

MINUTES OF THE  
OAK CREEK PLAN COMMISSION MEETING  
TUESDAY, AUGUST 26, 2014

Mayor Steve Scaffidi called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The following Commissioners were present at roll call: Commissioner Dickmann, Commissioner Johnston, Commissioner Carrillo, Alderman Bukiewicz, Alderman Guzikowski, Commissioner Correll, Commissioner Siepert and Commissioner Chandler. Also present were Kari Papelbon, Planner, and Assistant Fire Chief Mike Kressuk.

Commissioner Dickmann moved to approve the minutes of the August 12, 2014 meeting. Commissioner Siepert seconded. Roll call: All voted aye. Motion carried.

**Significant Common Council Actions**

There were no comments or concerns from the Commission.

**Plan Review**

**Wisconsin Granite Depot  
6720 S. 27<sup>th</sup> Street  
Tax Key No. 737-9038**

Ms. Papelbon described the proposed plans, noting that there was a paved area extension included in the Plan Commission packet that has since been removed. The area which is currently paved now shows some pervious area restored. Although it does say there are stalls for 64 vehicles, 58 stalls are shown.

Mayor Scaffidi confirmed that the first approved addition of 6,704 square feet was not constructed yet, and the applicant is asking for a second addition of 7,712 square feet, which calls into the question the number of parking spots that are available on the site. There are also screening issues with the loading dock. Mayor Scaffidi asked if the applicant was aware of these issues. Representatives confirmed that they were.

Steve Sharpe, architect, stated that after the approval for the first addition, and much discussion with their marketing people, the applicant decided that the approved addition was not sufficient because their business is growing and they need more space to display their products. Mr. Sharpe noted that nothing has changed as far as the number of employees and expected customers. Most of their customer base is by appointment. They may get 10 customers a day in the building, but never all at once. This is why they felt comfortable when the parking requirements were reduced last time to 59 spaces.

Mr. Sharpe stated that after extensive review, he calculated 33.1% of green space or pervious area on the property. The paved coverage area is 24,720 square feet. The proposed open space at 60.15% meets the requirement. He stated that all requirements are met except for parking.

Ms. Papelbon stated that she spoke with the City's Environmental Engineer and he calculated the green space versus lot coverage and came up with, at most, just about 30%. Based on what the original plans were (showing less than 30%) and the estimates, they just barely met the requirements. There were some questions about that, and it was the City's Environmental

Engineer who stated that there was not 33% green space on the lot. Mr. Sharpe responded that the total land area is 91,396.08 square feet, the proposed building area is 36,416 square feet, and 39.84% lot coverage. There is 54,980 square feet of open space. The paved area came out to 24,720 square feet, which comes out to a pervious area of 30,260 square feet or 33.1%. Ms. Papelbon stated that there would have to be some discussions to get the correct number.

Commissioner Correll stated that he never sees a lot of cars in that parking lot, and does not have an issue with the proposed number of parking spaces. He stated that screening is an issue, and they need to meet the 30%.

Mr. Sharpe stated that they had a requirement before to have 50% opacity screening facing the Menard's parking lot. To have a loading dock there is like seeing one of their trucks coming around the building. He does not see the need for that screening to be constructed of a similar material as the building and 100% opacity. Ms. Papelbon clarified that based on the Code, the screening is to be fully opaque landscaping or a wall to match the building.

Alderman Bukiewicz stated his biggest concern was the fence coming down on the north end of the property and how it affects the neighbors. Commissioner Dickmann asked if the neighbors were okay with the fence. Bob Givens, 6711 S. 26<sup>th</sup> Street, stated he is very happy with the fence. He did not want to see a parking lot and crates if that fence was taken down. He does not see a problem with removing the wood fence if they will be looking at a building.

Commissioner Dickmann asked if any space would be lost because of the construction on 27<sup>th</sup> Street. Ms. Papelbon stated that she does not know what the plans are for the 27<sup>th</sup> Street construction. The issue is the CSM that is on file from 2006 has a different acreage than what is being used as a basis for the square footage for the property. This may be where some of the discrepancy in calculations is coming from.

Alderman Bukiewicz agreed that there are not a lot of customers at one given time. As long as the neighbors are okay, he does not have an issue with this parking.

