

## Town of Verona Plan Commission Meeting Minutes

January 18, 2023 6:30pm

Town Hall Community Room

7559 County Highway PD, Verona WI

Members Present: Mark Geller, Lori Lukens, Tom Mathies, Sarah Slack, Haley Saalsaa-Miller

Staff: Sarah Gaskell, Administrator

1. Call to Order/Approval of Meeting Agenda – Geller called the meeting to order at 6:40 pm. Motion to approve the agenda by Slack, second by Lukens. Motion carried by voice vote.
2. Public Comment - none
3. Approval of Minutes from October 16th, 2023 – Motion to approve by Lukens, second by Miller. Motion carried by voice vote.
4. Discussion and Possible Action: Land Use Application 2023-01 Sugar River Road Properties Concept Plan Review and Rezone
  - a. Staff report – as provided in packet
  - b. Applicant comments – Ron Klass, D’Onofrio and Associates
    - Agent has a long history with the Town – Deer Haven, Fox Hill and Woods at Watch Hill
    - Project in alignment with the goals of the Town’s Comprehensive Plan
    - Design team has been working on the project for 18 months to address town and public comments and concerns
    - Conservation design exceeds minimum open space requirements
    - Design features: restored prairies and walking paths, preservation of large, wooded lot as open space, landscape requirements, ridgeline height restrictions, strong HOA covenants
  - c. Public comment
    - Sherry Combs, 7454 Valley Road – comments sent by email; see attachment
    - Cheryl Mellenthin, 2105 Sugar River Road – shares Sherry’s Combs’ concerns; Traffic Impact Analysis questions – bike traffic, farm vehicles; entrance has flooded in the past; verbiage used by commissioners is unclear
    - Tom Poast, 1990 Hidden River Road; Lots 19-22 are only 150’ wide; how will residents of the development be kept off of his property; trees hanging over his field on western edge
    - Dusty Poast, 1990 Hidden River Road; will be requesting enforcement of Wisconsin Fence Law
    - Jane Barnett, 2273 Sugar River Road; thanked PC for work done to date but more must be considered; traffic study concerns; sight line issues; flooding issues; wildlife use of road not considered; wants a robust stewardship plan for the development
    - Dave Lonsdorf, 1717 Beach Road; trail placement in NW corner runs with the grade and will erode; half of wooded lots will be destroyed by homes being placed there; flooding concerns; minimizing carbon footprint should be encouraged
    - Jeff Hartmann 2313 Sugar River Road; how does future mailbox location affect the current residents; would like more information on the phasing plan for the development roads
  - d. Commissioner Comments

## Concept Plan

- Flooding concerns:
  - Chief Machotka in attendance – he does not have any issue with response times; challenges re flooding exist everywhere; Addition of new neighborhoods in the town has not increased call volume
- Floodplain concerns – if entrance is determined to be in the floodplain, what's next; applicant stated there a number of alternatives including rebuilding the intersection of the access with Sugar River Road
- Design speed of roads is preferred to be 25mph
- County documentation of manure management plan would be helpful
- Lots 19-22 may need to be shifted to accommodate 300' distance for well placement
- Phasing of road construction
- Mailbox locations should be examined to minimize inconvenience to current residents (location likely dictated by USPS)
- Better explanation of the methods employed in the Traffic Impact Analysis
- Path alignment in Outlot 8 – address potential erosion concerns due to grade
- Would like to review floodplain study once completed
- Application needs to include vision triangle, floodplain, slopes between 12 and 20%, existing wells and septic fields
- Generally supportive of the design
- Design changes made to date are favorable and reflective of the Comprehensive Plan
- 

## Rezone

- More specific information is needed like a map

No action taken.

5. Discussion and Possible Action: 2023 OA-068 Amending Chapter 10 of the Dane County Code of Ordinances Regarding the Review Process for Conditional Use Permits and Rezones

Discussion by Plan Commission. Motion by Geller, second by Mathies to recommend approval of 2023 OA-068 Amending Chapter 10 of the Dane County Code of Ordinances Regarding the Review Process for Conditional Use Permits and Rezones  
Motion carried by voice vote.

6. Discussion and Possible Action: Land Use Application 2024-01 Rezone of Cross County Circle submitted by Town of Verona to correct a zoning oversight

Discussion by Plan Commission. Motion by Slack, second by Lukens to recommend approval of Land Use Application 2024-01 Rezone of 2744 Cross County Circle to correct a zoning clerical error.  
Motion carried by voice vote.

7. Other

8. Next Meeting: February 15<sup>th</sup>, 2024

9. Adjourn –Motion by Geller, second by Mathies. Motion carried by voice vote. Meeting adjourned at 8:17 pm.

Submitted by Sarah Gaskell, Town Planner/Administrator

## Sherry Combs Comments for 1/17/24 Plan Commission Meeting--Sugar River Proposal

1. I have concerns about the information or more correctly the continued lack of information submitted for the proposed Sugar River Road subdivision. It is interesting to compare the almost overwhelming amount of detailed information submitted for the initial Riverside Rd/Spring Rose Rd proposed development to the minimal supplied 9 months after the initial proposal. Why is this minimal approach acceptable? Aren't the rules of what information must be addressed contained in TOV documents? Minimizing information creates a lack of transparency as to what will actually be put in place. The burden of identifying potential problems is shifted to others when insufficient information is intentionally submitted. Lack of transparency is not good business.
2. The 50 plus page traffic study based on a single observation day does not do justice to the concerns that have been previously expressed. The observation was done right after the Ironman Race—bicyclists were not riding that soon after the race, so those numbers were under-represented. It also was after third crop hay and before grain harvest when little/no farm equipment was moving. A single point in time is not statistically important nor representative. The blind corner that is proposed as the entrance/exit is a safety concern under many situations that may not have been observed on that one day. Has fire and EMS been contacted and if so, what are their concerns?
3. The audience has brought to the Plan Commissions attention many questions and concerns about this project. What assurance do we have that these concerns have been considered by the Plan Commission? Will our questions be answered? How is the developer incorporating these concerns into his plans? Nothing seems to have changed—the same no conservation plat is now plopped onto an elevation map with no redesign. How has the need for manure application to adjacent land been addressed in the design? How will runoff from the entrance road into the subdivision be handled to prevent runoff downhill into the wetland/Sugar River? Houses placed on the ridge may be restricted to 1 story—why is it 'may' and under what circumstances will that be enforced?
4. It is difficult to follow the discussion of the Plan Commission members during real time because of being unfamiliar with the technical and specific language of building, platting, etc. Every profession has language specific to itself. But in order for those discussions to be meaningful to a broader audience, either less technical, specific language should be used or a glossary developed that defines the technical terms used. I'm sure other audiences attending Plan Commission meetings would benefit from such a glossary. I would like to ask the Town of Verona to construct such a glossary to help its residents better understand meeting proceedings.

I think most of us living in the surrounding area want to have honest, complete information presented at these meetings. Having to read between the lines and guess at the real meaning

makes it difficult to properly assess the proposal. Transparency is important. We would like to know that our concerns are being considered. How can that happen if complete information is not submitted or some design changes shown or reasons that changes can't happen be addressed?