

# DRAFT

**Village of Bristol Plan Commission Meeting and Public Hearing  
Bristol Municipal Building 19801 83<sup>rd</sup> Street, Bristol, WI 53104  
Tuesday, January 28, 2025  
Minutes**

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairman John Boldt at 7:00 p.m.. Commissioner Chris Leker, JoAnn Bolton, Ruth Atwood, Amy Klemko and William Niederer were all present. Also present were Village Planner Dominic Marlow, Village Administrator Randy Kerkman, Applicant Cory Mauer, Civil Engineer John Kastner, Plan Commission Secretary Renee Brickner and 6 constituents.
2. Approval of Minutes:  
motion was made by Commissioner Atwood and seconded by Commissioner Leker to approve the minutes of the November 26, 2024, Plan Commission Meeting. The motion was carried unanimously.
3. Chairperson's Comments:
4. Citizen's Comments: None
5. Unfinished Business: None.
6. Public Hearing: None.
7. New Business:
  - a. Discuss and consider for approval the request of Cory Maurer, CJMB Properties LLC 8950 222<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Salem, WI 53168 (Owner/Applicant) and Mike Sainski, NextGen Construction Inc., 23662 122<sup>nd</sup> Street, Trevor, WI 53179 (Agent) for a Site Plan Review Application (including Landscape, Lighting and Architectural Plans) on tax parcel 37-4-121-172-0201, on approximately 6.17 acres located in part of the Northeast ¼ Northwest ¼ of Sec 17, Town 1, Range 21, Village of Bristol, Kenosha County, Wisconsin. For informational purposes this property is located at 8555 194<sup>th</sup> Avenue in the Village of Bristol, WI.

**John Kastner, Civil Engineer**, stated that they are looking to make improvements and add additional multi-use storage facilities to the backside of the current property including pavement upgrades and adding storm water management and utilities appropriate for the development.

**Chairman Boldt** stated that in looking at this it looks like they basically are two separate businesses. He indicated he assumes they are going to be leased or rented storage units.

**John Kastner** stated that is correct.

**Chairman Boldt** asked if it was going to be under one ownership.

**John Kastner** confirmed it will be under the same ownership of the existing building.

**Dominic Marlow, Village Planner**, this is an application for a Site Plan Review indicating there is no zoning change being requested. He stated that the proposed use is for mini-warehousing being added to a M-2 heavy manufacturing district for general industrial

development. He indicated the subject property is approximately 6.15 acres with 3 access points along frontage along 194<sup>th</sup> Avenue with no change to the asphalt driveways with culvert and ditch. He stated the site contains a 65,00 sq ft building and parking lot with two separate parking areas and loading zones. He stated the site contains wetlands on the southeast portion of the site and vegetated area to the rear of the site. He stated the significant uses are warehousing and manufacturing at Beauti-Vue and Addicted to Deals. He stated that the adjacent property to the north is vacant and zoned M-2, to the east there is conservancy and zoned C-2, to the south is the Village of Bristol Veteran Park property zoned PR-1, and industrial to the west which is zoned M-2. He indicated that the applicant is proposing to construct 3 mini-warehouse structures connected by a new asphalt driveway extension from the northern parking lot and loading area. He indicated that there is utility extensions proposed from the right of way for water and sanitary services connecting to the existing water main and sewer line along 194<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He stated there is no new parking proposed, indicating the new driveway is 42ft wide traveling east to west and 60 ft wide traveling north to south making the area adequate for turning around. He indicated that the three proposed buildings are 8,820 sq ft, 11,970 sq. ft and 7,481 sq. ft.. Each building includes a restroom and expandable dividing walls, and a metal panel roof. He stated that a prairie seed mix is proposed for the 28,767 sq. ft. of the site surrounding the improvements. He indicated that the proposed landscape surface ratio for the site was shared. He stated that mini-warehouses are listed as permitted use in the M-2 Heavy Manufacturing District and the building is 22ft 7 inches tall and all setbacks and dimensional requirements conform indicating the closest setback is on the north at 26.6 ft. He indicated there are specific performance standards in which he did not call any of them out indicating he did not see anything he was concerned about. He mentioned that the architectural plan is consistent with the Village of Bristol Comprehensive Plan. He indicated there is a letter in shared correspondence showing an exemption from the US Army Corps of Engineers and the DNR from wetlands mitigation which permits construction activities and that Bristol's Wetland Protection Standards do not apply. He stated that in terms of landscape buffers he indicated that even though this is a land re-development of an existing site as a construction of new structures on the site the Site plan review process does require certain bufferyards. He indicated there are no zoning bufferyards required because of the adjacent zoning district but there is a street bufferyard required and stated that staff is recommending the application submit a landscape plan showing a street bufferyard with the intensity Factor 2 or greater along 194<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He indicated that some of the existing trees may count towards the required bufferyard. He stated that he was not going to get into emergency vehicle access as the building location conforms to a logical layout in the same parking lot. He stated that building separation is being deferred to the Building Inspector for appropriate building separation indicating there will be a conversation with the fire and building inspector on this issue. He stated that there is no new loading facility proposed as the existing loading serves the existing principal structure and does not appear to be impacted. He indicated there are no issues with consistency with the zoning code. He indicated that he did want to note for the Plan Commission's awareness that Attorney Alan Harvey did talk about Act 67 and the zoning code re-write, as well as conditional uses and things that cannot be required by the Village anymore stating that Part 13 is still in the old zoning code. He stated that the idea of consistency with the intent of the comprehensive plan is something

