



Plan & Architectural Review Meeting

Whitewater Municipal Building Community Room,
312 West Whitewater St., Whitewater, WI 53190
*In Person and Virtual

Monday, March 10, 2025 - 6:00 PM

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Meeting called to order at 6:00 p.m.

PRESENT

Chairman, Councilmember Neil Hicks
Board Member Bruce Parker
Vice Chairperson Tom Miller
Board Member Michael Smith
Board Member Marjorie Stoneman
Board Member Carol McCormick
Board Member Lynn Binnie

STAFF

Taylor Zeinert, Economic Director
Attorney Jonathan McDonell
Allison Schwark, Planner
Llana Dostie Neighborhood Services Administrative Assistant

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A committee member can choose to remove an item from the agenda or rearrange its order; however, introducing new items to the agenda is not allowed. Any proposed changes require a motion, a second, and approval from the Committee to be implemented. The agenda shall be approved at each meeting even if no changes are being made at that meeting.

Motion made by Board Member Binnie, Seconded by Board Member Parker.

Voting Yea: Chairman, Councilmember Hicks, Board Member Parker, Vice Chairperson Miller, Board Member Smith, Board Member Stoneman, Board Member McCormick, Board Member Binnie

HEARING OF CITIZEN COMMENTS

No formal Plan Commission action will be taken during this meeting although issues raised may become a part of a future agenda. Specific items listed on the agenda may not be discussed at this time; however, citizens are invited to speak to those specific issues at the time the Council discusses that particular item.

None.

CONSENT AGENDA

Items on the Consent Agenda will be approved together unless any commission member requests that an item be removed for individual consideration.

1. Hicks requested that the Minutes reflect that they are from February 10, 2025.

Motion made by Chairman, Councilmember Hicks, Seconded by Vice Chairperson Miller. Voting Yea: Chairman, Councilmember Hicks, Board Member Parker, Vice Chairperson Miller, Board Member Smith, Board Member Stoneman, Board Member McCormick, Board Member Binnie

PUBLIC HEARING FOR REVIEW AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL

2. Consideration to Approve and Recommend to Common Council a change in the District Zoning Map to Rezone Parcel # 292-0515-3233-008 from AT (Agricultural Transition District) to R-3 (Multi-Family Residence District) and /WUP 00359 from R-3 (Multi-Family Residence District) to AT (Agricultural Transition District.)

Planner Schwark stated there is some history with these parcels. A few years ago the rezone did come before the PARC. This developer Arch Development LLC is looking at rezoning some of the parcels. The county line splits the development up. There are two parcels in Walworth County and one in Jefferson. Back in 2017, the land was annexed into the City. In 2018, the applicant petitioned to rezone to R-3 on all the parcels permanently. From the PARC minutes and Common Council minutes, the PARC recommended the rezone to the Common Council and the Common Council denied the rezone. When the land was annexed into the City, there was a temporary zoning attached to these parcels, and that zoning was R-3. At that time, they were told to come back with their development to get permanent zoning. The proposed permanent zoning is consistent with the zoning. They are hoping to continue with the development between Walworth and Jefferson County. Planner does recommend approval.

Ben Holden with Whitewater Common Sense Citizen's Group stated "I have talked to many citizens and they are not in favor public funding for multi-family developments and apartments."

EDD Zeinert stated that this body doesn't approve TIF Funding. That is something that the Community Development Authority does. The Community Development Authority did see this development, however, didn't take any action.

Builder stated that this has no relevance to the TIF at all, this is not why they are here. As you have seen we have had a lot of push back with this project and we are just trying to bring a very nice project to town. And it has taken years to get to every step along the way. This would be just a small piece and a way forward.

Binnie stated he recalls in previous meetings, that there were some concerns about the fact that to the north is single family residential. And there was some hope that to some degree there would be a gradual reduction in density as it got closer to the single family residential. Is it the understanding that your plan now is to put townhomes into the most northern section?

Builder stated that the most recent plans has an apartment building at the corner of Tratt Street, stepping down to townhomes leaving open that western portion. We have been trying to contact developers to build single family homes into that western portion.

Bob Freirmuth HSI asked the developer if they needed TIF money to move forward with their project.

EDD Zeinert noted that this body has nothing to do with TIF, this is just for the rezone and I think this can be brought up at the Community Development meeting.

Smith asked should we just assume, it is a yes?

Builder stated as is stands, they are just looking for the zoning. We don't have plans to move forward with an apartment building. We need the zoning before we can have plans drawn. This is something in the future. It could be 10 years down the road from now. Interest rates need to come down, building costs need to come down. Without TIF we are unable to do this. We are just looking for the zoning so that in the future, if we have the opportunity and it presents itself, we can bring a plan forward.

Motion to recommend to common council to approve the rezone with planner's recommendations.

Planner stated that she would prefer that the builder parcel off the part the section that will be AT

Builder confirmed that they would carve out the AT area.

Motion made by Board Member Binnie, Seconded by Board Member Parker.

