fourth District) read a letter by constituent Trevor Roark who could not attend in person. Within this letter, he expressed his opposition to the proposed developments, citing environmental, ground water, and expanding boundary concerns.

Monica Lukasavige (5798 Kingfisher Dr) expressed her concern to the developments, citing water table and traffic congestion concerns, as well as construction noise and debris issues.

Mayor Wiza again extended an invitation for further discussion regarding traffic concerns. He also stated that the previous comments were more appropriate for items 8 and 9, but seeing as they were all related, and so long as the City Attorney saw no concerns, they could proceed.

Bob Enright (5753 Algoma St, Hull) asked the commission to consider the intention of the people that drafted the language for the CSM, and if they really meant every lot to encompass the 80% protection. He did not logically see how it could be concluded by looking at an old document that the intent of the drafters was to take 80% of the combined area and to keep it undisturbed and undeveloped.

Mayor Wiza pointed out for clarification that he was on council as an Alderperson in 2004, and to his recollection it was the intent, or at least his intent, to have it of that area, or both lots.

Reid Rocheleau (408 Cedar W St, Whiting), Stevens Point property owner, expressed strong opposition to the development and further expressed frustration with the history and validity of the error within the CSM.

Mayor Wiza stated that there had been a comment that the city had pulled the agenda item for further study, but they had not, and that it had been done at the request of the commission. He explained that the error had been found after evaluating all the original documentation. He added that Mr. Curless had not been contacted in regards to the handwritten error in question.

Aldersperson Kneebone stated that the property in question was in her district and neighborhood. She asked for clarification in what the 80% protection amount to exactly, to which Director Ostrowski stated that the 80% would pertain to lot 1 and lot 2 of the original 2004 CSM.

Aldersperson Kneebone asked what percentage that would equate to.

Director Ostrowski explained that with the existing Schierl gas station, the proposed Point of Beginning development, the proposed Blenker development, and the proposed driveway, the total disturbed area would equate to about 18.84%. The percentage would also include the proposed future addition for Point of Beginning's office, not just the original development request.

Aldersperson Kneebone stated for clarification that by placing the 80% on the entire parcel, they were opening up the ability to intently develop lot 2, to which Mayor Wiza said it did not, as lot 2 was in reference to the part that was not owned by the city.

Director Ostrowski further explained that if they looked at lot 1 of the original CSM, that area was owned by Parkdale Park and encompassed approximately a total land area of 656,006 square feet, with 45% of that area would be disturbed. The lots on the 2012 CSM were the lots in lot 1 of the original 2004 CSM.

Aldersperson Kneebone asked for further clarification.

Mayor Wiza explained that it would include all lots. The 2012 CSM contained a handwritten note that talked about the 80% for a parcel, which would be lot 1 of the original 2004 CSM. When going back to the original documents, it was found that the original intent for the 80% was to encompass lot 1 and 2 of the 2004 CSM. He understood the cause for confusion because both the 2004 and 2012 CSM referred to lot 1 and 2.

Aldersperson Kneebone explained that the privately owned parcel was opened up to extensive development with the addition of 20 acres from the park.

Mayor Wiza understood Aldersperson Kneebone's concern, but added that the 80% restriction didn't exist solely on the 2012 lot 2 CSM.

Aldersperson Kneebone didn't see what the issue was, and asked what they wanted to do.

Director Ostrowski reiterated that they were just looking to have Plan Commission recognize that the 2012 CSM was an error based on the information that was provided on the 2004 CSM, adding that he would rather avoid confusion in the future. That being the case, he asked that they acknowledge it, correct, and modify condition 2 of the CSM to reference the original CSM and the original 80% requirement, noting that it was important to publicly correct the statement on a CSM otherwise no one would know why it was changed.

Commissioner Haines stated for clarification that the total amount encompassed 36 acres, with 7.2 acres making up 20%, so that part could be disturbed.

Alderperson Kneebone acknowledged for clarification that the original intent was to keep the whole parcel at 80% undisturbed and noting it was just a technicality, to which Mayor Wiza confirmed that it was the original intent of the CSM and that they were looking to fix items like these rather than wait for someone to try and figure it out in the future.

Commissioner Curless asked how many acres of development totaled the Schierl gas station, the private street, and the Blenker and Point of Beginning developments.

Director Ostrowski stated that while they could have 7.2 acres disturbed, the developments would total 6.78 acres, which also included the proposed future addition to the Point of Beginning office.

Scott Groholski (5709 Windy Dr) with Point of Beginning, commented on the error on the CSM, agreeing that it made sense when looking at the amount of high ground left and what areas had been identified as potential development. He added that they had soil borings done and that it was really clean, good sand where they were looking to develop.

Mayor Wiza reiterated that he had been on the council in 2014 and that it had been their intention to have developers develop on the high grounds, adding that he was not a fan of having developers mitigate wetlands.

