

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor McAleer called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

ROLL CALL

Present

Mayor Ed McAleer (Chair)  
Mike Frede (entered at 7:04 p.m.)  
Kent Attwell  
Kevin Fitzgerald  
Dirilee Curtis-Costa  
Ald. Beth Leonard  
Roger Dupler, Planner  
Tim Schuenke, Administator (non-voting)

Absent

Larry Chapman  
Tom Maney, Inspector

Also Present

Christa Wollenzien, Yaggy Colby & Associates  
Joel West, Yaggy Colby & Associates

1. DELAFIELD CITIZEN’S COMMENTS PERTAINING TO SUBJECTS ON THIS AGENDA.

Lynda Holton, 485 Lillian Court – Stated that it was difficult as a citizen to see at the same time what the commissioners were looking at. New revisions are not always available on the website; you cannot trust the website to be accurate. She cannot print in color and was willing to pay for color copies, but because City Hall cannot print in color, she was referred to Yaggy Colby for copies. The copies are not always ready due to revisions being made. She has spent approximately \$75 on copies. Unless someone has a lot of time on their hands and has the funds for the copies, you cannot keep up with the information in a timely fashion. She thought a good time for citizen input might be at the end when there is a list of goals, etc. She suggested having meetings to get the information out to the public. If each chapter was summarized, the citizens would be able to understand what was going on. There is too much information being presented for the average citizen to absorb. Mayor McAleer asked if it would be helpful to have citizen comments after discussion of the chapter. L. Holton stated that this would work for her because she is present, but was concerned about getting input from all of the citizens. When the project was close to being complete, she felt it would be better to have it summarized. R. Dupler stated that it would be good to get input

**CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES**

as Chapters were being discussed. He reported that only two emails have been received through the website and neither came from citizens; public participation is not taking place. C. Wollenzien is keeping a log of all changes. Mayor McAleer suggested updating the list of changes onto the web more quickly. K. Fitzgerald stated that outdated documents should be swapped out with the most current being posted. Additionally, Mayor McAleer asked that the current list of the changes be posted on the website. L. Holton stated that noting the date of the document is very important and that a notation of the most recent revision date should be noted on the document in order to alert citizens to the changes. B. Leonard discussed how "One Delafield" organized a focus group to go through all of the changes; she would like to see a summarization of each chapter to use when addressing groups of citizens. A one – two page executive summary along with goals and objectives should be listed. K. Fitzgerald suggested putting the executive summary under Chapter 1 along with the date, the executive summary, and then goals and action steps with the change log at the bottom. The website should have the current version and a track of change log sheet. Mayor McAleer stated that he would leave citizen's comments open and ask the citizens for comments after the discussion took place on the agenda items.

2. DISCUSSION OF SMART GROWTH RESIDENTS SURVEY.

R. Dupler stated that the survey reflects the changes requested by the Plan Commission after the last presentation. These changes give a more objective presentation to the survey. Questions that were a little "leaning" have been modified. Over 1,000 surveys are intended to go out and will be directed to randomly selected city households proportionally to each aldermanic district. If one-third participation is received, it will be considered good, but they are expecting better. If the response tallies below 334, the information will not be statistically viable. Recipient samples are taken directly from the voter registration poll. Postcards will be sent preemptively the citizens and they will be given three weeks to respond to the survey.

Discussion took place on some of the questions. D. Curtis-Costa noted that question #7 was grammatically incorrect. B. Leonard suggested putting it on a continuum with other roles that the City controls. R. Dupler suggested the citizens write their preference of preservation of natural resources, i.e., usable park and open space, lake, woodlands/wetlands. K. Fitzgerald stated that the title for "Housing" should be before box 15 and not in the box. Discussion took place on sidewalks and it was stated that this subject is approached in the questionnaire three times. On question #32, there is not much difference between the fourth and fifth option. It was noted that sidewalks were also covered in question #35. Mayor McAleer stated that in #32, the first question should state "Highway 83 should remain two lanes".

B. Leonard asked if the questions directly correlated to specific sections of specific chapters as she did not understand how the questions were developed and did not see a close relationship. R. Dupler explained that the questions were grouped according to the chapters.

**CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES**

K. Fitzgerald asked if Question #2 should be “rural/country atmosphere”. R. Dupler suggested instead of “rural” to have “rural/estate”. M. Frede thought that it the current atmosphere should be stated. R. Dupler wanted the citizens to tell the City what the City atmosphere was. Mayor McAleer felt that it should be changed “rural/country”. M. Frede suggested that both “rural” and “urban” should be eliminated and combined with “atmosphere”. A comment was made by B. Leonard that the way a survey is designed is very important. R. Dupler commented that this survey was taken from multiple examples. C. Wollenzien will email B. Leonard sources that the survey was developed from.

Discussion on this item was stopped and without objection, Item #5 on the agenda was taken next.

Later in the meeting, the Commissioners were asked to email R. Dupler or C. Wollenzien any concerns on the survey no later than next Tuesday afternoon. The survey would then be reworked and presented on Wednesday evening at the Plan Commissioner meeting. The Commissioners thought that the survey would be able to go out by the end of the month.

An executive summary of the reviewed chapters will be prepared along with the appropriate goals and objectives. Commissioners can email Yaggy Colby items that they would want included in the summary of Chapter 6 for the citizenry to [ChristaW@Yaggy.com](mailto:ChristaW@Yaggy.com) by this Friday, September 19, 2008.

3. DISCUSSION OF SMART GROWTH CHAPTER 4 - COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND UTILITIES AND THE PARK AND REC COMMISSION'S REQUESTED REVISIONS.

R. Dupler stated that the Park & Recreation noted that there were a number of parcels that the City owns that were not reflected on the mapping system. Their discussion identified those areas not currently included in the maps as well as some of the thing that they identified as significant community assets that should be incorporated as well. The comments from the Park & Rec Commission were reviewed and were included in the Park & Recreation Commission minutes provided (and as listed below):

*Page 10, Section G, labeled Park*

- *Copperfield Park was renamed to Bostrom Park*
- *Inclusion of the fishing pier at St. John's Park*
- *Add Civil War memorial at Cushing Memorial Park*
- *Add the words “on Oakwood Road” to New community park listing to read “New Community Park on Oakwood Road”*
- *Add Oak Street lake access site and other City lake access sites*
- *Add Ruff's Preserve/ Conservancy with the owners being Waukesha County Land Conservancy*

**CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES**

4. DISCUSSION OF SMART GROWTH CHAPTER 8 – TRANSPORTATION AND THE DPW COMMITTEE PARK AND REC COMMISSION'S REQUESTED REVISIONS.

Comments from the Park & Rec Commission were reviewed and were included in the Park & Recreation Commission minutes provided (and as listed below):

*On page 9, Section 3,*

- *Add verbiage related to need for consideration of trails or sidewalks to provide access from Oakwood Road to the Lake Country Trail. A map was distributed by R. Dupler and discussion of the equestrian trails in that area followed. Discussion ensued regarding having a legal opinion rendered regarding any potential future use of the equestrian trails to provide connections around the lake. R. Dupler suggested the City work with farmers to procure easements along undeveloped properties to make the connection the north around the lake. The Committee gave unanimous support for implementation of acquiring trail space to finalize connections on the Lake Circle Route and for having the City Attorney provide an opinion on this matter. R. Dupler will draft verbiage and return for final approval.*
- *Page 9, City trails - Add Cushing Park Road Trail that connects the Lake Country Trail to Lapham Peak State Park to Glacial Drumlin Trail. Also add Glacial Drumlin Trail as a State trail.*
- *Verbiage added to encourage efforts be made to work with regional trail systems to make other area connections.*
- *Page 10, Sidewalks - R. Dupler noted there is verbiage in the existing Comprehensive Plan that explains roadways will be widened to accommodate sidewalks. He noted discussion needed to take place regarding the implementation of sidewalks in the future.*

*Discussion ensued regarding potential future sidewalk plans and how to deal with the disagreement to the Master Plan ideas in the future. R. Dupler stated that additional discussions would need to take place in the future on this topic with input being provided from relevant Committees. In addition, C. Smith stated he would like to see a process designed so agreement could be reached in instances where a decision should be made that would be contrary to the Master Plan. R. Dupler briefly drafted language for the Committee that would be placed in the final recommendations and implementation section of the document.*

**CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES**

*Additional review and approval of this language would be presented at a later date.*

- *Page 13, on the map, a question was asked regarding utilization of the equestrian trail for pedestrian use. R. Dupler explained trail space could be shared between pedestrians and bicycles, but safety dictated horses and pedestrians could not utilize the same trail space.*
- *Page 16, Section 6, Water Facilities, Item a Water trails – Identify areas for potential water trails such as the Bark River. Funding is sometimes available for certain designated routes, as in establishment of a portage area. R. Dupler stated he would add this item to the objectives section as well. He also stated skyway areas (for seaplane use on the lake) should be identified.*
- *Page 19, Goal 2, add Objective f) - Evaluate opportunities to realize completion of all trails to connections on the east side of the lake.*

B. Leonard discussed the issue regarding sidewalks when the streets were being widening/repairing streets, specifically clarification of the statement the Park & Rec Commission made stating “*would like to see a process designed so agreement could be reached in instances where a decision should be made that would be contrary to the Master Plan.*” R. Dupler thought what Park & Rec was asking for was a public process to ensure that if there is any change that goes beyond the scope of the Master Plan that it would have to go through an approval process, i.e., a public hearing to be part of the change (current policy). B. Leonard stated that Smart Growth would require that. K. Fitzgerald added that any planned development would also require a public hearing. R. Dupler stated that Park & Rec was asking for more stringent consideration in that public hearing and deliberation process. B. Leonard did not want to put the City in a situation where the City would always have to put sidewalks in when a street is repaved. She wanted to make sure that there was not a blanket policy on collector streets unless the individual situation was reviewed. K. Fitzgerald shared B. Leonard’s concern that the City has an existing policy that it may not be following. The question was if the City should continue its policy and start following it, or change the policy. Mayor McAleer thought that language needed to be added to the policy identifying trails and sidewalks with language noting that the objectives can be met or they shouldn’t be in there; the objectives need to be doable. R. Dupler commented that any time there is a new subdivision this is always discussed (whether or not the new development should have sidewalks on both sides) because the current policy does identify that any new streets are to have sidewalks on both sides. Recent developments were discussed. D. Curtis-Costa asked if the policy could be changed to a case by case basis. It was clarified that this is now being done. The Plan Commission needs to look at this policy. K. Fitzgerald stated that there could be a policy for developed land and another for undeveloped land. R. Dupler thought the Master Plan was lacking some sort of graphic guidance, a map that

**CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES**

identified zones of areas for sidewalks. It was not know if there was an actual map identifying trails. K. Fitzgerald asked if Park & Rec is in charge of trails when they do their Five Year Plan or if the Plan Commission covers this as part of Smart Growth. The lake circle route was discussed, particularly if regional trails through undeveloped land would be feasible so that as the land develops they could be utilized. Rather than having one route, does Smart Growth do that or should P&R be deferred to? R. Dupler stated that in his opinion it was the Plan Commission's charge with Smart Group – to identify what the implementation strategy is going to be. K. Fitzgerald thought that the loop around the lake should be discontinued and replaced with two regional looped trails. There was the issue of sidewalks and the issue of trails. R. Dupler noted that this body could state that they did feel it was not worthy of trying to maintain the circular route and to identify in the implementation section that the City should engage necessary resources to evaluate the bi-modal trail to develop more reasonable, serviceable, trail systems that relate to the neighborhood rather than the city as a whole. This would establish the goals. How to implement this will be determined.

Yaggy Colby has looked at the Lake Country bike path on the WEPCO easement. Ways to encourage the use of the path were discussed. If language was put into the Smart Growth Plan, the expectations would be established.

B. Leonard was in favor of having trails without tearing neighborhoods apart. Guidance was asked for by R. Dupler regarding evaluating whether parts of the existing equestrian trail could be changed into a bi-modal trail.

Discussion took place zones for implementation of sidewalks. It was questioned whether or not to treat undeveloped land differently than developed land that is being resurfaced. The goal should be if it is pedestrian walkways/sidewalks if you are close to the downtown area. In response to a question as to whether or not there was a policy for special assessments for sidewalks, Mayor McAleer responded that the Public Works Committee would be reviewing assessment policies.

