

CITY OF WHITEWATER
PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION
Whitewater Municipal Building Community Room
December 14, 2009

**ABSTRACTS/SYNOPSIS OF THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE OFFICIAL
ACTIONS OF THE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION**

Chairperson Torres called the meeting of the Plan and Architectural Review Commission to order at 6:10 p.m.

PRESENT: Zaballos, Binnie, Dalee, Torres, Miller, Coburn. ABSENT: Stone. OTHERS: Wally McDonell/City Attorney, Mark Roffers/City Planner, Bruce Parker/Zoning Administrator, Wegner/Secretary.

HEARING OF CITIZEN COMMENTS. This is a time in the agenda where citizens can voice their concerns. They are given three minutes to talk. No formal Plan Commission Action will be taken during this meeting although issues raised may become a part of a future agenda. Items on the agenda may not be discussed at this time.

There were no comments.

REPORTS:

- a. Report from Community Development Authority Representative. Tom Miller reported that CDA had a presentation of the new Tech Building by the Architect. They recommended to the City Council to borrow TID infrastructure money. They had a presentation from Inn Development and Management for a study to build a new hotel in Whitewater.
- b. Report from Tree Commission Representative. No Report. Tom Miller explained that there no longer was a Tree Commission and a new committee had been formed. Plan Commission is to have a representative on that committee.
- c. Report from Park and Recreation Board Representative. No Report.
- d. Report from City Council Representative. Lynn Binnie reported that the City Council was to have a second reading on the ordinance to abolish the Tree Commission and start the new Urban Forestry Commission. If the ordinance passes, the new group will need a representative from the Plan Commission to be appointed. Binnie mentioned that when the Plan Commission schedule was changed in order to avoid having Plan Commission meetings in the same week as the Common Council, it was not noted that sometimes the second Monday and third Tuesday are in the same week. City Council passed the budget; and they had a discussion of the downtown parking issues, for example possibly changing the parking on North Street to no longer be two hour parking.
- e. Report from the Downtown Whitewater Inc. Board Representative. Dave Saalsaa, Design Committee Chair, stated that they finished the Tainted Love project with Barbara Kramer. Pinnacle Financial was coming before the Plan Commission at this meeting for their proposed awnings. They are also working with the Hale family on their Main Street project which will be coming to the Plan Commission at a later date.

f. Report from staff. Zoning Administrator Bruce Parker explained that he had put calendars in the last Plan Commission packet and that there are less conflicting weeks for the Plan Commission and City Council in 2010.

g. Report from chair. No report.

MINUTES. There were some minor corrections to the some of the following minutes. Moved by Zaballos and Coburn to approve the minutes of January 28, 2008. Motion approved by unanimous voice vote. Moved by Zaballos and Coburn to approve the minutes of February 25, 2008 with the corrections as made at the meeting. Motion approved by unanimous voice vote. Moved by Zaballos and Torres to approve the minutes of March 24, 2008 with the corrections as made at the meeting. Motion approved by unanimous roll call vote. Moved by Zaballos and Torres to approve the minutes of April 7, 2008 with corrections as made at the meeting. Motion approved by unanimous voice vote. Moved by Zaballos and Coburn to approve the minutes of September 21, 2009 with the corrections as made at the meeting. Motion approved by unanimous voice vote. Moved by Zaballos and Coburn to approve the minutes of November 9, 2009. Motion approved by unanimous roll call vote.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION TO INCREASE THE STREET YARD SETBACK TO BUILD A NEW HOME IN THE MIDDLE OF THE LOT AT 503 S. FRANKLIN STREET FOR THAYER AND ANNE COBURN. Chairperson Torres opened the public hearing for the consideration of a conditional use permit application to increase the street yard setback to build a new home in the middle of the lot at 503 S. Franklin Street for Thayer and Anne Coburn.

Zoning Administrator Bruce Parker explained that this property is located at the intersection of S. Franklin Street, W. Ann Street and W. Walworth Ave. It is a very large lot that goes all the way back to Cravath Lake. The Coburn's would like to build somewhere within the x'd area in about the middle of the huge lot. The Whitewater Zoning Ordinance allows setbacks to be increased or decreased with Plan Commission approval. If he can't build in that area, Thayer Coburn did not want to go to the trouble and expense of having plans drawn up. This area is well out of the 100 year flood boundary line. The land from the 100 year flood boundary line to the lake cannot be built on. There are three lots that this property goes behind that might be able to see the proposed home, but due to the landscaping of their yards, they will not see much. The driveway will come off Franklin Street, go past the red barn and angle toward where the house will be placed. Parker recommended approval with the placement of the home subject to staff approval.