Voting Yea: Board Member Parker, Vice Chairperson Miller, Board Member Stoneman, Board Member Binnie

Voting Nay: Chairman, Councilmember Hicks, Board Member Smith

Voting Abstaining: Board Member McCormick

Motion Passed.

DISCUSSIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

3. Discussion and possible approval of Site Plan for remodel for Martin Bower located at 411 N Newcomb Street. Tax Parcel # /A 199100002.

Planner explained the project. The applicant is requesting this review for an existing property. The Martin Bower Company's proposed improvements would include an updated parking lot layout, updated landscaping, new asphalt and concrete; in addition, to 4 new loading docks with hydraulic lifts and retaining walls for entry from the docking area. There are a lot of interior modifications for the docks, but there is not much exterior. The square footage of the building is not changing and the impervious surface of the site is only changing by 0.8 percent.

Motion to approve with planner's recommendations.

McCormick asked what they do there?

Bradon the general manager for Martin Bower stated. "We do quick services for McDonalds and Chick-Fil-A. We provide the products for the stores on a daily basis."

Motion made by Board Member Binnie, Seconded by Board Member Stoneman.

Voting Yea: Chairman, Councilmember Hicks, Board Member Parker, Vice Chairperson

Miller, Board Member Smith, Board Member Stoneman, Board Member McCormick, Board Member Binnie

4. Discussion and possible approval of Site Plan for New Recycle Building located at 107 County Road U for John's Disposal. Tax Parcel # 292-0515-3312-000.

Planner stated the applicant, is John's Disposal Recycling Center, they are requesting a site plan review since they are located in the M-1 district, which requires all building improvements to come before the Plan and Architectural Review Commission. They are asking to replace the building that burned down several years ago. They would like to place a new 16,000 square foot building on the same parcel. In the image included, in the site plan the proposed new location is shown, along with the old building. This building has since been torn down. It does meet all the requirements of the M-1 zoning district. They are not making any changes to the site as a whole. They are not adding any new impervious surface. I'm recommending approval.

Brian from John's stated that they are replacing the building they lost just over two years ago. We are moving it slightly off the old foot print. This time we are excited we have City water with and an excellent fire suppression system going in everywhere.

McCormick asked why it took so long?

Brian stated that they had an original building that they moved back into 15 weeks after the fire. We've always had an extra building, but we can hardly be without it.

Motion to approve the plan with the planner's conditions.

Motion made by Board Member Stoneman, Seconded by Board Member Parker.
Voting Yea: Chairman, Councilmember Hicks, Board Member Parker, Vice Chairperson Miller, Board Member Smith, Board Member Stoneman, Board Member McCormick, Board Member Binnie

STAFF REPORT

5. Staff Report regarding Technology Park Zoning. **(Planner Schwark)**

This is just a brief memo as how it came to be and how it stands out from other zoning districts. Around the 2011 the City, University and CDA collaborated to build and maintain the Tech Park, as well as the Innovation Center. The 130 acre Technology Park was created as an expansion area, for business needs. It was meant for startups, to grow. Instead of adopting separate covenants, the covenants were written into the ordinance. They were trying to match the look of the Innovation Center. There are a lot of uses within the Tech Park. The Tech Park is like any other business district in the City; it is just a collaborative effort with the University.

EDD Zeinert stated that Whitewater is unique with this district.

Binnie stated that with the action that we took the last time, we recognized when we did it, we were not following these guidelines, which creates something of a conundrum at this point. When the Tech Park was built, we had high hopes it would be something like the one in Madison with the Tech Park there. We were going to bring in a lot of up and coming businesses. That has not been successful, obviously. I think that if we had been

able to construct a smaller building for start ups to move out of the Innovation Center into, we may have had some success with that. It might be appropriate at this time to meet with the Tech Park board to see if they would support relaxing these standards.

Hicks would like EDD Zeinert and Planner Schwark to work on item number 2 with the Tech Board.

Planner Schwark stated that would be a good idea, since she is a big proponent that if it is in the ordinance, that we enforce it. And if it is something we do not want to enforce, lets make a modification to the ordinance. So that the ordinance is consistent with the overall intent of what the City wants.

Ben Holden, Whitewater Common Sense Citizens asked if there were any businesses wanting to come in but didn't because of the standards. And how many do we know?

EDD Zeinert stated that not specifically to this area but in the M-1 district.

Ben Holden is any part of the Tech Park or Business Park being rezoned from M-1 to residential?

EDD Zeinert stated that not at this time. But that would be something that would have to come before this body. Because the body takes care of zoning.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

6.
 1. Rezone for all Whitewater Schools-Schanen
 2. Landscaping Guidelines Policy-McCormick
 3. Update on Royal Hounds of Whitewater (Doggie Daycare)
- None.

NEXT MEETING DATE APRIL 14, 2025

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned 6:38 p.m.

Motion made by Vice Chairperson Miller, Seconded by Board Member McCormick.

Voting Yea: Chairman, Councilmember Hicks, Board Member Parker, Vice Chairperson Miller, Board Member Smith, Board Member Stoneman, Board Member McCormick, Board Member Binnie