Commissioner Brush asked Mr. Groholski if the ground water table was a certain distance below the entire buildable space.

Scott Groholski (5709 Windy Dr) confirmed that it was, as well as adding that they had done a survey, soil borings, and a delineation. Seasonally, the water went up and down, adding that they were not going to want to buy an undevelopable piece of land, as well as doing their due diligence to know where they were building was high ground.

Commissioner Brush stated that the delineation for the wetland area didn't have a lot of land.

Scott Groholski (5709 Windy Dr) stated that the wetlands and the top of the wetland where the water was, as well as where the ground water table was, differed slightly.

Mayor Wiza stated that the wetlands were delineated based on soil borings, plant specifics, as well as other things, and it didn't necessarily mean it was going to be wet all year long.

Scott Groholski (5709 Windy Dr) stated that if they were to walk through that area, it's definitely high and dry, and wet nearer to the wetlands.

Commissioner Brush added that he had walked the site and following the flagging for the clear-cut area for the private drive. He didn't see how that area was buildable land since it seemed like water was close on either side of that strip.

Scott Groholski (5709 Windy Dr) reiterated that it was definitely buildable land, noting that they didn't want to take any risks and wanted to make sure it was buildable.

Mayor Wiza reminded the commission and audience that the staff recommendation was to refer back to the original CSM.

Bob Enright (5753 Algoma St, Hull) expressed concern in the transfer deed of the property not being consistent with the accepted land dedication. He asked that Plan Commission look at the events leading up

the creation of the CSM before moving forward, noting that there had been a discrepancy in how much land the owners had offered to dedicate versus what was actually transferred.

Director Ostrowski stated that he was glad that information had been brought up as he passed around copies of the resolution that was referenced by Mr. Enright. He explained that in August 16, 2004, there was an acceptance of the land dedication. At the time, nobody knew what the wetlands on the site were officially, as they had DNR maps referencing potential wetlands. When looking at Director Gardner's memo in July 26, 2004, the last two paragraphs state that while they recommended approval of accepting the donation, the exact dimensions of the donation remain to be determined. The area to be decided that would be donated came in December, which can be referenced in the warranty deed. He further explained that the warranty deed referenced lot 2 of the original CSM which would be the 20 acres of Parkdale Park. After further review into the property, there was more area in that land that could have been developed which they decided to keep, so the actual donation was 20 acres.

Motion by Commissioner Cooper to approve correction of condition two on Certified Survey Map #10311-46-41 per staff recommendation; seconded by Commissioner Curlless.

Motion carried 7-0.

7. Request from Point of Beginning, Inc. for a site plan review of an office development at an unaddressed parcel north of US Highway 10 and East of Badger Avenue (Parcel ID 2408-36-1200-02).

Director Ostrowski first stated that Point of Beginning was looking to purchase and do the development on an unaddressed parcel north of US Highway 10 and east of Badger Avenue, noting that the proposed townhouses to the north would be on the same lot and would be discussed in a later agenda item. He explained that the proposed request was to construct an approximately 7,500 square foot office building and accessory building along Highway 10. The development would include a private drive access for staff, and a second access point off Highway 10 for visitors. The property was zoned B-5 Highway Commercial, and every structure placed in that zoning district required a site plan review, a requirement that was adopted to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the city and its property owners, as well as to protect the safety of users of the adjacent highway and the users of commercial sites of the district, and to protect pedestrians and property values. Given this, the site plan review was there to make sure that access to the site was safe and that access points would be aligned across from each other and limited in nature. In addition to access points, he explained that the 1998 Intergovernmental Planning Agreement between the City of Stevens Point and Town of Hull was also in effect. That agreement was put together for the planning and growth of that area, but would expire in 2018. The agreement contained landscaping requirements, use restrictions, access point discussions, parking and material requirements, and so forth. The overall intent had been to make sure that development was orderly and planned as the city grew and headed towards the east. As previously discussed, the development would not exceed the 20% disturbed area of the combined lots, emphasizing that the proposed development would not be within delineated wetlands. Director Ostrowski further explained that the outlot 1 would serve as the proposed private drive off of Badger Avenue and provide access for the townhouses, Point of Beginning Office, as well as continue to serve the Schierl gas station, adding that that they would not be extending any utilities or infrastructure so there would be no additional costs to the city for extending the road. He noted that their request for access off Highway 10 had been submitted to the Wisconsin Department of Transportation. While they had not received any confirmation whether it had been granted, a denial would most likely prompt a site reconfiguration to make their parking work for their development. He further explained that they were planning on keeping the existing tree line as much as possible and that they would not be impacting any of the wetland areas. Their intent would be to keep the development as natural as possible. Due to the concerns for the wetlands, he

briefly reviewed how their stormwater plan, which had also been submitted to the Department of Natural Resources for approval, would mitigate any contaminants that would go into the wetlands. He also noted that the city's utility department had already given their preliminary approval. Lastly explained that office developments, as well as sewer and sanitary residential developments, were typically clean and a low impact use. In terms of the groundwater supply, it was a good development to have wellhead protection area. Overall, they had met all zoning code and intergovernmental agreement requirements, noting that they would have to still receive approval for stormwater through the DNR to make sure they weren't disturbing any of the wetland areas, as well as approval from the DOT for access of Highway 10. He recommended approval with conditions outlined within the staff report.