Thayer Coburn explained that it is a level lot and it presented challenges for siting the house.

Plan Commission Member Coburn stated that she will be abstaining from this vote.

Chairperson Torres closed the public hearing.

Moved by Miller and Binnie to approve the conditional use permit to increase the street yard setback to build a new home in the middle of the lot at 503 S. Franklin Street for Thayer and Anne Coburn. Motion approved with all ayes except Coburn abstained.

REVIEW TWO STORY ADDITION TO THE EXISTING DUPLEX AT 124 S. PRINCE STREET (ADDING BEDROOMS AND BATHS TO EACH LEVEL MAKING EACH

UNIT 5 BEDROOMS AND TWO BATHS WITH A WASHER AND DRYER FOR EACH UNIT) FOR BOB FREIERMUTH. See next item.

REVIEW TWO STORY ADDITION TO THE EXISTING DUPLEX AT 130 S. PRINCE STREET (ADDING BEDROOMS AND BATHS TO EACH LEVEL MAKING EACH UNIT 5 BEDROOMS AND TWO BATHS WITH A WASHER AND DRYER FOR EACH UNIT) FOR BOB FREIERMUTH. See next item.

REVIEW TWO STORY ADDITION TO THE EXISTING DUPLEX AT 140 S. PRINCE STREET (ADDING BEDROOMS AND BATHS TO EACH LEVEL MAKING EACH UNIT 5 BEDROOMS AND TWO BATHS WITH A WASHER AND DRYER FOR EACH UNIT) FOR BOB FREIERMUTH. Zoning Administrator Bruce Parker explained that these three items are R-3 duplexes and are allowed up to five unrelated persons per unit. The additions will not increase the allowed number of residents. It will be a two story addition to the back of the existing building along with additional parking spaces in the back of the property. There are two units per building, each with two baths and laundry facility. The garage at 140 S. Prince Street will be removed. Strand has reviewed these projects. The properties are under one acre in size. There will be a detention area in the back. Bob Freiermuth wants to take care of his stormwater on site.

Bob Freiermuth explained that he has past examples of properties he has improved. The colors stand on their own.

The City Planners recommended approval of the plans to construct 2-story additions onto the existing duplexes at 124, 130, and 140 Prince Street, along with associated parking improvements, subject to the following conditions:

1. The project shall be constructed in accordance with the revised Site and Landscape Plan (Titled “Grading Plan”) dated 12/8/09; the Building Elevation sheets for 124, 130, and 140 Prince Street dated 10/15/09, 10/15/09, and 10/16/09, respectively; and the first and second floor plans for 124, 130, and 140 Prince Street dated 10/15/09, 10/15/09, and 10/16/09, respectively; except as changes to those plans are required to meet the conditions that follow.
2. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Site and Landscape Plan (Titled “Grading Plan”) shall be revised and resubmitted for City staff approval, including the following changes:
 - a. Specify that any excess gravel areas that are not paved will be restored to landscaped green space (gravel removed, topsoil added, and seeded).
 - b. Indicate that all parking spaces will be striped and that wheel stops or other attractive barriers (e.g., boulders) will be installed at parking lot ends.
 - c. Show a different ornamental tree species instead of the Magnolia tree proposed for 124 Prince Street, drawing from the City’s landscaping guidelines as appropriate.
 - d. Indicate the size of all plantings at the time of installation, per City landscaping guidelines.
 - e. Indicate that the property owner will install additional street trees between the sidewalk and the curb, such that street trees are spaced no further apart than 1 tree for every 35 feet along the entire frontage of the three properties, selecting species that will minimize future interference with power lines in the future and which are approved by the City Forester.

