

1. Meeting called to order

President Dobbs called the meeting to order at 6:01p.m. at the Village Hall, 5043 Chester Lane, Racine, Wisconsin.

2. Roll Call/Introductions

Members present: President Dobbs, Thomas Knitter, Trustee Weatherston, Tim Just, and Joseph Minorik.

Absent: Bill Folk and Nancy Pierce were excused.

Also Present: Development Director Peter Wagner, Public Works Director Tom Lazcano and Trustee Fran Martin

3. Approval of Minutes

Approval of May 24, 2021 meeting minutes.

Motion by Trustee Weatherston

Seconded by Minorik

4. Citizens' Comments

None.

5. Public Hearing Items

A. ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT – Review an amendment to the Village of Caledonia Zoning Code to create Section 16-1-1(a)(10) relating to residential and commercial parking restrictions.

Peter Wagner read from his report:

In response to the Village Community Development Authority concerns pertaining to parking matters in residential and commercial districts, staff was directed to draft a zoning ordinance addressing the parking of vehicles, recreational vehicles, trailers, and semi-tractors and their trailers. The proposed ordinance is a section of the proposed Zoning Code, Chapter 12: Off-Street Parking.

Staff drafted an ordinance addressing this issue by providing regulations pertaining types, size, and setbacks of vehicles and trailers in residential and commercial districts. Key components to this ordinance are:

- One commercial vehicle not over 10,000 lbs and/or not over nine feet tall and 26 feet in length can be parked routinely in a residential district.
- Recreational vehicles in residential districts must be parked 5 feet from side and rear lot lines.
- Recreational vehicles parked in the street yard must be parked on an improved surface such as stone, asphalt, or concrete.
- Trailers and their contents parked on lots less than one acre cannot exceed 32 feet in length and 13 feet in height. For residential lots greater than one acre, the trailer cannot exceed 37 feet in length and 13 feet in height.
- A parcel's street yard cannot have an improved surface by more than 50% of the street yard.
- Semi tractors, trailers, or dump trucks on commercial property is prohibited unless approved through the conditional use or site plan review process.
- Agricultural equipment in agricultural districts are permitted on site.

**Plan Commission Meeting
Monday, June 28, 2021**

The current parking code does not address parking on front lawns of trailers, boats, cars, and other vehicles. The purpose of the text amendment is to clearly define off-street parking regulations in residential and commercial districts.

If adopted, these regulations will provide better authority to address complaints regarding the parking of vehicles in residential districts. This draft ordinance has gone before the Legislative and Licensing Committee for review with the recommendation that a public hearing be held and be further reviewed by the Plan Commission.

Public hearing opened: 6:14 pm

President Dobbs asked three times if anyone wanted to speak in favor of this proposal.

In favor:

Fran Martin 5630 5 Mile Rd: CDA – spoke some changes are needed in the ordinance to constrain their property. There should not be restrictions on larger or agricultural parcels.

Diana Lesnjak 421 Harvest Ln – agrees with having regulations.

President Dobbs asked three times if anyone wanted to speak against this proposal.

Against:

Wendy McCalvy 4825 Richmond Dr – Village changed the zoning without giving the chance to have a say. Larger parcels should not be restricted.

Howard Stacey 5750 5 Mile Rd – concerned about the equipment that may sit out on an agricultural property.

Closed public hearing: 6:40pm

5A. Commission Deliberation

Plan Commission Members asked Peter Wagner to clarify junk vehicles ordinance, it was believed the property owner needed to prove vehicles were operational and registered. Wagner stated that this ordinance was still in place, but this code will enforce how, where and what vehicles, trailers and recreational vehicles are allowed to park on a residential property. Wagner stated that staff can review and change the verbiage of – “Sub G. operation of specific vehicles used in a farm operation” to accommodate all vehicles used to run all farm types.

Commissioners asked what is considered art when using vehicles. Wagner said those situations would need to be reviewed on a case by case and the courts may have to make that decision. Plan Commissioner Members expressed concern for farming and small business owners aren’t driving this change and it is the other portion of the residential community. They stated that the ordinance needs to be reviewed further and that any restrictions are not so broad spread. Wagner said staff would go back to the drawing board and reconsider the size of larger properties and the restrictions.

