

PLAN COMMISSION

PLAN COMMISSION COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OPEN HOUSE and PUBLIC HEARING

Wednesday, OCTOBER 12, 2016

St Joseph Town Hall

The Comprehensive Plan Open House and Public hearing was held Wednesday, October 12 2016 at the St Joseph Town Hall. The agenda called for a 6:00 PM start with the opportunity for citizens to review posters regarding the Plan and ask questions of Stantec representatives and Plan Commission members.

At 6:30 PM - A Presentation about Comprehensive Plan was given by Phil Carlson, Stantec. The presentation ended approximately 7:10. The hearing was noticed for 7:30 pm.

7:30 PM - Public Hearing for the Comprehensive Plan was called to order. The format was based on a discussion of goals and policies in each Chapter. The public hearing was chaired by Tom Spaniol, Town Chair. The hearing was duly noticed in the Hudson Star Observer. Members of the Plan Commission were introduced. Present: Steve Balfanz, Carolyn Barrette, Jason Coyle, Dan Lynch, Chris Matter, Joy Packard, Theresa Schousek. Anton Rang, excused. Members of the public are invited to speak during the public hearing, but may also submit written comments. The written comment period will be held open for 21 days. Individuals are asked to limit verbal comments to no longer than 5 minutes.

In accordance with Wisconsin Statutes 66.1001 (4), following the public hearing, a resolution recommending adoption of the comprehensive plan may be made by a majority of the Plan Commission members. Following adoption of the resolution, a copy of the comprehensive plan will be sent to local government units adjacent to the Town, Regional Planning, St Croix County, three public libraries, and State of Wisconsin.

Spaniol outlined the procedures for the hearing specifying that discussion would be Chapter by Chapter and based on the goals and policies in each. The purpose of this meeting is for public input on the Comprehensive Plan. Members of the Plan Commission could respond to comments during the hearing since they are familiar with the Plan.

General discussion: General Goals

Mark Simpson noted that Burkhardt was not mentioned in Goal 7.

Judy Kadidlo, 611 Old Mill Rd, Burkhardt, presented written comments. She asked that the residential area of Burkhardt be residential rather than "rural mixed use" due to width of street, historic houses, proximity to the Willow etc. The portion along Scott Rd could be rural mixed use. commercial area in Burkhardt could be 200 ft. in depth on the west side of Co Rd. A. see comments.

Elaine Duncan commented on Goals 2 and 4. She noted the #1 issue on the survey and in the Town was water. She did not feel the plan and NRI has gone nearly as far as it needs to in protecting ground water including run-off from farms, and roads, and planning for water that seeps into wells and from septic.

Don Kadidlo read a letter from Chad Christensen, 618 Old Mill Road whose concern was amount of traffic on Old Mill Road and affect on environment if it were "rural mixed use" or commercial. see letter. Don comments were similar. Kevin Kadidlo also entered written comments along voicing same concerns.

Housing Goals:

Paul Nasvik asked 'what does multi-use housing and variety of housing styles mean.' It was explained that is an opportunity for additional type structures. As population ages, they may want to stay in the area, but living in smaller spaces such as twin homes , or ADUs (accessory dwelling units) similar to mother-in-law apts . Nasvik was concerned about developing a sanitary district and low income housing. He was concerned about developers dictating growth in the Town.

Dan Lynch pointed out that the Houlton Town Center mixed uses area that we talked about such as a house and a small business or commercial area side by side. Developers would be responsible for any sanitary system. Other governmental agencies would be weighing in on this.

Howard LaVenture - do not want affordable housing - everyone should have affordable housing, so some people shouldn't get a break on housing. He did not like the concept of a Houlton Town Center. He suggested that Houlton could incorporate as its own village in Houlton and the surrounding area, and anyone interested should contact him.

Transportation Goals - No comments

Community Facilities - No comments

Agriculture, Natural Resources and Cultural Goals. - Barrette pointed out Agricultural goals would be added.

Discussion centered on Natural Resources and water. Paul Nasvik said UWRF did geographical studies of water between McKinley and V and said there is an underground lake along River Road. Wells are 300', his is 275' and he was advised the area needs to be watched for nitrates.

Economic Development Goals - A question of how many acres in the business park? (Around 100) Goal # 4 refers to the Non-Residential Design Standards. Goals 3 and 4 should be rephrased.

Intergovernmental Cooperation - No comments

Land Use Goals

Steve Erickson asked for definition of "encourage" in Goal #3. Barrette read the definition from 2006 Comp Plan. Spaniol spoke of the \$500,000 in MOU monies to buy land to set aside. He noted briefly the general procedure was for a developer to come to the Plan Commission, discussion includes options and suggestions during the review.

Dan Gavin - Goal 3 - Town should work with current landowners to preserve their equity and investment in land.

Mark Simpson - Goal 4 refers to create and develop a Houlton Town center, but doesn't define 'town center' and it could be a number of things. Is it an area of "old Houlton" . The Plan Commission's desire was to continue discussion with Town residents. The goal gives a guide for further discussion.