- f. Label that the fences surrounding the dumpsters will be completely opaque on all four sides, including the gate.
 - g. Indicate any changes to the stormwater management components of the plan, as recommended by the City engineering consultant.
3. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the floor plans for 140 Prince Street shall be revised and resubmitted for City staff approval to clearly show two windows on each floor of the rear wall.
 4. Prior to the issuance of any building permits for 124 Prince Street or 140 Prince Street, respectively, the applicant shall provide evidence of a recorded shared driveway agreement between 124 Prince Street and the property to its north, and between 140 Prince Street and the property to its south.
 5. In the event that not all site and landscape improvements are completed before occupancy of this building, the applicant shall provide the City with a site improvement deposit in the amount of \$200 per property (\$600 total).
 6. Per the applicant's application, when the additions are constructed, the applicant shall repaint, replace old windows, and repair trim on the existing portions of the three buildings. The building additions shall be constructed with siding and colors that match the existing buildings.
 7. Per the applicant's application, occupancy shall not exceed one unrelated person per bedroom, which shall be specified in all lease agreements, and may be enforced by either the property owner or the City.

The Board suggested a different color scheme for each building. There was also concern that there were no railings shown on the plan and no roof covering at the entry ways. There was also concern of the spiral staircase as a second exit.

Bob Freiermuth explained that railings are mandated by his insurance company; and the roofing over the entry ways is appropriate. He has removed the spiral staircase because the deck is adequate for a second exit.

Zoning Administrator Bruce Parker explained that stairs over two feet in height need railings per the State Code. Also the second exit off the deck can be approved without the spiral staircase as long as the deck is no higher than 15 feet in height.

City Planner Mark Roffers suggested that a condition be added to put a shelter over each of the entry doors.

Bob Freiermuth was o.k. with City Planner Mark Roffers conditions and City Engineer Strand and Associates comments. At the 130 S. Prince Street location, they plan to save the trees by the garage. (The garage is being removed.)

Moved by Binnie and Miller to approve the proposed two-story additions to the buildings at 124, 130 and 140 S. Prince Street subject to the City Planners conditions and the addition of condition #8 that all entrance doorways will include a roof covering. Motion approved by unanimous roll call vote.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A PROPOSED PERMANENT AUTOMOBILE DISPLAY AREA TO BE LOCATED AT 1260 W. MAIN STREET (FRONT PORTION OF THE SENTRY PARKING LOT) FOR KETTERHAGEN MOTOR SALES. This item was pulled from the agenda on 12-8-09.

REVIEW PROPOSED AWNINGS TO BE LOCATED AT 109 S FIRST STREET FOR PINNACLE. Zoning Administrator Bruce Parker explained that this proposal is required to come to Plan Commission for review of any exterior alterations. The Downtown Design Committee has reviewed the project. The awnings are for over the doors of the new office area, an attorney and investment office.

Dave Saalsaa, Chairperson of the Downtown Design Committee, explained that the Committee has given approval of the two solid color awnings over the entry doors. They will be replacing the existing doors with full view glass doors which will be handicap compliant. The air conditioners will be removed; that area will be replaced with stucco and covered with the awning.

Moved by Zaballos and Binnie to approve the proposed solid colored awnings to be located at 109 S. First Street for Pinnacle. Motion approved by unanimous roll call vote.

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW OF A PROPOSED ADDITION OF A THIRD 24-UNIT APARTMENT BUILDING TO THE EXISTING 4 ACRE SITE ON W. CAINE STREET FOR SPRINGBROOK APARTMENTS LLC. Zoning Administrator Bruce Parker explained that in 2007 the Plan Commission approved two 20-unit apartment buildings. Prior to that, there were other proposals: three 22-unit apartments with a clubhouse and pool, which was denied; a minor subdivision with seven 4-unit apartment buildings, which was approved. At this time, they were requesting an additional 24-unit one bedroom apartment building.

Paul Nooyen, Springbrook LLC., explained that in 2004, they determined that they would like to utilize the property to a higher density as they have done in other communities. At this time their two apartment buildings are 95% leased out. They have found that there is less demand for the three bedroom units than the 1 and 2 bedroom units. There is a high demand for one bedroom apartments. Nooyen stated that they would agree to the recommendations of the City Planner except that they would like to keep the density a little higher than 16 units. At this time they have the landscaping and the bike path to complete. Before they did a lot of plans, they wanted to get feedback from the Plan Commission to see what direction they could go. Their two 20-unit buildings have 13 three-bedroom units (which are harder to lease), 18 two-bedroom units, and 9 one-bedroom units. There is adequate parking and an on-site manager.