Motion by Weatherston to table and refer back to staff for review.

Seconded by Knitter.

ROLL CALL

Jim Dobbs	Aye
Thomas Knitter	Aye

Trustee Weatherston	Aye
Tim Just	Aye
Joseph Minorik	Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

B. ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT – Review an amendment to the Village of Caledonia Zoning Code to create Section 16-1-1(a)(11) relating to accessory structures for residential and non-residential districts.

Peter Wagner read from his report:

Background: In response to repealing the administrative policy for oversize garage variances, staff was directed to draft new regulations pertaining to accessory buildings in residential districts. As part of drafting the ordinance, staff discovered that any repeal of the existing administrative policy regarding oversized garages, would result in no regulation for accessory structure size and accessory buildings only be limited by the regulation that no more than 20% of the rear yard can be developed with accessory structures. This would allow for accessory structures to be larger than the principal building on a residential parcel by right.

Staff drafted an ordinance addressing this issue by providing regulations pertaining to size, number, and setbacks as it relates to accessory buildings in residential districts. These regulations are nearly identical to the regulations proposed as part of Chapter 10: Accessory Structures that were reviewed earlier this year as part of the overall Zoning Code update. Since that time, staff has made changes to building size as it relates to lot size.

The current policy states that an accessory structure in a residential zoned district, no matter how large the parcel, could not exceed 1,050 square feet. If constructed of stone or masonry, the building could not exceed 1,200 square feet. Currently, a resident can file a request with the Village Board to approve building a larger accessory building than is allowed by administrative policy.

Staff is proposing to increase the maximum building size based on the size of the residential parcel and a percentage of the living area of the principal structure. If the parcel is less than two acres, the maximum size building would be 1,200 square feet or 75% of the living area of the principal structure, whichever is smaller. If two acres or greater, the maximum size would be 1,600 square feet or 75% of the living area of the principal structure, whichever is smaller. These regulations will encourage accessory buildings be smaller in stature than the principle building on a residential property. If a resident wishes to build a bigger accessory building, the resident would have the opportunity to request a size variance to the Village Board of Appeals.

In addition, this section of code proposes using the same 17-foot height limit as currently exists. Furthermore, buildings would be required to be setback five feet instead of three feet from side and rear lot lines. This better accommodates any overhangs a structure may have as it relates to property lot lines and provide additional space to accommodate snow or stormwater runoff from trespassing on a neighboring property. The ordinance also regulates the total number of accessory structures on a residential lot to two. The resident does have the option to go before the Plan Commission for approval of additional structures. Lastly, the ordinance includes setbacks for other accessory structures and uses such as patios, a/c condensers, electric generators, decks, and basketball/tennis courts in residential districts.

This ordinance also includes regulations for accessory buildings located in non-residential zoned districts. These regulations are the same as what is currently in the zoning code and what was reviewed earlier this year by the Plan Commission.

By the Village adopting this code section, it will provide regulating authority as it pertains to accessory structures and allow the Village to pursue repealing the administrative policy regarding requests for oversized garages in residential districts. This draft ordinance has gone before the Legislative and Licensing Committee for review with the recommendation that a public hearing be held and be further reviewed by the Plan Commission.

**Plan Commission Meeting
Monday, June 28, 2021**

Public hearing opened: 7:07pm

President Dobbs asked three times if anyone wanted to speak in favor of this proposal.

In favor:

None.

President Dobbs asked three times if anyone wanted to speak against this proposal.

Against:

Email responses

Joe Kiriaki 4240 Harvest Ln: These changes will impact properties negatively. While there may be cause to address certain issues, the proposed changes are far to reaching. The limits to residents to make decisions about construction on their property is far too restrictive. Residents should be given more time to review these proposed changes and provide their feedback. Clearly, more information is needed before such drastic changes are acted upon. Caledonia residents are entitled to know the intended needs and purpose of these proposed changes. I'm asking the members of the committee to oppose the proposed ordinance change.

Lisa Seils 7145 West River Rd: It has come to my attention, and to many others via a large horse and farm group here in Caledonia, there are changes in structures pending. According to the information provided, and included in the minutes from previous meeting, this will greatly affect the rural Caledonia farm community. Seems either no one has really done their homework, or we are getting thrown under the bus because of some oversized garage on a small residential property. If anyone on this committee would look at the records of properties listed as R2, or residential....you will find many west of Highway 31 . These are not subdivisions. These are the roads in Caledonia described as rural. However, many like our small farm are described as Residential, guessing because the village can get more tax money that way...rather than Ag property. Many of these properties are over the 2 acre size. And many contain older homes under 2000 square feet. The changes you are looking to set in stone would unfairly punish and limit small farms. Many of us have barns...which in addition to stalls, and other needed space, require hay and feed storage. Example...I own three equines...and typically buy 280 bales of hay each summer. And to stack it, require more than a height of 17'. We have equipment to store, other supplies, a turnout shed, goat shed, duck, geese pen...and we have lived here for over 38 years...25 years ago added 3 plus acres of AG land, and made our small farm. You need to go back and rewrite this new ordinance change to accommodate the rural homeowners here in Caledonia. Limiting the outbuildings to two unless special permission is ridiculous.

Kjell Erlandsson 6208 Hwy 31: The proposed ordinance on accessory buildings ignores the needs of a big part of the local economy, and the lifestyle of a significant part of the Village; horse farms in residential zoning districts. The proposed rules are similar to those in Oak Creek, but Oak Creek is more urban and suburban, whereas Caledonia has more of a rural character with many larger properties where the risk of a property looking cluttered with accessory structures is much lower.

Existing rules for residential zoning districts allow one "unit of livestock"--defined as a 1000 lbs. animal, e.g. one horse--if you have a 5 acre property, and then one unit for each additional acre. So, as an example, if you have 10 acres, you are allowed 6 horses. Ordinances also require that you have adequate shelters against weather if you have livestock. But with the proposal, you will not be allowed adequate shelter and facilities for those 6 horses. You also need structures for equipment needed to farm and maintain these properties.

The horse community is an important part of the quality of life and economy in Caledonia and must not be legislated out of existence. The horse community has a significant investment in infrastructure; according to an informal 2020 survey, we have 30+ indoor riding arenas (averaging somewhere around 6,000 sq ft), 90+ horse properties (21 added the past ten years), 40 miles of riding trails that can be used by the public. Farms provide

**Plan Commission Meeting
Monday, June 28, 2021**

much welcome relief in the form of green space. Caledonia Conservancy has been a driving force behind much of this development that enhances Caledonia both in terms of quality of life and economy.

The Village is trying to promote itself as an attractive place in terms of lifestyle, and horse life is a large part of the attractiveness. To put a stop of any further development for horse life would be counterproductive for this promotion and the quality of life in the village, not to mention stopping those who already live here and wish to further invest in their properties.

Rules affecting horse farms affects not only the people owning the horse farms. It also affects the people that don't own horse farms, but board their horses, or lease horses, at horse farms. Horse farms also provide greenspace in residential areas.

The horse farming community contributes significantly to the local economy. It supports local businesses more than national chains and franchises. The contributions include, but are not limited to, the following activities:

- Hay farming
- Equipment sales and service
- Feed stores
- Building contractors and materials
- Fencing contractors
- Riding instruction and horse training
- Farriers, veterinarians
- Barn help
- Work opportunities for teenagers
- Entertaining events for the entire community

We suggest the proposed rules be amended to allow for the needed structures required to have a horse farm in residential zoning districts. One approach to this would be to switch to a 3% rule for properties over 5 acres, where you would be allowed structures with a total of 3% of the property area, and the number of accessory buildings as needed for the operation of the farm.

Kim Hoover 8220 Foley Rd: I am writing today as a concerned Caledonia resident with regard to the Zoning Text Amendments under the Public Hearing Items for tonight's (6/28/2021) Planning Commission Agenda. I became aware of these amendments just yesterday afternoon, and while I understand the importance of attending the meeting in person to express my concerns and state my opposition to some of the amendments being made, I am unable to attend tonight's meeting on such short notice. As such, I hope that you take the time to read and consider my email before making such important decisions that not only affect me personally, but many within our community that may not be aware of these amendments being considered.