Phil Carlson pointed out paragraphs in the Land Use Section of the Plan describes use, but isn't specific. There are some concept plans and three pages in the Comp Plan summarize that, and wanted to be open to different ideas. There is a definition on page 2.2. Spaniol pointed out an Action Step calls for establishing a task force to study the concept.

Paul Nasvik - Sounds like Plan Commission intends to develop and create a town center in Houlton. He again referred to incorporating Houlton, a Village of Houlton can annex what they want and take the power away from the Town. This is a document that developers will use to protect their interests. Be careful with this language. One only needs a certain amount of value to incorporate.

Barrette pointed out the Loop bike trail goes through Houlton. It was taking advantage of that opportunity.

She had a written list of items to be discussed regarding the Plan. Schousek pointed out the 21 day open period for written comments.

Open Comments:

Elaine Duncan - Preservation Residential affects economic development, land use and natural resources in the Town. Looking at the last map, we're talking about 9000 acres. Preservation Residential would set aside 40% of the acreage or 3600 acres. On 3 acre lots you're looking at 1200 units, selling for \$100,000 so we're talking about 100-120 million dollars extracted from gross wealth if set aside land, and \$480 million more in houses on the land. So the Preservation Residential sets aside 600 million dollars of wealth in perpetuity, because currently the ordinance requires that the preserved land be maintained as preservation land, so I believe it will suppress interest in development on what's left of the acres. We're looking at a lifelong commitment. It will have a big impact on the tax base, so even if you don't have land that is in that corridor, we are taking land out of development and potential wealth away from future generations. I would like as we're talking about budgets, to look at the economic impact of this grand idea.

I have been living on my acreage since 1980. I have 12 acres in set aside for crops and almost 20 acres in woodland set aside. I have devoted myself to natural preservation. I'm not against natural preservation, but I am against the so-called natural corridors, because this is not a commune. This is a town made up of people who own and cherish the land they own. I talked to alot of my neighbors, some of whom I have never even met until this came up. So I know that these folks feel they are the best stewards for the land, and I look at this so-called corridor and I know from my own land, it's not even an accurate presentation of the natural part of my land and where I would like to have that land set aside. I have talked to Paul and Phil at length and they know exactly where the errors are, but this is a new map in October. I've been talking

since August about what's wrong with that map. It's not getting changed. What I would really urge the Plan Commission to do is take that map, tear it up, take that other little tiny map that Paul just gave us with all the numbers on it that show exactly where the areas are, and get those people in a task force, and urge the people who own these lands that you want to have set aside to come up with a real plan, not these United Nations-Agenda 21 natural corridor bull shit - pardon my French - that's not what we are, that's not who we are. Who we are, are people who have been preserving this land with our own blood sweat and tears - 30 - 40 - 100 years, so we can do this, but let us do it. OK. (timer went off)

Phil Carlson commented that preservation residential ordinance is not some kind of taking of the land for the public. So the number of units that were cited for the land would still be allowed. There is no reduction, and density within the area is maintained.

Elaine Duncan: I'm quoting from the ordinance. I'm talking about the current Town ordinance. Don't tell me I'm wrong. I'm reading from the Town ordinance. This is the Town ordinance today, not your plan. This is what it is today.

Phil Carlson - there is nothing in that ordinance that says land with that designation must be given to the public.

Elaine Duncan - I didn't say that.

Phil Carlson - Just be clear- the intent is the density ... (unclear)

Steve Erickson - has 150 acres south of E to River Road. He liked the statement about not taking owner's equity out of the land. The work is well done. Nothing like this has happened before, and what we plan won't be what it will be in reality. How does rural character change over the years. NRI is a snapshot of now and it won't be the same in 2040. We need a plan to go by.

He was concerned about the graphs of population and that growth might level off. How will the Town pay for itself and for the infrastructure? There will have to be growth and development to pay for things. What it looks like and how we handle it is the question. If encourage development with fiscal responsibility to pay for infrastructure, how would you pay for it with no growth?

His property is protected - not developing and still owns it. There has to be a methodology in developing. People have asked him. He read the ordinance, there is a possibility to keep density. Example - someone might want to do a cluster type development. Does "encouraging" language allow this? He wants to protect the bear, turkey and foxes, etc. and does not like being regulated. He's a conservationist, yet, change will be constant. We talk about people retiring here, how about the people who are 25, 28, 32? Do you want to have them, or do you want just a retirement community.

Paul Nasvik - When he was on the board there was an Industrial Committee. It just didn't pan out. If that was the case, Hudson would be cheaper to live in than St Joe, and the only reason it was cheaper was that you had a smaller lot and it wasn't as valuable. Farm land kept the taxes the lowest. Subdivisions bring more people, more kids, more administration, more costs. The question is what kind of community do you want to live in.

At 8:35 pm Steve Balfanz moved to close the public hearing, Dan Lynch seconded, motion carried.

8:35 PM - The Plan Commission meeting was called to order. After discussion at the public hearing, the Plan Commission decided to meet Saturday, October 29 at 9:00 AM at the Town Hall to go over changes and corrections for the Plan. Lynch moved, Schousek 2nd, to adjourn. Motion carried.

Carolyn Barrette, chair

Chris Matter, Laurie DeRosier and Carolyn Barrette took minutes of the public hearing.