

# VILLAGE OF EPHRAIM

FOUNDED 1853



## PLAN COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Monday, January 23, 2012

7:00 p.m. - Village Hall – 9996 Water Street

Members Present: Chair John Cox Paul Flottman, Walt Fisher, Roy Elquist, Tim Nelson, Brent Bristol – Zoning Administrator, and Charity Buhr – Administrator/Clerk

Members Absent: Jim Stollenwerk and Fred Bridenhagen

Also Present: Todd Bennett

1. **Call to Order**

Chair Cox called meeting to order at 7:00 PM

2. **Quorum**

There is a quorum of the Plan Committee members present.

3. **Changes in Agenda**

There are no changes in the agenda at this time.

4. **Visitors' Comments**

There are no visitors' comments at this time.

5. **Approve 11/28/11 Plan Committee Minutes**

Nelson moved, seconded by Flottman to approve the November 28, 2011 Plan Committee meeting minutes as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

6. **Stuart Chomeau – 9901 Water St – Faceprint Change**

Bristol explained that Mr. Chomeau would like to add a new door and a few new windows to his property at 9901 Water Street. The majority of this project is an interior remodel. They are adding two new windows, moving one window to the other side of the building, and putting two replacement doors in at the property. These changes aren't that visible from the road. The doors and windows they are adding and replacing are very similar to those currently at the property. Bristol noted that this was recommended for approval from the Historic Preservation Committee. Bristol noted that he has no issues with this project. Some of the changes are being done so that they didn't need to go to Board of Appeals.

Elquist moved, seconded by Nelson to approve the Faceprint change for Stuart Chomeau at 9901 Water Street as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

7. **Todd Bennett – 3063 Church St. – Concept Review**

Bristol explained that this item is being brought before the Plan Committee for a concept review. Mr. Bennett would like to have a second story placed on a good portion of this structure located at 3063 Church Street. Any new work on this structure would need to meet current setbacks. The owners are aware of this and aware of how Board of Appeals works. Mr. Bennett wanted to come before the Plan Committee to try to get a feel for how receptive this group would be toward a project like this. HPC and Plan Committee would ultimately have to approve design for a project like this. The formal

application and site work isn't yet done to find out specifics of variances needed, however, this is here for design review.

Mr. Bennett stated that his family lives over a portion of the restaurant. They would like to stay within the footprint of the building but raise the roof to where the current roofline is. The east side of the building would have a dormer and windows. The south elevation would have a secondary exit with a stairwell. The stairwell would run directly into the backyard area. The north side of the building would have the roofline raised to meet the existing. Mr. Bennett would like feedback on the ideas presented.

Fisher questioned the footprint ground coverage. Bristol stated that it is already larger than it would be allowed but the current is grandfathered. He believes that he believes it is more than what is allowed. Fisher's main concern would be the balcony and the stairway since it is outside of the current existing roofline.

Elquist questioned the additional square footage, it would be approximately 700 sq ft. Their main reason for the addition would be to have additional living space for their family.

This would be for owners' use.

Bennett stated the need for the secondary exit would be for fire escape purposes, there is currently one entrance/exit from the upper living space.

Cox stated that his understanding is that the Board of Appeals split the previous lot into the two existing substandard lots. Nelson confirmed.

Nelson believes that the current lot coverage today is similar to when the lot previously existed with the gas station on it. The Board of Appeals split the lot previously to make the restaurant property a viable lot.

Cox asked if a stairwell increases impervious surface. Bristol confirmed that it does.

Bristol stated that at a minimum there will be a need for front and rear setback variances from the Board of Appeals before anything can be done other than repair/replacement.

The Committee discussed the Board of Appeals process.

Fisher mentioned that the Plan Committee has discussed in the past looking at small downtown lots similarly to the way the protective waterfront is looked at. This may be something that the Committee may want to discuss potential changes to the ordinances.

Nelson has no direct objection, but looking for another way to incorporate a fire escape would be a good idea.

Flottman agrees, the visual effect change is significant but it will tie together with the existing for continuity. He feels the staircase may be difficult to get approval on.

Bristol explained that if you remove impervious surface you can replace it to keep from increasing lot coverage.

Fisher stated that from a planning standpoint there is a lot of additional square footage being added to a building that doesn't meet setbacks. Should the committee be looking at making this type of property in the central business district have an ordinance that assists in this process.

Cox stated that this has been identified as a problem and this type of issue will come up again.

Cox stated that the Committee can see what is being attempted at this property. They didn't see any large issues with this project.

Bristol advised Mr. Bennett to contact the commercial building inspector to look into any codes that may affect his proposal.

## **8. Discussion and recommendation regarding sign ordinance language**

The draft under review incorporated the few minor changes proposed at the last meeting in November. There was discussion regarding creating a separate section in the sign ordinance specific to lighting. Bristol is wondering where the Committee would like to go with this.

Nelson would like to direct people when they are trying to put up new signs to try to control the lighting issues that the Village is experiencing along Water Street. He would like to add language to

the exempted signage that states that the signage isn't lit. If it is lit, it should comply with the lighting section of the ordinance.

Cox would like the application process to determine if a signs lighting is appropriate and allowed or not.

Nelson stated that the obtrusion can be to pedestrians and vehicular traffic. He discussed precedent with the Village sunset-ting acceptable signs so that they would eventually be corrected.

Elquist stated that there is already some wording regarding shielding light as to not cast any direct light in the ordinance.

Bristol plans on going to all businesses to enforce the current ordinances once this is passed.

To conform to the ordinance you may need to add additional structure to the existing signage.

Bristol suggested adding wording to the language that allows for additional shrouding that wouldn't be counted against signage allowance.

Cox stated that maybe the application needs to be reworked to include questions regarding lighting.

Flottman questioned the process for looking for how to light a sign. Is it appropriate to give example of good lighting in the village for them to reference?

Bristol will work on amending the application for the next meeting.

#### **9. Discussion and consideration of ongoing review of Comprehensive Plan**

There is nothing new to discuss this month regarding the Comprehensive Plan other than this evenings discussions.

#### **10. Visitors' Comments**

There are no visitors' comments at this time.

#### **11. Adjournment**

Nelson moved, seconded by Flottman to adjourn at 8:10 PM. Motion passed unanimously.

Recorded By:

Charity Buhr, WCMC

Administrator/Clerk