

Town of Verona Plan Commission Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, March 11, 2020, 6:30 pm

Town of Verona Hall

7669 County Highway PD

Members Present: Doug Maxwell, Deb Paul, Tom Mathies, and Sarah Slack

Absent: None

Staff: None

Also Present: no one from the public was present

1. Call to Order/Approval of Meeting Agenda – Doug Maxwell called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm. Motion to approve the agenda by Mathies, second by Slack. Motion Carried.
2. Public Comment – None
3. Approval of minutes from 2/13/2020 – Motion to approve minutes by Mathies, second by Slack. Motion carried.
4. Discussion of Declaration Covenants for Twin Rock and Prairie Circle Developments: Maxwell reported that the Town Board had reviewed these two covenants. The Commission members commented on the list of recommended trees. Maxwell indicated that this document was not signed by Town Chair or Town Clerk and thus no formal action was necessary.
5. Discussion of Developer's Agreement for subdivision developments: Maxwell indicated that the previously used developer's agreements had been edited by Amanda Arnold and himself so that the areas that have been difficult to enforce with the developer's agreement for the condominium developments had been adjusted. The agreement is now with the Town's attorney for review.
6. Discussion of Subdivision Ordinance:

Stormwater Management Practices and options to be considered for the subdivision ordinance – The Plan Commission continued to discussion options for increasing stay-on water on cluster-conservation subdivisions with the possibility of providing a bonus in number of lots for the development. At the 13 Feb 2020, Jason Valerius from MSA Professional Services presented background information relating to providing a bonus to developers for keeping more water on the subdivision. MSA recommendation from memo 13 Feb 2020: "100% stay-on can be challenging to achieve in an urban setting – this is why it was not selected as the county-wide standard. But in a rural setting with large lots, it is not difficult to achieve. We encourage you to consider offering this option in your ordinance. In most cases it appears that just a 10% density bonus (10% reduction in the minimum lot size or 1 additional lot for every 10 lots under conventional standards) it appears to be in the landowner's interest to achieve 100% stay-on." For clarification, 100% stay-on refers to infiltration and not to run-off.

Several questions were asked at the 12 Feb Meeting and MSA provided addition information in Memo dated 6 March 2020.

i) What is the relationship between soil slopes and infiltration? "As clarified during the meeting, stormwater modeling software does account for elevation changes within the system, as it affects how quickly water moves through the site (time of concentration)".

ii) How does farmland compare to residential development in stay-on performance? "Conventional farming methods without a "cover crop" to slow water and prevent erosion can have extremely high runoff rates, higher than the low-density urban development typical in the town. Dane County doesn't allow that high-runoff cropland performance to be used as the baseline for calculating post-development stay-on requirements; instead they use pre-settlement prairie conditions as the baseline."

iii) Don't infiltration basins need forebays to keep sediment out of the infiltration basin? "A high-quality bio-infiltration basin with good soils and deep-rooted prairie plants can handle sediment

without the need for a forebay because the plants will maintain the porosity of the soil at the surface.”

iv) So, what’s the total cost of an infiltration basin with forebay? MSA estimated that the cost of 100% stay-on could be covered by the incentive of one lot.

v) Can we contain 100% of runoff from a 100-year storm, not just 100% of pre-development stay-on? “No. A 100-year storm is about 6.7 inches in 24 hours. Roughly 65% of that, or 4.4 inches of rain, will leave the site even if you are meeting 100% of pre-development stay-on. The infiltration basins to handle that much water would consume about 20% of the site. Using Fox Hill as the example, the infiltration basin(s) would grow from 0.75 acres to 12.6 acres, and you would not be able to offer enough lots through a density bonus to cover the costs of those ponds.”

vi) Can we go above the requirement of the County to match the pre-development discharge rate for the 100-yr storm, and require developers to match the predevelopment rate for the 500-yr storm instead? MSA is not convinced this is the way to go. MSA suggested that there be an incentivized requirement to ratchet down the runoff rate from 100-yr storm (and smaller events) from 100% of predevelopment rate to 80% of pre-development rate. This would hold more water on the site for a longer period. MSA estimated that this would require about a 15% more volume capacity in the ponds. Using Fox Hill, the increase in land use, might increase by 0.2 acres.

MSA recommendation: That the Town could offer a 10% increase in lot numbers for achieving 80% of pre-development rate of run-off for the 100-yr storm event, and/or a 10% bonus for achieving 100% of pre-development stay-on. Developers could receive a total of 20% bonus in lots (rounded down) for achieving both objectives.

Maxwell presented an overview of considerations for stormwater management including a discussion of stormwater hydrograph figures of comparing discharge rates vs. time. He suggested that the commissioners consider three issues: i) Increase stay-on rate (infiltration and evaporation), ii) decrease peak run-off rates for rains over x inches, and iii) decrease run off volumes for rains over x inches.

Maxwell suggested the possible working for the subdivision: If the stormwater management plan achieves 100% of pre-development stay-on and/or 80% of pre-development peak runoff rate for a 100-yr rain event (6.7 inches in 24 hrs), the applicant will be allowed up to a xx% bonus in lot numbers, but not to exceed the density allowed by the Comprehensive Plan. The increase in lot numbers would be possible by using 1.x-acres as the minimum lot size. Since each site is unique, the exact number of bonus lots cannot be predetermined without a concept plan being presented to the plan commission.

Discussion followed: It seemed better not use exact amounts for rainfall as Dane County requirements might change. Most commissioners favored stay-on rate increases vs. run-off rate increases. The minimum size that should be considered might be 1.x acres. Also, the concept of lot averaging should be considered so that the subdivision would have different lot sizes.

7. Reports:

Chair: Town Board supported the grant application by the NARC for equipment for burning the prairie around the Town Hall.

Committee Reports: No reports

Commissioners: Nothing to report

8. Review of schedule for future meetings – Next meeting set for May 14, 2020

9. Adjourn – Doug Maxwell adjourned the meeting.

Submitted by: Deborah Paul, Secretary of Plan Commission, member, and Douglas Maxwell, Chair

Approved: