

Springfield Plan Commission Meeting
Springfield Town Hall
Monday, May 2, 2011 @ 7:30 p.m.

Call to order, Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chair Jeff Gabrysiak. Scott Laufenberg, George Pasdirtz, Jeff Endres, Jim Pulvermacher, Karen Crook and Elliott Long, Attorney Mark Hazelbaker, Engineer Joe DeYoung (MSA) and Office Assistant Jan Barman were present. Also present: Alan Main, Rod Zubella, Pat O'Connor, Gary Pivotto, Bob Barmish, Chuck Elliott, Duane Wagner, Scott Button, Mark Lanham, William Scott and Don Hoffman. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Confirmation of Compliance with Open Meetings Law

Office Assistant Jan Barman reported that notice of this meeting was met by posting at the Town Hall, corner of CTH K and Church Roads, Bong Excavating on Schneider Rd and on the website.

Minutes for April 11, 2011

Motion (Pulvermacher/Endres) to approve the April 11, 2011 minutes. Motion carried, 7 – 0.

Informal Public Comment Time - None

Jeff Gabrysiak explained that because he lives in this subdivision, he was excusing himself from the commission and Jeff Endres (Vice-Chair) would be conducting the meeting.

Jeff Endres explained the order of the meeting as follows:

1. Applicant
2. Plan Commission
3. Town Professionals
4. Audience
5. Discussion P C
6. Vote

Atty Hazelbaker explained that the Plan Commission does not have to agree to changes to the vision corner just because the water feature is in the right of way, this is a self-made hardship and not the responsibility of the commission or the board to correct for that reason. If the structure had not been constructed would you grant a variance for it now?

Discuss & Take Action: Vision corner for Bridle Ridge subdivision, Pat O'Connor agent, Grand Development LLC and Engineer Rod Zubella (Vierbeicher). Pat O'Connor explained the request to reduce the vision corner from the original measurements to the proposed size. Pat recapped the process to date, mentioning the meeting with Town Board, and then with Renee Powers from WI Dept of Administration, Plat Review division. Ms. Powers reviewed the vision corner and explained in a letter to Noa Prieve (Williamson Surveying Co) that it could be modified if all the steps to do so were followed. This letter was included in the commissioner's packet. The standards for a vision corner stated are for a minimum size. Mr Zubella (Engineer for Town of Middleton, also) pointed out that the requested size meets their standards.

Jeff Endres stated that the vision safety was thoroughly considered when platted. One of the reasons was if Vosen Road is realigned in the future because of possible development in that area.

Jim Pulvermacher (on Town Board when subdivision was approved) stated that we went through great pains on the vision corners taking into account the speeds of the roads, a lot of study and site visits with these intersections were done and that is the reason for this size of vision corner. All 3 entrances have different vision corners. Pat O'Connor explained that a vision triangle and intersection sight distance = a vision corner. The current vision corner is 132 x 411' and the request is for 75 x 150' which is the minimum standard. George Pasdirtz asked how much of the water feature is in the right of way, about 1/3 was the answer.

Rod Zubella stated DOT standards do and have changed thru the years.

Karen Crook asked about the entrance feature and that there were 3 on the plans for signage. She was surprised by the size of it, it is a lot more than just signage and asked Joe DeYoung about it. MSA was not the engineering firm for this subdivision, Foth & VanDyke were and he could not answer for them. But Joe did state that the town does not have a standard for vision corners and can follow AASHTO as well as DOT and that the modification being requested is for the minimum standard. Also, to consider if a controlled or uncontrolled intersection (stop or yield sign).

Elliott Long asked about the amount of encroachment – not sure was the answer.

George asked for a clarification from Atty Hazelbaker as to what the P C responsibility is? Responsibility to do what is in the public interest, the issue is not about the feature and the burden on Mr. O'Connor to remove it or not. If not obstructing motorists – may grant a variance. Over engineered originally as Pat suggested is not the issue as we do not have the answer to why it was platted the way it was and we shouldn't be second guessing.

Audience:

Alan Main, Champions Run– topography, the ups/down, curves, etc have to be considered and a minimum standards was increased for safety (FDM 11- Ch. 10) Aesthetics need to be considered, public works improvements, efficiency. Road may be different in 40 years but the development will still be there, long-term planning went into this for a reason. Why was it graded and fencing installed outside the platted vision corner measurements, if Mr. O'Connor didn't know the setbacks. Lessening any distances is not in the public's safety and is changing their personal interest in the subdivision that he purchased. Not an improvement to the safety of the public but a taking from this safety. Suggestion of checking with a traffic expert.

Bob Barmish – Lives on Winners Cir to Bridle Ridge Pass to get to Vosen Road but doesn't use this entrance to turn left onto Bridle Ridge Pass if driving north on Vosen as it is too dangerous. He stated this change to Champions Run would make two unsafe intersections, (7-22-09) reaffirmed document. Leave this vision corner as is.

Scott Button lives on Champions Run and has a young family who walk and bike through this entrance and feels it is safe and would be ok if a variance was granted.

Gary Pivotto also Champions Run- request should be granted, feels it is safe.

Don Hoffman – remembers that the main concern was the Bridle Ridge Pass intersection and made a large vision corner for this reason and followed thru to the other two.

Jeff G – agrees with Don – Bridle Ridge Pass was the main concern.

Chuck Elliott, Champions Run, has built 3 homes in this development, the developer has gone out of his way to work with the residents on the water feature but wishes it would get done and this issue would be put to rest. Leave vision as it is.

Mark Lanham – asked what the sight distance should be 10' or 15' – what should it be – 57' was answered.

William Scott, Winners Cir, agrees that top of hill turning left into development is dangerous and that Champions Run is safer.

Barmish – margin of safety and being smarter than the DOT standards.

Main – Plan Commission in the position to make a decision on whether this intersection will be safer or less safer?

Pat – 75 X 150' no visible impediment

Comments from Atty Hazelbaker: Never a good idea to give away land (which is what the town would be doing), there was a reason why it was granted this way 7 years ago, don't undermine your creditability. You should have had, fast evidence why it was adopted originally, don't second guess why or what was done then.

Jim – Plan Commission should be looking at what was approved originally, if we will amend the plat.

George – study the Bridle Ridge Pass entrance and make this safer. Information might be available from Foth & VanDyke or is this an issue for the Town Board?

Karen drove in and out of this intersection numerous times and did not feel it was unsafe. But now she is confused on what the issue is, because the application packet did not reflect on this and would like to have had some comments/direction from Atty Hazelbaker in advance of this meeting. She is not comfortable voting on this at this time.

Jeff E – 1. Was platted subdivision and knew what was there 2. Intent of large vision triangle facts needed. 3. Plan Commission and Town Board took this plat very seriously as it was the first one we had since the mid-1970's. 4. As a town we should not give anything away - questions our creditability. Get Foth & Van Dyke info if possible.

Atty Hazelbaker – Foth & VanDyke info to P C and T B and have a site visit, Joe should be there with a big stick not to beat us with but to measure distances and see what the facts are and where to go from that point.

Jeff E – will need to see something earth shattering to change his mind from this original platted vision corner.

Karen – engineer report to Joe to review and site visit.

Pat asked would the public interest be served and safety issue reserved?

Motion (Crook/Pasdirtz) to table this request to allow for a site visit for the Plan Commission and Town Board and Joe DeYoung, get Foth & VanDyke plans to Joe, to answer our questions. George added a friendly amendment to consider the Bride Ridge Pass intersections also. After some discussion, some felt it was not fair to Pat to review both intersections as he would be charged for that and it was not an issue before the commission. Friendly amendment changed to include the full intersections report.

Motion carried, 6 – 0.

A site visit date was set for Wednesday, May 25 at 6:00 p.m. and the Town Board and Joe DeYoung should attend if possible.

Jeff Gabrysiak returned to the Chair duties.

Discuss and Take Action: FUDA Public Participation Plan

The purpose of this plan is to get the public involved in Future Urban Development Area. Motion (Laufenberg/Crook) to approve the FUDA Public Participation Plan. Motion carried, 7 – 0.

Chair and Vice Chair positions

Chair position was opened to nominations, Jim Pulvermacher nominated Jeff Gabrysiak. Motion (Pulvermacher/Endres) to approve Jeff Gabrysiak as chair. Motion carried, 6 – 0 with Jeff Gabrysiak abstaining.

Vice-Chair position was opened to nominations, Jim Pulvermacher nominated Jeff Endres. Motion (Pulvermacher/Gabrysiak) to approve Jeff Endres as Vice-Chair. Motion carried, 6 – 0 with Jeff Endres abstaining.

Committee Reports – None

Office Assistant's Report – None

Adjourn

Motion (Endres/Crook) to adjourn at 9:35 p.m. Motion carried, 7 – 0.

Jan Barman
Office Assistant