By way of background, my family and I are 16 year residents of the Village of Caledonia, with 14 of these years in our current home on Foley Road. Our children attended and graduated from Racine Unified School District. We were involved parents within the schools while they attended, and although my children have graduated (and now live out of state), I am an elected School Board Representative for Caledonia/Wind Point District 9. We also moved my husband's disabled mother into the Caledonia community (Parkview Senior Apts) 9 years ago to have her closer to us and make it possible for us to assist with her care/needs after my husband's father passed away unexpectedly. I have worked within our community (CNH Capital in Mt Pleasant) for 16 years. We are active and involved community members, supporting and volunteering regularly for our community organizations (Caledonia Conservancy, St Rita's Church, Woof Gang Rescue, Racine's Habitat for Humanity, to name a few). We moved to Caledonia from a Milwaukee suburb with the intention of "planting roots" (raising our family here which we have), as we loved the rural feel of this community, with close proximity to Milwaukee and Racine for our modern conveniences. We are not just residents that pay our annual property taxes to live in our house, nor can we easily replicate our life/home/property elsewhere. We live in, work in, play in and support our local community in any way we can! I say all of this because Caledonia truly is our home!! We are in our early 40s

**Plan Commission Meeting
Monday, June 28, 2021**

and intend on remaining here in our current home for many years, which brings me to the real reason for my email...

I understand based upon my reading of some past meeting agenda and minutes that there may be several reasons for the need to look over the Zoning ordinances and possibly make some changes. From my read, it would appear one continuous concern appears to be over-sized garages in residential neighborhoods. The real issue here is that "residential districts" can (and does) include all R-2 zoned properties.

I believe this would include my specific property and many properties like mine. I live on 8 acres, what I consider a small horse hobby farm, on Foley Road, yet we are zoned R-2 residential (no sewer/water). Your zoning amendments would greatly affect how I live and enjoy my property for the next 20-30 years (and maybe even beyond that). My house is a typical small 1960s ranch home, with 2 outbuildings, 1 shed and 1 stand-alone shelter for my horses. While I know that my buildings are already existing, and we have no current plans to construct any new outbuildings, your amendments would prohibit that since I already have the maximum outbuildings (even assuming my shed and shelter are not included), and my house size would prohibit anything bigger than maybe a large garage. My husband is an avid classic/muscle "car guy" and I am an equestrian. We purchased our specific property because it contained 2 outbuildings, 1 for each of us, to begin enjoying our passions at home. In addition, we are avid ATV/UTV riders and also own equipment for our own personal use/property maintenance (more storage space needed). Should we outgrow our current buildings for storage and/or livestock/horse purposes, your zoning requirements prohibit us from building any more buildings on our property. In addition, as I age, the possibility for an indoor riding arena would be completely restricted as well (for me or anyone similarly zoned). My property is at least 80-90% green space currently, which provides ample opportunity for us to add additional buildings. While our house may be smaller than our outbuildings, the layout of our property and the buildings do not create issues for any neighboring properties or make it visually inappropriate. Adding another building for our own personal use, storage and/or enjoyment is hardly going to disrupt the community or make our property look overrun and/or blighted.

Your restrictions don't take into consideration the needs of community at large! I am not just writing from a concerned "horse person" viewpoint, although I do have to point out that the height restrictions adversely affect hay storage, hay wagons and/or equipment needs, as the current hay provider trends are moving toward large rounds and large squares (think more storage space and more equipment needed). What about those with "green thumbs" that have permanent greenhouses for their gardening needs? What about classic car collectors? ATV/UTV riders? Those that wish to house their large campers inside during the winter months (I know there are a few of these oversized, super tall garages here in Caledonia). I hardly think that your intention of these amendments is to greatly restrict and essentially cut off your residents from overall personal enjoyment of their property. I am not talking about subdivisions here, or even those on 1-2 acres. I understand there may be some restrictions there due to the proximity of neighbors.

Many of us paid a high price tag (money/time/sweat equity) for our current properties (my house wouldn't sell for 1/3 of the price if it was located in the true "residential" area of Caledonia), and did not move here just for a place to lay our heads at night, but to live out our dreams right here at home. I urge you to rethink anything over 2 acres, or at the very least 5 acres, since 5 acres is the village's land requirement for housing livestock (which Caledonia then also require specific shelter/building requirements for their care).

In attendance responses

Fran Martin 5630 5 Mile Rd: said concerned with sending it to the Board of Appeals and feels it may not be the right decision since it being constrained by state statute for what they would consider as hardship. She said to consider categorizing parcels 5 acres or more with the same restrictions as agricultural parcels.