City Planner Mark Roffers explained that the City of Whitewater Comprehensive Plan is going to the City Council on January 19, 2010 for adoption. The Plan Commission may want to postpone any major decisions until after the Comprehensive Plan is adopted. Caine and Gault Streets are mostly single family and duplex homes (Central Area Neighborhood). The existing housing mix is diverse. The area is 50/50 owner to renter occupied. Most buildings are single family residential and residences converted to duplexes. New projects should be considered particularly for quality and how it relates to the neighborhood. A higher density project provides traffic volume and noise. If this third building is built, it would not be in line with the neighborhood. Roffers also stated that between 2004 and 2007, the streets in that area have been upgraded. One of Roffers recommendations was to reduce the density from 24 units to 16 units. The fewer units would be in line with the almost new Comprehensive Plan. If the Plan

Commission is considering allowing the 24 units, they should think of how the applicant can help, for example, build trails etc. if the extra units are allowed (provide an amenity for the property, the neighbors and the City). It is complicated to keep plan consistency.

City Planner Mark Roffers recommendations for this possible development were that no Plan Commission action is required since the applicant has not yet submitted a formal application for a conditional use permit. However, the applicant is seeking guidance from the Plan Commission regarding whether or not the proposed building would be an appropriate use for this property. Comments and discussion by the Plan Commission are encouraged.

If a 24-unit building is not considered appropriate for this site, the Plan Commission may consider what other configuration would be appropriate? A third 20-unit building? A 16-unit building? Townhouses?

Unlike a proposal for a brand new development, this proposed building would effectively be an expansion to an already-existing development, in an area that is already zoned for and has already been conceived of as an apartment community. For these reasons we feel this is a complex situation to which there is not a clear answer. And we feel the Plan Commission has some latitude to make a decision either way about whether or not this development is appropriate.

The Board voiced concerns: has the Five Points area been environmentally cleaned up; that it was a deal, lowering the density quite a bit; the landscaping has not yet been completed; have there been any reports of traffic concerns; there would only be 24 cars with the new building; possibility of Plan Commission imposing 1 non-related person per unit;

Paul Nooyen stated that they could build the apartments to look like townhouses to make it more feasible for the developer and the City. He explained that they plan to do the landscaping all at once and will be started in the spring. The bike path will be done when they finish the top coat on the driveway/parking area.

City Planner Mark Roffers and Zoning Administrator Bruce Parker explained that neither of them had received any reports of traffic issues. Parker stated that the City of Whitewater holds a site improvement deposit for each building in order for the work to be completed. Roffers explained that the previous two buildings are R-2 and the maximum non-related persons per unit is 3. The Plan Commission could apply a non-family occupancy limit.

Plan Commission Binnie recognized the neighbors present and thought that even though this was not a public hearing, neighbors had been noticed and that the Plan Commission should ask for public comment.

Dave Jacobs, 535 S. Gault Street, lives two houses away from this complex. He stated that the apartments are well taken care of. There are no huge traffic or noise problems. Jacobs' concern is about the floodplain and its relation to the creek. When the existing apartments were built, there was fill brought in so the apartments were not in a part of the 100 year flood plain. City Planner Mark Roffers explained that the City Engineer, Strand and Associates, would be reviewing the site for water run-off, including the impervious areas such as the rooftop and driveway/parking areas.

Fred Kraege, 529 S. Gault Street, voiced concerns of previous developments in the area and the drainage issues they had. He stated that there was a fire access to the Springbrook property on the west side of the first apartment building. Now it is the entrance and exit to the property. He stated that sometimes it seems like a race track. The owners should inform the tenants. Kraege

explained that there is parking allowed on both sides of the street on Gault and Harper Streets, which makes the driving area narrow. He would like the street parking problem brought up on an agenda sometime.