that we are not going to including as something that can affect approval of site plans in the future and he wanted to bring it up now, Act 67 procludes the Village from making zoning revisions based on comprehensive planning which is why it is more important to focus on that during the re-zoning decisions not during site plan review. He indicated if there were any questions about that he could discuss that further. He stated that this is something that is not going to appear on our site plan reviews in the future. He stated that the recommendation is for conditional approval with a revised bufferyard along 194<sup>th</sup> Avenue with Intensity Factor 2 or greater. He stated that there is no proposed signs on the property indicating if there is a need for signs those sign permit applications get submitted to the Village.

**Commissioner Leker** had a question as to what is considered as mini storage as apposed to the next level of storage.

**Dominic Marlow** stated that he does not believe the zoning code has a size-based difference indicating it is not mini storage it is mini warehousing, and mini storage is multiple units versus a warehouse where there is a large structure.

**Commissioner Klemko** stated that there was a new word in the documents, bio-retention. She indicated that she knows what a retention pond basin is, but she did not know what a bio-retention pond basin was, so she did research and asked why the developer is going with a bio-retention basin instead of a regular retention basin.

**John Kastner** stated they are going with a bio-retention basin to clean the water, so it reduces the total suspended solids. He indicated the other difference is that they have it in the northwest corner which is a really small area with the grade changes and to get a pond in there would be pretty cumbersome especially when we are trying to maintain the one year and the two-year storm events for the Des Plaines stormwater requirements. He indicated the bio-retention basin allows them to minimize those footprints and also hit those stormwater requirements versus digging down and having a basin at a 4 ft deep wet basin.

**Commissioner Klemko** asked if they were costly with the vegetation and maintenance on them. She indicated that from what she read they are and being back in that area she does not think there is a need for it as it will be butt up to a tree line there. She stated that she went over there to look mainly because there had been so much wind and there was garbage everywhere in the back that had blown down and was caught by the trees. She asked what that is going to be like having all that vegetation.

**John Kastner** indicated that was a good question and stated that with any stormwater management structure or facility whether it is a wet basin or a bio-retention basin there is a maintenance agreement that has to be worked out which requires annual inspection that includes correction and cleaning that up as needed. He stated that with the bio-retention basin one of the ways we potentially do a more traditional wet pond is we were working with the Engineer and talking about if there were a way to come back from exceptions for the one year or two year requirements from the stormwater management indicating they were very close with those things, but the way the requirements say we had to design it for this. He stated that they definitely did look into that.

**Commissioner Klemko** asked why the one across the street did not have to do that, indicating she saw they have a regular retention basin along the road.

**John Kastner** stated he would have to look at that in more detail about whether they have more space, or whether it is less graded, which those may be the potential reasons.