Mayor Wiza opened the floor to comments.

Reid Rocheleau (408 Cedar W St, Whiting) expressed strong opposition to the development, as well as frustration with the addition of more proposed development. He noted that there were other properties in the area that could be redeveloped. He took issue with the support letters that had been submitted, stating that they were more like forms, as well as the potential problems that may result in evacuating people in case of a fire where the developments restricted to the one private drive as a result of the DOT denying them access of Highway 10.

Kent Hall (200 Pine Bluff Rd) asked how many trees would be left after the office was built, as well as how much of it would be wooded.

Scott Groholski (5709 Windy Dr) did not want to give an exact percentage without looking at the members, and asked that they look at the actual map to show where the cuts would be.

Mayor Wiza asked that questions be asked all at once so the applicant could address them later rather than the back and forth.

Alderperson Dugan (Eighth District) expressed her opposition, stating that the development was not appropriate for the area, asking that every opportunity be made for infill and redevelopment of underused, vacant, or blighted properties before continuing to develop in pristine ones.

Jeff Lukasavige (5798 Kingfisher Dr) lifetime resident of Stevens Point, expressed strong opposed to the development, citing issues with developing in prestigious and preserved lands. He also added that there were available lots across the street, as well as briefly summarizing the process in which the soccer fields were created.

Tori Jennings (1632 Ellis St) expressed strong opposition to the developments. She stated that while they sounded great up front, were they capable of being sustainable in 20 years. Ms. Jennings took issue with the support letters and felt uneasy in why they wished to push for approval so quickly with a housing survey and study underway. She noted that wetlands didn't abide by borders created by people as it was a living and changing system. She asked for a push in developing within the core of the city.

Bob Enright (5753 Algoma St, Hull), who was on the Parkdale site commission, thought that the purpose of converting agricultural natural land to commercial land was to promote economic development inside the City of Stevens Point in a way that was suitable for economic development, environmental concerns, and welfare for the people that have lived in that area. Now 20 years later, there was vacant land that was being skipped over to create development on natural land. He added that it was reactive to a developer's intent, not in the public's best interest, especially if it was to open a driveway where people drive 50 miles an hour.

Terry Hackett (5954 Melrose Ct) expressed their opposition to the development and agreed with Mr. Reckner in Highway 10 being dangerous. They also asked on signage, light pollution, and traffic estimates.

Jon Holdredge (Chairperson, Town of Hull) found issue with not being informed of this development, noting that a resident had brought it to his attention. The biggest issue raised, he stated, was the transportation problem. He asked that the Town of Hull be allowed to review the plans as well.

Roger Hackler (1025 Clark St) commented that with all the talk about wetlands, why people weren't also upset about air, soil, and water pollution.

Scott Groholski (5709 Windy Dr) expressed his attachment to the Stevens Point east side, specifically off of Highway 10. He stated that they designed and engineered stormwater plans all over the region, and that they were very sensitive not to cutting trees and leaving as much vegetation as possible. Landscaping will be maintained, and options could be explored to better maintain the site and adhere to conditions.

Mayor Wiza pointed out that they could encourage developers to build in certain areas, they could not force them to do so. As a conservation advocate, what he didn't understand, he looked to experts. He explained that he would rather have the proposed use than wait for a future common council that might make a decision to infill the lot. He asked Associate Planner Kearns how many letters they received that had been in favor, and how many had been against the developments.

Associate Planner Kearns summarized that they received approximately 109 support letters, with about 10 differentiated in letterhead, body, and owner. They did not receive any for denial of unfavorable, and all of them were in support of the project.

Mayor Wiza pointed out that even though the body of the letters seemed simple, they were each signed by an individual person who was in support.

Alderperson Kneebone expressed strong opposition to the development, stating that the parkland, the woodlands, and the wetlands were a part of the community. She asked that they examine what was ethically and aesthetically right, and economically expedient, adding that the development would destroy the property and contribute to traffic issues.

Commissioner Brush commented that he had personally walked the property and wasn't confident with the development, noting that it didn't seem like buildable land, especially how narrow the strip seemed for the north access way.

Mayor Wiza stated that the road would be 30 feet across, and took into account the wetlands that were delineated by a core of engineers. He reminded them that staff was requesting that they would need approval from the DOT and DNR before moving forward.

Commissioner Haines commented that it didn't seem like the site could be accessed due to an existing median, and asked how someone would turn left into the driveway, to which Director Ostrowski confirmed that there was no mountable median there.

Commissioner Haines reaffirmed her position with access off of Highway 10 being a terrible idea, no matter if the DOT came back with an approval.

Mayor Wiza mentioned that it was in the commission's purview to put a condition that would restrict access from Highway 10.

Commissioner Haines asked if they were discussing access for just Point of Beginning and not the townhouses, to which Mayor Wiza confirmed that it would include access of Highway 10 and Badger Avenue.

Commissioner Haines held similar issues with the wetlands as previous testimony.

Scott Groholski (5709 Windy Dr) explained that they didn't have their permit for access off highway 10, but they were working on a contingency plan if they didn't get it.

Commissioner Haines asked why they wanted to have their surveying and engineering business off of Highway 10.

Scott Groholski (5709 Windy Dr) again cited a personal connection with the development location. He noted that they had a forester come in and look at the trees, and were told that they were low quality and needed to be cut to promote undergrowth, adding that they had also offered to donate 2 to 3 acres of the north half of the development that were wetlands.

Commissioner Brush stated that commercial foresters were only concerned with the market value of the forests, adding that just because they were not tall, old standing trees, that they don't have value and that they held a lot of value for people in the area.

Director Ostrowski noted that that had heard a lot of comments not pertaining to the item, adding that they had access control and site plan review over the document, not for the wetlands. He stated that they had met requirements from the DNR's perspective and that the city's review authority rested with the site's access and traffic generated. He further explained that he was a huge proponent of infill and redevelopment opportunities within the city, but that cities did need to grow. Planned growths needed to be identified, and the proposed area had previously been identified to be highway commercial. He reiterated that they were not infilling or impacting wetlands, and they were creating a stormwater plan to mitigate any contaminants that would go into the wetlands, adding that the wetlands along Highway 10 most likely took in more salt than the development would even come close to putting in any of the wetlands. He also stated the condition to not allow access on Highway 10 would be valid in order to preserve the integrity of Highway 10. In time, he added, a light may be required at that intersection, but it would take a significant amount of traffic to generate that light.

Commissioner Curless stated that due to the earlier confusion about the 80% protection requirement that they he most likely was not going to approve it. After correcting the confusion, he felt the development was as good as it was going to get.

Director Ostrowski asked for clarification that if the DOT was to deny access of Highway 10, and reconfiguration of the site was needed, if they wanted the plans to come back to the commission or if staff could approve changes so long as it met all zoning and intergovernmental agreement requirements.

Commissioner Curless noted that the proposal it was a tough decision. He asked how many people came into the Point of Beginning office in a days' time.

Scott Groholski (5709 Windy Dr) estimated about 2 to 3 customers or visitors a week, with roughly 20 vehicles on any given day in the summer for staff, to which Commissioner Cooper asked if their employees would be using the Highway 10 access.

Scott Groholski (5709 Windy Dr) confirmed that they would not, adding that if the DOT allowed access on Highway 10, they would prefer only visitors to come in off Highway 10.

Mayor Wiza suggested that they allow the DOT to determine if it was appropriate to have access there and if the DOT denied them access, to allow staff to use the existing footprint to remove that access, to which Commissioner Haines stood firm in not allowing access off Highway 10.

Aldersperson Kneebone noted a concern with the amount of traffic that would be generated between the developments if access on Highway 10 was to be denied, adding that they may only have 12 staff members, but the apartments would potentially generate 44 cars, to which Mayor Wiza stated that they were not discussing apartments.

Aldersperson Kneebone understood that, but stated that the two could not be separated if they generated traffic issues and concern for safety for her neighborhood. She preferred that all access be taken off of Highway 10.

Commissioner Curless agreed with only allowing access off Highway 10 rather than having another private drive through cut through the wetlands, to which Mayor Wiza clarified that the private driveway that was proposed would not cut through any wetlands.

Director Ostrowski again asked for clarification about allowing staff to make modifications to the site plan if the DOT denied them access to Highway 10 without having to bring it back to Plan Commission.

Commissioner Curless and Commissioner Cooper agreed to allow staff to make those modifications.