Carrie Mathison, 525 W. Caine Street, stated that her house is the only other house on Caine Street other than the apartment buildings. The owners of the apartments have been cooperative. She tries to maintain her property. She is concerned that if the new apartment is built directly behind her, she will feel pushed out. When the City re-did the street, there were assessment charges for water, sewer, street and sidewalk. At that time, there were only two apartment buildings. The traffic has increased. They are student centered apartments with fast drivers. She feels that with the proposed parking spaces, there will be constant headlights at her house and her backyard will be illuminated. She has made no complaints. When the students walk past her house to and from the bars, they are noisy. There are good people in the apartments, but students have a different life style. The owners of the property are now willing to help out with a tax break. A letter was sent out to the neighbors that she had agreed to this proposal for which she felt misrepresented. If the third apartment building goes in, they can work together, but it feels like she is being pushed out. There are some nice wild life in the area (12 deer etc.) that she would hate to see disappear. Carrie Mathison also had an issue with the water. She has no basement because the water table is high there. She has a landscaped lot. The water flows down to the corner. When it rains, her front yard is flooded.

Antonette Bodar, 520 W. Caine Street, was concerned about the lack of stop signs in the area. She would like to see a stop sign on the driveway of the apartment buildings so they have to stop before they enter Caine Street. There are days when she has to wait quite a while to back out of her driveway because there is not a break in the car traffic. The apartments are nice, but she would like a stop sign coming out of the apartments.

David Behren, Springbrook and HSI Management Services, explained that they have a mix of 65% students and 35% non-students. They would like to make the impact of the new building less, by installing a berm and a 10 foot fence for privacy with landscaping. They will put up a stop sign immediately for exiting the driveway. He would be pleased to put a quasi retention pond in the front green space to direct the water to come to their property instead of the Carrie Mathison property. It would not be a full blown retention pond as they have on the other side of the property.

Paul Nooyen asked for input as to what direction to go. He didn't feel that stormwater should be a concern because it has to be right in order to proceed. The City Engineer would review the plan and they would have to follow their recommendations.

Plan Commission Member Zaballos suggested in response to City Planner Mark Roffers comments, she feels that we need to follow the draft comprehensive plan. The Plan Commission needs to be cautious about density- need to find a place that makes sense. The third building should not be made to look different than the other two buildings. They should look like they belong together. There are things that can be mitigated with overall concerns. In consideration of the comprehensive plan, the project should be made in the highest possible quality with considerations of more amenities such as the bike path, mitigating impact of the new building on the neighborhood, and taking traffic calming measures. A reasonable limitation to the greater density would be to allow up to two unrelated persons per unit.

Plan Commission Member Coburn noted that the area had been marshy and supported a lot of wildlife. She is not in favor of another building.

Chairperson Torres felt that they could work something out with the issues. Plan Commission Member Zaballos thanked the applicant for giving a lot of information to work with.

REVIEW AND DISCUSS CITY OF WHITEWATER LANDSCAPING GUIDELINES.

Plan Commission Member Zaballos suggested that this item be postponed to the next meeting to allow the training session to begin before it got too late. The Plan Commission agreed.

TRAINING DISCUSSION ON STATE COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

“CONSISTENCY” REQUIREMENT. City Planner Mark Roffers headed the training session on the roles and responsibilities of the Plan Commission. The State Laws have changed and will be significantly changed in another two weeks with the comprehensive planning and the “consistency” requirement. He suggested that any major items coming to the Plan Commission at the January 11, 2010 meeting, should be postponed until after the City Council adopts the Comprehensive Plan. It will make it easier for the Plan Commission to keep the “consistency” in their decision making. Roffers explained the reasons for community planning and the different levels of planning (State and Regional, Community Planning and Plan Implementation). He explained the “Smart Growth” legislation requires that all communities that regulate land use must have a comprehensive plan. Zoning, land division, and official map “actions” must be consistent with the plan. There are nine required elements of the comprehensive plan, which include issues and opportunities; agricultural, natural and cultural resources; land use; transportation; Utilities and community facilities; housing and neighborhood development; economic development; intergovernmental cooperation, and implementation. The City of Whitewater’s comprehensive plan identifies development and preservation areas over the next 20 years; recommends types of land uses for different properties; identifies transportation and utility improvements to serve future land use; it is the foundation for more detailed plans, zoning, and intergovernmental agreements; and makes community character, design, and sustainability recommendations. The City of Whitewater has many detailed plans that have helped in the creation of the City’s Comprehensive Plan. They include the Neighborhood Development Plans: East, West, North and South. They also include the Redevelopment/Corridor Plans, Park and Open Space Plan, TIF Plans, Action Plan for Downtown Revitalization, Sewer Service Area Plan and various utility studies and plans.