Diana Lesnjak 4421 Harvest Ln: stated to consider changing the math again and was concerned about the size of the horse barn and what if the owner wanted to live in a smaller home.

**Plan Commission Meeting
Monday, June 28, 2021**

Wendy McCalvy 4825 Richmond Dr. – spoke for herself and for another resident on 6 Mile Rd. Consider looking into the ordinances for the care of horses and size of structures that house them and review the multiple types of structures used/needed for running a horse farm.

Sandy Welsher 8804 Foley Rd – Worked on the ordinance for the sheltering and care for animals and number of structures needed to house and care for the animals with a feeding area and the tractors/vehicles for storage. Learn more about how a farm life is.

Martha Hutsick 4502 Harvest Ln – suggested working together to come up with a conclusion.

Greg Berg 6001 6 Mile Rd – feels 3% works currently for the larger properties.

Howard Stacey 5750 5 Mile Rd – worried about giving board of appeals the responsibility over Village Board. He said consider changing from Residential to Agriculture.

Jennifer Berg 6001 Mile Rd – said its costly to rezone properties and 1600 sqft is too small of a number in size for the uses of larger parcels.

Jeff Wilkowski 7141 7 Mile Rd – was against the size limitation on the accessory structure for larger properties.

Suzie Thorton 4310 Washington Ave – spoke for the Conservancy and the residents of Caledonia and said she was against these accessory structure size restrictions.

Public hearing closed: 7:34pm

5B. Commission Deliberation

Plan Commission Members said to consider having a max size percentage overall structures up to two (2) structures. They expressed concern that the number of variance requests would grow.

Motion by Weatherston to table and have staff reconfigure and review the zoning code.

Seconded by Just.

ROLL CALL

Thomas Knitter	Aye
Jim Dobbs	Aye
Trustee Weatherston	Aye
Tim Just	Aye
Joseph Minorik	Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

6. Non-Public Hearing Items

6A. BUILDING, SITE, & OPERATION PLAN REVIEW – Review a building, site, and operation plan for the construction and utilization of a ±778 square-foot, storage building located at 6025 Douglas Avenue, submitted by Patrice Sebastian, Applicant, S&P Holdings LLC, Owner. (Parcel ID Nos. 104-04-23-18-175-000, 104-04-23-18-177-000, & 104-04-23-18-181-000)

Peter Wagner read from his report:

**Plan Commission Meeting
Monday, June 28, 2021**

The applicant is requesting approval for the construction and utilization of a ±768 square-foot storage building located at 6025 Douglas Avenue. This building will be built alongside an existing 1-car garage that will be razed upon completion of the new storage building.

The proposed building is designed to be used as a storage facility for equipment and materials for the restaurant business that operates on the site. The building design is to look like a residential garage with a covered porch. The exterior of the building will be residential style siding with asphalt shingles. The west elevation of the building will have a 16'x8' overhead door for main access. The overall height of the building is 19'1". Per code, height is determined by the average of the wall height and peak height, which cannot exceed 17 feet. The calculated height is approximately 14.5 feet and is compliant with code. The building location conforms with setback requirements for an accessory structure. Three exterior decorative lights will be installed on the building. Due to the location of the structure and the limited brightness of the light fixtures, staff did not require a lighting plan. If the applicant were to increase the number or lights or brightness of the lighting on or around the building, the applicant will need to submit a lighting plan for approval.

There will be no requirements to address stormwater runoff as it does not disturb enough land or create enough additional impervious surface on the site. Engineering has reviewed the proposed structure and has no concerns.

If the Plan Commission is comfortable with the proposed storage building, staff has drafted a suggested motion recommending approval of the ±768 square-foot storage building located at 6025 Douglas Avenue with conditions as shown in Exhibit A.

6A. Commission Deliberation

None.

Motion by Weatherston to approve and recommend to the Village Board that the building, site, and operational plan for a ±768 square-foot storage building located at 6025 Douglas Avenue be approved with conditions outlined in Exhibit A for the following reasons:

1. The proposed use is allowed by underlying zoning through the building, site & operation plan review process.
2. The proposed use will not adversely affect the surrounding property values.
3. The proposed building is consistent with the existing use on the property.