Motion by Commissioner Curless to approve the request from Point of Beginning, Inc. for a site plan review of an office development at an unaddressed parcel north of US Highway 10 and East of Badger Avenue (Parcel ID 2408-36-1200-02) with the following conditions;

- 1. Refuse storage shall be screened with a permanent wall matching the metal and stone construction of the primary building as required in the intergovernmental agreement, to be reviewed and approved by Community Development Department staff.**
- 2. New elevations shall be submitted for review and approval by Community Development Department staff that incorporate alternative materials for the southern façade. Metal panels shall be allowed as accents, but they should not be the dominate material.**
- 3. Only native, non-invasive plant species shall be used as part of the landscaping.**
- 4. The applicant must receive approval from the Wisconsin DNR for the stormwater plan.**
- 5. The applicant must receive approval from the Wisconsin DOT for direct access to Highway 10. If the Wisconsin DOT denied access, staff would have the ability to modify the plans as long as they meet all zoning code requirements.**

seconded by Commissioner Cooper.

Motion by Commissioner Haines to amend the original motion to deny the development access off of Highway 10 East; seconded by Commissioner Brush. Amendment failed 3-4, with Mayor Wiza, Aldersperson Kneebone, Commissioner Curless, and Commissioner Cooper voting in the negative.

Original Motion carried 4-3, with Alderperson Kneebone, Commissioner Haines, and Commissioner Brush voting in the negative.

8. **Public Hearing** and action on a request from Point of Beginning, Inc., representing Blenker Companies Inc., for a conditional use permit and site plan review to construct town home apartment buildings at an unaddressed parcel north of US Highway 10 and East of Badger Avenue (Parcel ID 2408-36-1200-02).

Director Ostrowski explained that this agenda item pertained to the familiar area of Badger Avenue and Highway 10. The area would be north of the current access point coming into that site. The proposed request was to construct 4 townhouse homes with 22 total units and a max of 66 bedrooms, with each unit being a combination of 2-3 bedrooms. Each two-story building would have a footprint of 8,172 square feet, with about 1,400 square feet for each unit, with parking for 22 spaces. Each development would have their own separate entrance and act more like single family units. It was before the Commission due to all multi-family being a conditional use within the City, as well as requiring a site plan review to determine access and traffic control due to it being in a B-5 zoning district. He further explained that their access would be off of the private drive connecting Badger Avenue, with private utilities servicing it. He reiterated that the development would not be within any of the delineated wetland area, and that the parkland and trails to the north would be maintained. He reviewed several elevations, findings, and briefly explained the drainage areas and stormwater plan that would filter and recharge the wetlands. Landscaping would be minimal, as they wanted to keep the area as natural as possible. He recommended approval with conditions within the staff report.

Commissioner Brush asked where to the south the trees would be planted, to which Director Ostrowski stated they would be planted every 50 feet north of the private drive.

Commissioner Curless asked if the road north of the gas station was private, to which Director Ostrowski confirmed that it was a private drive.

Commissioner Curless asked who would maintain the road, to which Director Ostrowski stated that it may be maintained by the three property owners as a combination effort, and Mayor Wiza adding that the road would remain private and that the city would not be required to plow and maintain that area.

Commissioner Haines asked about infrastructure for the private drive, to which Director Ostrowski explained that infrastructure would be extended down the private drive, as well as the addition of sidewalks.

Commissioner Haines asked on the placement of sidewalks, to which Director Ostrowski stated that it had been a requirement of the intergovernmental agreement with the Town of Hull.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing open.

Reid Rocheleau (408 Cedar W St, Whiting) reiterated his strong opposition to the development and noted that there were available lots elsewhere. He held concerns over all the developments potentially having only one access.

Alderperson McComb (Ninth District), while thinking the business development was a good idea, was not inclined to think the same about the townhouses. She cited concerns with runoff into the wetlands and protections of wildlife and preferred to hear from a wetlands expert or biologist concerning the runoff issues. She also asked that only organic products be used on the property, that dogs and cats not be let loose on the property, and that the developer consider wildlife tunnels.

Jenny Burton (5718 Sandpiper Dr) expressed strong opposition to the development, noting that the community loved and was invested into the trees, walking path, and natural land, and cited that they could build within the city or the available land near Songbird and Badger Avenue. She held very high concerns over the wildlife.

Kent Hall (200 Pine Bluff Rd), coordinator of Bird City Wisconsin, stated that he had been to the site and did not approve of the developments as it was a sensitive habitat. He asked for a chance to do a bird census on the site as they were not sure what birds were involved in the property or how the wildlife would be impacted. He expressed interest in maintaining the entire property in a natural state.

Tori Jennings (1632 Ellis St) expressed interest in seeing the project closer to the middle of town and disagree that the city was doing all it could for infill redevelopment.

Les Dobbe (Service Cold Storage, President & CEO), member of Parkdale Development, explained that they had owned the property for a long time, and when wanting to sell the property along Highway 10, there was a strong desire to fill it. He explained that they had plans to turn over the properties in a reasonable time, but that timeframe to recoup costs was already gone. As far as infilling went, he stated, it was already in the city bounds and suggested that if there was nothing left on the outskirts to meet development needs, infill would probably be more dynamic. As a big proponent of intercity development, he stated that the proposed developments were probably the greenest alternatives for that property.