Asst. Fire Chief Kressuk stated that even the current setup is not good for a turnaround. He stated that they are in the process of coming up with a reasonable solution. One of the Fire Department's concerns for fire risk is having access around the east side of the building to reach those vehicles. Moving the dock into that one-way lane creates a new dynamic. When you reach a certain length of a one-way access road, you have to have a Fire Department-approved turnaround. Currently there is no good way to do this. The solution currently under discussion involves a Y-turn around a loading dock. The architect is aware that this is a work in progress, and there might be some adjustment to the parking islands which will affect parking spaces. The southernmost island is a turn they may ask to have removed just for access for the turnaround.

Mr. Kressuk stated that the owner should be aware that the loading docks, except for the drive down loading dock, must remain clear because they are turnaround areas. Because the buildings are fully sprinklered, they can be further away from access roads. The north side of that structure creates some issues. The architect is aware that an additional fire hydrant and sidewalks may be required.

Mr. Kressuk stated his concern about changes in occupancy, and that materials maybe stored with a different hazard level than stone. When the City works around the edges of the Code to make sure than the design is done properly and maintain fire protection, the next occupant can

run into some issues because the Fire Department may require different things then.

Commissioner Correll stated his concern that there be no outside storage. Mr. Sharpe stated that the paved area that they were leaving before for future parking has been proposed to be completely removed in favor of planting grass and adding landscaping so it is more aesthetically pleasing to the people to the northeast and to the north.

Commissioner Johnston asked how the materials are delivered to the site. Mr. Sharpe stated they come by 44' long trucks and take no more than three hours to unload them and then they are gone. There is nothing in the loading dock until the next container comes.

Commissioner Dickmann asked where snow would be stored. Mr. Sharpe stated there is plenty of room on the north side of the building.

Commissioner Chandler asked if the additions were for material storage or customers. Mr. Sharpe stated the new proposed addition will take the place of the first one for storage of materials that are currently outside. The approved addition is for display purposes.

Commissioner Siepert asked if the new buildings would require a sprinkler system. Asst. Chief Kressuk stated the current structure is sprinklered and the additions would also require fire suppression.

Ms. Papelbon asked the applicant where the dumpster would be located. Mr. Sharpe responded that presently it is located on one of the loading docks, but will eventually be located inside the loading dock area.

Ms. Papelbon stated her concern about the change in occupancy. With the reduction in parking spaces, and building out this site with no possibility for future parking or future addition, it does limit the use of the property. That is why there are such strict conditions for granting a reduction in the parking, and the requirement to show where future parking may go.

Asst. Chief Kressuk asked about the storage of combustible waste inside the structure, such as package-type material. Mr. Sharpe stated it would be strictly granite and stone products. Mr. Sharpe stated all the packaging is in wooden crates and they are taken away by truck. Asst. Chief Kressuk stated that every business has some waste (combustible product) material and trash. Ms. Papelbon stated that an outside dumpster would require an enclosure. Mr. Sharpe suggested putting a dumpster with an enclosure on the southeast corner of the property. Ms. Papelbon responded that as long as the Fire Department is okay with the location, it is screened with an acceptable material, trucks have access to it, it is not overflowing, and is not on the property line, this would be an acceptable location.

Asst. Chief Kressuk stated that there was fencing material originally shown in the plan. The fencing cannot be connected to the structure for Fire Department access issues. Mr. Sharpe stated the fencing is only on the south border.

Ms. Papelbon stated the key items regarding this approval: they have to meet building codes including Fire Department turnaround on the property, specify a minimum number of parking stalls, the vegetative screening on the south would be addressed by submitting a landscaping plan to Community Development prior to building permits, 30% open space requirement verified by the Engineering Department, all technical corrections to be made to the plan so that it actually shows correct numbers, and a stipulation that no fencing is connected to the building.

After lengthy discussion on several outstanding issues, Alderman Bukiewicz suggested that this be worked out with Planning staff and that the applicant come back to the Plan Commission with a more complete picture. Mayor Scaffidi concurred with this recommendation.

This item was held for the September 9, 2014 Plan Commission meeting.

Commissioner Carrillo moved to adjourn. Commissioner Siefert seconded. On roll call: all voted aye. Meeting was adjourned at 6:58 p.m.