Seconded by Just.

ROLL CALL

Jim Dobbs	Aye
Thomas Knitter	Aye
Trustee Weatherston	Aye
Tim Just	Aye
Joseph Minorik	Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

6B. SIGN PLAN REVIEW – Review a proposed master sign plan for the construction at 54 square-foot monument sign with an electronic message board for the multi-tenant development located at 1317 4 Mile Road submitted by Stephen Prochaska, Applicant, Kayne & Danny Properties, Owner. (Parcel ID No. 104-04-23-28-052-000)

Peter Wagner read from his report:

**Plan Commission Meeting
Monday, June 28, 2021**

The applicant is requesting approval of a master sign plan for a commercial building located at 1317 4 Mile Road. The applicant is proposing to construct a monument sign that exceeds the size maximum. Per Code Section 16-7-9(a)(5): Monument Signs: a monument sign shall not exceed 48 square feet on one side or 96 square feet on all sides. Section 16-7-3(h)(3) includes regulations for electronic message centers (EMC) which limits EMCs to no more than 30% of the overall sign size. Village sign code also includes a provision that allows an applicant to request modifications to the size, height, and number of signs on a parcel if a master sign plan is submitted and approved by the Plan Commission and Village Board. This provision allows the opportunity for the Village to consider on a case-by-case situation if a sign can exceed the existing 48 square-foot maximum.

Currently the multi-tenant development has one wall sign per tenant which meets sign code. In addition, there is an old-fashioned changeable copy sign located on the corner of Charles and 4 Mile Road. The owner would remove the existing changeable copy sign and replace it with a 54 square-foot monument sign with an EMC.

The proposed sign plan includes all the existing walls signs on the property and a new monument sign with an EMC. The applicant is requesting approval of enlarging the monument sign by one foot which increases the overall sign size by six square feet. By doing this, the applicant is able to to comply with the 30% area cap for an EMC as part of the overall sign. The location of the sign will be situated outside of the vision triangle and the EMC can be dimmable if found to be light nuisance.

Included with this report is a spec sheet for the sign illustrating how the sign will look along with dimensions. Included with this report is the applicant’s rationale for the allowing the oversized monument sign at this location. If approved, the sign will be required to meet all other zoning regulations as outlined in Title 16, Chapter 7: Signs.

6B. Commission Deliberation

Plan Commission Members asked the differences between Casey’s and the Dentist office signage. Wagner stated that Casey’s sign is larger and the Dentist office sign is small. Members expressed concern for the multi-tenant building asking does it limit the other tenants. Wagner said yes and that there is only one (1) monument sign allowed on a property. It was also asked if there is a time limit for the verbiage of the led sign and Wagner’s response was yes it can’t be less than 5 seconds.

Motion by Minorik to approve and recommends that the Village Board approve the sign plan submitted by Stephen Prochaska on behalf of Kayne & Danny Properties as presented for the property located at 1317 4 Mile Road for the following reason:

1. The proposed number, height and size of signs are permissible through the sign plan review process.

Seconded by Knitter

ROLL CALL

Jim Dobbs	Aye
Thomas Knitter	Aye
Trustee Weatherston	Aye
Tim Just	Aye
Joseph Minorik	Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

6C. FINAL PLAT REVIEW – Review a final subdivision plat for the proposed Bluffside Subdivision submitted by Nancy Washburn, Applicant, Charles Kotaas Warren Knuth Trust. (Parcel ID No. 104-04-22-25-029-000, & 104-04-22-02-027-040)

Memorandum:

From: Tom Lazcano P.E. – Public Works Director

Re: Bluffside Final Plat
Parcel ID's: 104-04-22-25-027-040 & 104-04-22-25-029-000

The Engineering Department has received a Final Plat for Bluffside Subdivision from Newport Development, Inc. on behalf of Thomas Antonneau.

Bluffside Subdivision is located south of 4 Mile Road along Bluffside Drive and Park Ridge Drive in the Village of Caledonia. This subdivision is located within the sanitary sewer service area and this Final Plat is for the creation of 19 Lots and 3 Outlots.