Jason Blenker (500 Laurie St, Amherst) developer of the proposed apartment project, addressed a few questions posed during testimony. In terms of runoff and stormwater, the runoff management program had already been approved. Loose dogs and cats were not intended to be let loose on the property. While they had not considered wildlife tunnels, they would be willing to explore and look into them. As far as organic fertilizers, it was certainly something they had already used in other rental properties so it would probably be incorporated in the proposed project as well.

Jenny Burton (5718 Sandpiper Dr) asked whether other plots had been considered for development. She also asked if there were any provision for excess light or sound, noting that the city could apply for a dark city designation.

Scott Groholski (5709 Windy Dr) stated that while many of the other open lots were zoned multi-family, they wanted to remain on the same lot. He explained that since they were planning on building the private road and infrastructure in the back, it had made sense to work closely with someone who could utilize that roadway as well.

Alderperson Phillips (Tenth District) asked what the tax base would be for the property. He also added that it was a good fit for the property, adding that they were saving the wetlands since they were building on high ground. Development, he stated, was needed in the city and projects always seemed to be stifled. If they continued to be stifled, they were going to lose their tax base to Plover. Overall, he gathered that there would be no extra costs to the city for having the development there. He only stated that there be no street lights.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing closed and asked that the applicant come forward to answer questions posed during testimony.

Jason Blenker (500 Laurie St, Amherst) also expressed appreciation for a dark sky, but added that those who lived in the area would want safety and security, so they would do the minimal amount for lighting. In terms of finding another location, he reiterated that they had worked together to offset some of the costs in order

to develop the rest of the buildable portion of the land, and that that portion would provide a tax base to the city. For estimated costs, he stated, they were estimating roughly 2.5 million dollars' worth of apartments and infrastructure. He also stated that he would not have any objections to a bird census, but that Mr. Groholski could elaborate on that.

Scott Groholski (5709 Windy Dr) clarified that there was an endangered species study done when Schierl built their gas station property, but that a bird census was not specifically done. If it was something that was warranted, they would absolutely engage a group to do that. They were estimating \$1.7 million for the development of the Point of Beginning office.

Director Ostrowski roughly estimated 96,000 dollars annual for taxes based on total development costs.

Aldersperson Kneebone reiterated her strong opposition to the development, adding that the greenest thing to do would be to leave it undeveloped. She also expressed concerns for bird species, wetlands, and overall wildlife. She went on to explain that if the apartments came in with a road, they would end up sandwiching the natural area between developments that could result in the killing of any natural wildlife, adding that once it was gone, it was gone forever. The property was sensitive and unique and if Point of Beginning had to be there, it should be with an access off Highway 10.

Mayor Wiza explained that he had been on council and county boards for a long time, and in that time, a lot had changed and evolved over the years. While it was a difficult situation, he reminded the commission that it was private property, and the owners could decide to clear-cut the lot tomorrow and they wouldn't have a say about it. While he agreed that the greenest thing would be to do nothing, it was not theirs to do nothing with. He stated that it was the most ecologically sensitive developments that could go there, adding that a future council or plan commission different than the existing body could allow developers to not only clear-cut, but also mitigate the wetlands. He further explained that they created requirements based on their wishes, requirements created by the commission, from the studies, from the DOT and DNR, core of engineers, and more, in order to protect those interests. And when they met all those guidelines and requirements, they still found reasons to say no. While it wasn't the best use, he stated, perhaps the best control was to approve a project that was more sustainable. Lastly, he agreed with doing a bird census.

Commissioner Curless agreed with Mayor Wiza's comments, noting that they seemed most realistic as they did not own the property and really couldn't control what the owners wanted to do with it.

Aldersperson Kneebone disagreed that they didn't have any power, noting that they were before them requesting a conditional use permit. Even though the owners could clear-cut the land tomorrow, they still wouldn't have an apartment complex, the unintended traffic, noise, pollution, and other concerns.

Commissioner Brush agreed that this development and property was probably the most sensitive they have had for consideration. He thanked everyone for their efforts in combatting runoff and other requirements. Even so, he came back to it being a conditional use and how they had to consider all the factors. Overall, he felt that the project did not meet the overall safety and interests for the public's welfare. He stated that a lot of people felt strongly about the development, and that they had to acknowledge that and think about the community.

Commissioner Hoppe agreed with allowing the Point of Beginning office building since it was off Highway 10, but that they were not trying to push back into that area, noting that there would be more of an impact there as opposed to the location of the office. He felt conflicted with the amount of traffic that would be generated with the apartment complex buildings.

Commissioner Curless agreed with several of the testimonies, noting that he was fine with the Point of Development office along the highway, but any extra development beyond that would probably kill the tranquility for that property.

