



# VILLAGE ACTION REPORT

**PROJECT: PBBS Equipment Corp. Site Plan Amendment**

**APPLICANT: Richard Fisher – Architect, Fisher & Associates**

**PROJECT LOCATION: 380 Progress Drive**

**REPORT DATE: JUNE 10, 2021**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The applicant is seeking approval of a site plan amendment to permit the construction of a 1,258 sq. ft. (25' x 50'-4") addition onto the north side of its existing 3,515 sq. ft. building located at 380 Progress Drive. The existing building was constructed in 2000. PBBS sells and services commercial and industrial boilers. The proposed addition will provide warehousing and parts storage. There will be no additional employees related to the addition, and typical hours and operations will not be altered. The proposed exterior materials will match the existing building.

**PLAN COMMISSION MEETING: JUNE 9, 2021**

**STAFF REPORT PROVIDED BY:**  X  Planner,   Engineer,   Public Works

**MOTION:** by Brinkmeier (1st), Schulze (2nd)

The Site Plan Amendment application was **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**, with the following conditions:

Engineering – Site Plan Comments

1. Site is considered a minor land disturbance based on approximately 4,000 square feet of site disturbance. A land disturbance permit should be issued prior to construction.
2. A tracking pad should be located at location of the proposed new asphalt to control site tracking during construction.
3. The proposed roof drain on the east side is at the new northeast corner of the building. The pavement should be graded to drain the roof drain to the east to the swale area to the extent possible.
4. Whether this addition or the future addition, a retaining wall may be necessary at the north end of the site due to the existing grades and to maintain drainage.

Additional Conditions Applied by Plan Commission

1. If the applicant chooses to move forward with the expanded paved area, they can seek an approval from staff rather than coming back to the Plan Commission.

**VOTE:**  6  Aye,  0  Nay,  0  Abstain

**APPLICANT COMMENTS:**

- (Rick Fisher – architect, Fisher & Associates) – provided an overview of the project. Indicated the client may wish to expand the pavement beyond what is shown in the submittal. Ruth stated that if the paved area is expanded the applicant could either get approval from staff or come back to the Plan Commission for subsequent approval.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

- None.

**PLAN COMMISSION COMMENTS:**

- (Jushchyshyn) – asked if staff had a preference whether the applicant should seek staff approval for the expanded paved area. Ruth replied he was comfortable with a staff review.
- (Williams) – happy to see the business is expanding.

**STAFF COMMENTS:**

- See staff reports and as noted above.