Next, The City Planner presented the Plan Implementation and the Role of the Plan Commission. The key plan implementation tools include the Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Ordinance, including extraterritorial area standard, Official Map Ordinance, Economic Development Initiatives (e.g. TIF), Grants, Capital Improvements, and ongoing development review. The role of the Plan and Architectural Review Commission is to provide advice to developers and land owners on conceptual development plans; review proposed developments; guide the preparation of the Comprehensive Plan, its detailed components and ordinances. The Plan and Architectural Review Commission has final approval authority for: site plans, conditional use permits, preliminary plat approval, certified survey maps in ETJ area, certified survey maps within City limits not involving public land dedication, and Planned Community Developments, SIP approval. The Plan and Architectural Review Commission is the recommending body to the City Council for: annexations (optional), rezoning, Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance text, final plat approval, CSMs within City limits involving public land dedication, Planned Community Developments- GDP approval, official map and amendments to it, and public land acquisition and disposal. Roffers explained the different levels of discretion the Plan Commission has in decision making.

The City Planner then discussed “consistency” and decision making. The “Consistency” Requirement is that all zoning, land division, and official map “actions” must be consistent with the comprehensive plan after January 1, 2010. A variety of local government bodies are involved with these actions. Actions that require consistency by the Plan and Architectural Review Commission and the City Council are: rezoning, Planned Unit Developments, conditional use permits, plats and CSMs, Official Map and amendments to it, site plans, and possibly land reservations, dedications, acquisitions and dispositions (especially if related to the Official Map). Actions requiring consistency by the Board of Zoning Appeals are variance requests, and appeals for zoning interpretations made by the Zoning Administrator.

The Plan and Architectural Review Commission’s role is to interpret the Comprehensive Plan and make decisions consistent with the Plan. Consistency should be evaluated and determined by the City Council, following advice from the Plan and Architectural Review Commission. In doing so, the Council and the Commission should consider benefits and detriments to the community, and the proposal’s **overall** relation to the Comprehensive Plan.

City Planner Mark Roffers gave some examples of proposals and possibilities of handling them. Roffers also gave suggestions for additional resources that could help Plan Commission Members. They include “Guide for Plan Commissioners”; Exploring the Concept of “consistency” under Wisconsin’s 1999 Comprehensive Planning Laws, by Brian Ohm; and the League of Wisconsin Municipalities.

The Board voiced concerns of: the regulation of drainage of a property; and areas that the City might be challenged on with possible decisions overturned or denied.

City Planner Mark Roffers explained that the City of Whitewater has had a Stormwater Management Ordinance for five years which requires stormwater retention. It applies only where difference in the impervious surface of a parcel is greater than an acre from prior to development to after development.

Zoning Administrator Bruce Parker explained that the City would look at stormwater calculations no matter what the size of the property is. They particularly look at areas that have stormwater problems downstream to make sure that the problem is not increased or that we are not creating another problem.

City Planner Mark Roffers explained that it is uncertain where the City will be challenged on their decisions. The Plan Commission can provide greater certainty of their decisions by being consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

City Attorney McDonell explained that when making decisions, the Plan Commission should make sure there are findings showing consistency with the Comprehensive Plan; always explain the reasons for the decision. There is still a lot of discretion for the Plan Commission. If there is an action, it must be done on a rational basis and explained on the record. City Planners have experience and will help make findings that are consistent. Even if a proposal is consistent with the comprehensive plan, it can still be denied on an appropriate rational basis.

City Planner Mark Roffers explained that the standards in the Zoning Ordinance are still important. The Plan Commission does not have to automatically approve what is in the Comprehensive Plan. It must be worked through.

Plan Commission Member Zaballos stated that the Plan Commission needs to make decisions on a rational basis. The Plan Commission Members need to continue to and encourage the explanation of their decisions on the record.

The Plan Commission appreciated all the information presented.

INFORMATION:

Possible future agenda items include: Review and discuss the City of Whitewater Landscaping Guidelines; Plan Commission appointment to the Tech Park Committee and to the Urban Forestry Committee.

The next regular Plan Commission meeting will be January 11, 2010.

Moved by Miller and Coburn to adjourn at approximately 8:45 p.m. Motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane E. Wegner
Secretary