Commissioner Haines stated that they were going through a comprehensive planning process and rewriting the zoning code. When looking at the details and specific areas to consider for development, she asked, would the area be highway commercial. She asked that they pause because it was a really intense development and they needed to consider what was appropriate.

Motion by Alderperson Kneebone to deny the request from Point of Beginning, Inc., representing Blenker Companies Inc., for a conditional use permit and site plan review to construct town home apartment buildings at an unaddressed parcel north of US Highway 10 and East of Badger Avenue (Parcel ID 2408-36-1200-02); seconded by Commissioner Haines.

Motion carried 5-2, with Commissioner Cooper and Mayor Wiza voting in the negative.

9. Acceptance by the City of Stevens Point of the dedication of land totaling approximately 2.892 acres identified as Outlot 2 on the preliminary certified survey map, located on the north side of the unaddressed parcel east of Badger Avenue and North of Highway 10 (Parcel ID 2408-36-1200-02).

Director Ostrowski explained that wetland area identified as outlot 2 on the preliminary CSM located on the north side of the unaddressed parcel east of Badger Avenue and North of Highway 10 was going to be potentially dedicated to the City of Stevens Point. In reviewing it, staff recommended approval in accepting that dedication, noting that they were not certain if it would be moving forward at that point and that it would be up to the developer. He asked that they act on the dedication so there could be a discussion at the Common Council.

Mayor Wiza stated that they should move forward and consider it, adding that the property owner had the option of withdrawing for whatever reason. The dedication would include approximately under three acres that could be incorporated into Parkdale Park.

Mayor Wiza opened the floor to comments. Seeing none, it was brought back to the commission.

Alderperson Kneebone stated that if they were willing to provide that wetlands between the park and their lot line, she would be grateful to have it in order to preserve the park land for the future.

Motion by Alderperson Kneebone to approve of the acceptance by the City of Stevens Point of the dedication of land totaling approximately 2.892 acres identified as Outlot 2 on the preliminary certified survey map, located on the north side of the unaddressed parcel east of Badger Avenue and North of Highway 10 (Parcel ID 2408-36-1200-02); seconded by Commissioner Curless.

Motion carried 7-0.

10. Conceptual project review of the extension of Songbird Lane east to serve potential future development.

Director Ostrowski explained that the agenda item was separate from any Point of Beginning or Blenker development as they were trying to identify a frontage or backage road along Highway 10 to make sure they didn't have severe traffic impacts in the future. He reminded the commission that they were not putting them in today, and it was all conceptual, and that they were just wanting to start mapping past the city limits. The area for discussion was the Highway 10 corridor, noting that there had always been a thought about getting a frontage or backage road as the city grew east over the next several decades. This was

brought forth due to a potential 64 acre property being listed for purchase. While Songbird Lane may not be the road, there were options to divert north and south. Overall, it was prudent that those access points were identified in order to restrict access to those intersections and not have them direct access points to Highway 10. He stated that something should be done on the official street map to identify areas that the City may want to preserve as a future right-of-way in the town areas, noting that it would become very challenging for their extraterritorial review to deny any development that would come in without it. Planning beyond the municipal boundaries was always a good idea, he stated before asking for thoughts on the extension.

Commissioner Brush stated that a backage road was a really good idea, but wasn't sure why it had to turn onto Sandpiper Drive.

Director Ostrowski clarified that it would not be on Sandpiper Drive, but on Songbird Lane as it seemed like the most logical connection. If Windy Drive were to be extended, he explained, it would go through the wetlands and they had just had that conversation. In looking at the mapped wetlands, there were some wetlands in Parkdale Park and they would have to do an official delineation to see the extent of wetlands. He noted that the area was identified because it had been on a CSM to be reserved for future right-of-way.

Commissioner Brush asked about the traffic, to which Director Ostrowski explained that as Highway 10 developed, a backage road would carry a lot of the traffic to individual businesses. In that case traffic would come down another access road to access those business rather than having direct access points off Highway 10. They needed to have discussions as a city in how to deal with traffic on Highway 10 as they continued to develop.

Commissioner Brush asked why the street had to be Songbird Lane and asked whether the intent was to get back to the original Highway 10.

Director Ostrowski stated that traffic was likely to occur there. In time, it could warrant a signalized intersection, adding that there would be limited access points on Highway 10 heading east.

Commissioner Brush asked if any traffic was being generated currently, to which Director Ostrowski stated that there was no road, and they were just discussing the extension for planning purposes.

Commissioner Haines understood the need to have the discussion, but added that it was imperative that if they approved something like this, it had to be discussed in their planning process where they could really get into specifics, adding that it didn't give Plan Commission any direction if it was too general.

Director Ostrowski described that throughout the comprehensive planning process, this would be the future growth area, and it would identify potential land uses within the areas as the community grew. In the past, he added, they had identified areas all the way out to Highway J.