As background for the Plan Commission, the owners of the property had previously sold off a few parcels at a time in the past creating an unplatted subdivision without a subdivision plat or Homeowner's Association. This also created several parcels that are disconnected and share the same parcel ID. Village Ordinance now requires a Subdivision Plat to divide the property further. The developer plans to create a Homeowner's Association for the 19 Lots to care for the Outlot and stormwater pond maintenance.

The property currently has a R-2S Zoning Classification on it. R-2S Zoning requires 150 feet of street frontage and 40,000+ square feet size. The Village's 2035 Land Use Plan shows that the property shall be Low Density Residential, 19,000 square feet to 1.49 acres in size. The Final Plat meets or exceeds the requirements of the Land Use Plan.

The layout for Bluffside Subdivision is for 19 units at approximately 1.26 dwelling units per acre. This overall subdivision plan does have approximately 2.9 acres of open space for an overall open space percentage of 12.15%. The Developer is asking for a waiver to the 40% Open Space rule. The Developer stated the owner is looking into ways to make the southern 17.2-acre parcel into Park or Conservancy as it is in the Primary Environmental Corridor. If this land was an Outlot, a waiver would not be required. If the concept plan is acceptable to the Plan Commission and Village Board then the Developer will need to submit for a Final Plat.

The Plan Commission and Village Board will need to approve a waiver modification for a Subdivision with less than 40% Open Space.

6C. Commission Deliberation

None.

Motion by Weatherston to approve the Final Plat subject to the following:

- A Pre-Development agreement needs to be entered into.
- A Developer's Agreement will need to be signed prior to final approval.
- Final Plat is subject to Engineering review comments and technical corrections from Village staff and Racine County staff.
- Approving the Open Space waiver modification.
- All new Lots will need to connect to Sanitary Sewer and Water facilities.
- An approved stormwater management and grading plan will be needed.
- Any Easements required by the Utility District.
- The Bluffside Final Plat must conform to all Ordinances in Titles 9, 14, & 18 as necessary.

Seconded by Knitter

ROLL CALL

Jim Dobbs	Aye
Thomas Knitter	Aye
Trustee Weatherston	Aye
Tim Just	Aye
Joseph Minorik	Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

6D. ZONING CODE DISCUSSION – Review draft Chapters 7, 8, 9, & 17 of the Village of Caledonia Zoning Code.

Peter Wagner read from his report:

Background: When the Town of Caledonia became the Village of Caledonia in 2005, the Village adopted Racine County’s Zoning Code as their own. Since that time, the Village has amended its code several times and has created zoning code Title 16. As a result, staff has had to reference both Title 16 of the Village Code and Racine County’s Zoning Code that was adopted in 2005 when applying the zoning code for development projects and code enforcement. This split in regulations is difficult for developers, residents, and businesses to understand what the rules and regulations are for the Village. Staff has been working on merging the two code sections into one unified Village code Title. This process has been more time consuming than originally anticipated.

Staff has prepared draft Chapters 7, 8, 9, & 17 for review and discussion. Chapter topics for discussion will be:

- Chapter 7: Planned Unit Development Districts
- Chapter 8: Nonconforming Uses, Structures, & Lots
- Chapter 9: Conditional Uses
- Chapter 17: Changes & Amendments

The purpose of this agenda item to review and discuss the content of the chapters and answer questions or take suggestions as to what should be and not be included in these chapters. No action is required at this time. Over the next few Plan Commission meetings, staff will be presenting new chapters for your review and input. It is anticipated that the Title 16 will include eighteen chapters. Some of the chapters have few, if any, changes, and others will have significant changes or reorganization than what currently exists.

6D. Commission Deliberation

Plan Commission Members asked how many Planned Unit Development’s (PUD’s) does the Village have? Wagner said there are approximately 35 PUD’s. Chapter 8 – the only change for additions and rebuilds so that the 50% rebuild rule will change. Chapter 17 (Sec.16-17-2 General Amendment Procedure)– the Plan Commission directed staff to include language that would allow flexibility for the Village to rezone areas of the Village not in line with property boundaries. Consider reviewing near or adjoining municipalities how Conditions of Approval / Special Conditions are provided.

Motion: None needed.

7. - Adjournment

**Plan Commission Meeting
Monday, June 28, 2021**

Motion by to adjourn Trustee Weatherston. Seconded by Just. Motion carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Erika Waege
Administrative Assistant Building/Engineering