**Chairman Boldt** had a question on the landscaping as to where the landscaping would go. **Dominic Marlow** showed the property line on the overhead photo indicating where the specific depth was and stating that he believes there are exceptions allowed to that depth and the bufferyard.

**Chairman Boldt** asked if you would be able to see the landscaping from the new construction.

**Dominic Marlow** indicated you would see the new construction from the street stating that street buffers are intended to buffer the appearance of industrial facilities from public view.

**Chairman Boldt** asked if they have to put landscaping across the front of the existing building.

**Dominic Marlow** stated yes indicating that any redevelopment of a property under site plan review requires the property to be brought to conformance with the Village's site plan standards. He stated that the M-2 district allows for a lot of exceptions as in they don't have to conform with architectural plans, they don't have to minimize the number of principal structures on the subject property, there are a lot of exceptions, but landscaping is one of those that does not have an exception.

**Chairman Boldt** asked if they have to put landscaping across north property line.

**Dominic Marlow** stated they do not, it is only a street bufferyard not a zoning bufferyard requirement indicating there is already some landscaping that looks pretty good but does not quite meet the amount required.

**Chairman Boldt** stated that if the new construction was abutting the street, then he would say do the landscaping, but it is set way in the back and the only thing you are going to see is what you see now as in the existing building. He asked if it is all going to be warehousing, there is not going to be any manufacturing allowed in those smaller units.

**Dominic Marlow** confirmed that it is true.

**Commissioner Leker** asked why they chose to do the entire thing in short prairie seed instead of regular grass for the rest of the property.

**John Kastner** stated he believed it was for low maintenance after it was established indicating he would have to check with their landscape architect.

**Commissioner Leker** stated that it would seem like more maintenance to him to try to get the prairie seed to grow. He indicated that he was curious about the six-inch water service going back there in terms of the size.

**John Kastner** stated that they are still kind of working through the design with their mechanical, electric and plumbing contractors indicating that the six-inch is kind of a place holder for right now and once the building design gets finalized and submitted, we will verify if that needs to be six-inch, four-inch or some other size.

**Chairman Boldt** asked if the new storage units are sprinklered.

**John Kastner** indicated they were not.

**Chairman Boldt** stated if he remembers right the big building is sprinklered to which the answer was yes.

**Commissioner Klemko** asked if parking was going to change at all, asking if they will still have the same amount of parking in which the answer was the parking will stay the same.

A motion was made by Commissioner Leker and was seconded by Commissioner Bolton to recommend to the Village Board **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL** of the request of Cory Maurer, CJMB Properties LLC, 8950 222<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Salem, WI 53168 (Owner/Applicant) and Mike Sainski, NextGen Construction Inc., 23662 122<sup>nd</sup> Street, Trevor, WI 53179 (Agent) for a Site Plan Review Application (including Landscape, Lighting and Architectural Plans) on tax parcel 37-4-121-172-0201, based on the application and supporting documents submitted, the written review of Strand Associates dated January 21, 2025, the Memorandum of GRAEF dated January 21, 2025 and subject to the following:

- 1) The Applicant shall submit a revised landscape plan showing a street bufferyard with Intensity Factor 2 or greater along 194th Ave;
- 2) The Applicant shall apply and receive approval for any proposed signs before installing signs on the Subject Property;
- 3) Any and all technical deficiencies shall be corrected;
- 4) All applicable Village of Bristol application and review fees shall be paid by the applicant;
- 5) The Applicant shall address any other issues which are raised by an approving or objecting authority, which the Village Plan Commission and/or Village Board deem necessary for the applicant to address in the application materials, and which have been made, or may be made, by the Village Administrator, Village Attorney, Village Engineer, and Village Planner; and
- 6.) The distance between the existing building and the new building shall be 10 feet and 1 inch as required by the Village Fire Chief.

The motion was carried unanimously.

8. Next Plan Commission Meeting is scheduled for February 25, 2025.
9. A motion was made by Commissioner Bolton and seconded by Commissioner Klemko to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 p.m..

Respectfully Submitted,

Plan Commission Secretary Renee Brickner