Commissioner Haines agreed with identifying areas, but reiterated that it was too general.

Director Ostrowski explained that they couldn't get into the planning phase to the point of doing site plans, but they could start by identifying potential uses for an area, as well as main access points to Highway 10 which would help drive what those uses would be out there.

Mayor Wiza asked how specific they wanted to get, to which Commissioner Haines stated that she would like to see more neighborhood plans because it was easy to paint a whole area with a broad brush, such as residential, when it could mean nothing in the end.

Mayor Wiza added that the commission was charged with making those long range, long term general plans, adding that they could focus on smaller pieces to incorporate within them, and ultimately individual projects.

Commissioner Haines agreed and stated that they could do more zoning, to which Mayor Wiza reiterated that they still needed the overall big picture for area consistency.

Commissioner Brush asked when the consultant would be coming in, and whether they would consider those bigger issues.

Director Ostrowski explained that it would be coming back to the Plan Commission in the land use chapter where they would identify in generality what types of uses were going to be along the Highway 10 corridor. Since the City had extraterritorial boundary review within three miles of the city, they could review developments that could occur in that area in order to make sure those developments remained consistent with their planning efforts. He further explained that they would not be planning on a neighborhood level for the next three miles since it could take up to 40 years to get out there and by that time, many things could change, but that they should still start looking at what options are available to make sure that development is consistent with their goals and objectives within the comprehensive plan.

Commissioner Curless asked if Highway 10 would end up being mostly commercial, and whether there would be a dropdown from Songbird Lane to Windy Drive so they wouldn't have to sell a commercial lot all the way up to Songbird Lane.

Director Ostrowski stated that there would most likely be another frontage road in there. Within a 40 acre parcel he explained, there would be several additional roads, but they were looking to get their main backbone roads through that area.

Commissioner Haines asked what it would mean for the next plan commission.

Director Ostrowski explained that he would look at modifying the official street map to get some of those roads configured, adding that they could always be modified. He stated that they would still push infill as much as they could, but that the city would eventually grow beyond its current boundaries.

Mayor Wiza reminded the commission that they didn't need action on the item, just thoughts and ideas.

Aldersperson Kneebone stated that she wasn't comfortable with putting a road between Ice Hawk's arena and Parkdale Park, but that it seemed like the best option to relieve some traffic off Highway 10. She agreed that they had to look at it comprehensively, adding that they needed to include and communicate with their neighbor, Town of Hull.

Mayor Wiza asked Aldersperson Kneebone about which area she would prefer to road to go through, to which Aldersperson Kneebone elaborated on her preference for the road to bend to the north.

Director Ostrowski warned that as the city took more private land owner's property for streets, the City would have to pay for it and that it could get expensive, as well as making sure that they were not making a building nonconforming with their setbacks due to placing a road through there.

Mayor Wiza opened the floor to comments.

Steve Lane (First Weber Realtors, Stevens Point) representing the Bickfords and their 64 acre parcel, stated that he looked forward to further discussions on what would be best for the community and owners of the

property, noting that it would have to happen in conjunction with the environment, community, and welfare in mind.

Bob Enright (5753 Algoma St, Hull), member of the Town of Hull Plan Commission asked if the City of Stevens Point could share their comprehensive plan with them as the intergovernmental agreement stated that there should be discussions over border issues and land use. He had not been aware of this discussion prior to the meeting and stated that the Town of Hull should have some say so in the discussion.

Director Ostrowski explained that what they wanted to do was provide a conceptual view of what could occur, and that future discussions would not only include the Town of Hull, but the Town of Stockton as well. He further explained that it had been brought to the city first to see if it was something that they even wanted to entertain.

Mayor Wiza stated that everything thus far was just conceptual. Depending on where the discussions lead, they would be contacting the Town of Hull and Town of Stockton in the future.

Bob Enright (5753 Algoma St, Hull) had clarifying questions about potential routes for the extension, noting that an extension between the soccer complex and Parkdale Park may cause a major issue in terms of traffic and safety.

Jenny Burton (5718 Sandpiper Dr) thanked the commission and city staff for putting together research into future development. She also stated her preference in extending Algoma Street, noting that it would isolate developments with recreational purposes, as well as for the safety of children in the area.

Mayor Wiza stated that staff would do more research and bring back a proposal to Plan Commission in the near future.

11. Community Development Department Monthly Report for February 2017

Director Ostrowski reported that strong development continued into 2017 and that they had already exceeded 2014, 2015, and 2016 development, as well as having issued 123 permits. Pinewood Apartments had also broken ground on Frederick Street North and was well under way.

12. Director's Update

Director Ostrowski stated that they were potentially looking at reviewing the compressive plan and zoning code rewrite on the last Monday of the month at 7:00PM.

13. Adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 10:18 PM