Consideration of the water trails was asked for by Park & Rec. R. Dupler explained there was a sea plane lane a fly lane on the lake was discussed, but this might not be under the jurisdiction of the City.

Equestrian trails by Price and Nagawicka Roads will be added to the trail plan map.

The comments recommended by the Public Works Committee on Chapter 8 were reviewed.

Discussion on whether Highway 83 should be two lanes or four lanes took place. Mayor McAleer stated that the City's contribution to the traffic on Highway 83 did not mandate four lanes. Mayor McAleer addressed the possibility of Highway 83 traffic being diverted over to Highway P and whether this would have an affect. M. Frede thought the vast majority of traffic on 83 was between Highway 16 and I94 and there was not much the City could do in controlling the traffic on Highway 83.

**CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES**

Mayor McAleer would like to keep the land use as low density in the Master Plan so the City was not contributing to the Highway 83 traffic and therefore it would not be responsible for expansion costs. Ultimately the State determines whether the highway is expanded to four lanes or not. The Commission did not want to advocate for four lanes on Highway 83. T. Schuenke responded to M. Frede's question on four lanes would benefit the City by stating that the purpose of having additional lanes is to move traffic through. If traffic reaches a point where people start avoiding Highway 83, you hurt commercial and people would then cut through and drive around, use more gas, etc. to try to get from their homes to wherever their point of business is. The issue was to keep Highway 83 as two lanes, but he did not know if the City would have a say in the decision. R. Dupler suggested making a statement to strongly discourage any potential connections to Highway 83 from the west (only if you match up with a road on the east side). It is not yet known if Highway 83 was a trucking route or a long haul truck route.

What are the positive and negative aspects if Highway 83 went to four lanes?  
Negative: cost, faster rate of speed (safety), increase in traffic, and encroachment of existing houses. Positive: reduction in air pollution. Mayor McAleer stated that this is one of the survey questions.

The recommendation regarding the number of cul de sacs in a given development was discussed. R. Dupler stated that the T. Hafner stated that the DPW would like to have a right of review in the design of a subdivision. Justification must be given for cul de sacs. C. Wollenzien stated that Chapter 8 in the packets has highlighted sections of text that address comments from the Plan Commission and comments from the Public Works Committee. She added a goal on page 18, Goal 1 of Objective regarding Cul de Sacs which addresses the Public Works Committee's comments. K. Fitzgerald felt that cul de sacs were an advantageous plan. K. Attwell felt that cul de sacs should be encouraged. C. Wollenzien stated that the goal stated "Road patterns in new subdivisions should selectively use cul-de-sacs in response to the environment or necessity of traffic control..." T. Schuenke cited public safety costs, etc. associated with cul de sacs.

It was clarified that Goal 1b should read "Discourage the improvement of Highway 83 as a four-lane arterial."

5. DISCUSSION OF SMART GROWTH CHAPTER 6 - ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

J. West made a presentation on the Economic Analysis. It showed Employment Trends by County in the SE Region 1990 - 2006, Top 3 employers by industry classification (services, manufacturing, and retail trade), Employee Demographics, Largest Employees in Waukesha County, Largest Businesses within Waukesha County, Largest Employers within Delafield, Employment Projections for Waukesha County, Waukesha County Employment Industry Trends, Delafield Employment Industry Trends, Basic Industries in Delafield and Waukesha County, Delafield - Basic Industries, Delafield - Near Basic Industries, County - Shift Share Analysis, National Growth Component, Industrial Mix Component, Competitive Share Component, Delafield 5-10-15 Minute Drive Time Map, 2008 Estimate Population

**CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES**

in Drive Time Areas, Household Income, Existing Total and Undeveloped Land Use (Discussion took place on the title – it was clarified these are the existing categories that exist on the current recommended land use map [this will be identified]. This is needed to justify changes that will be made later. Also, the “Percent of Total” will be changed to “Percent of Change”. The columns on the table showing square footage will be deleted. A total of “Percent of Change” will be added to the table.), Underdeveloped Land Use Assessed Value (the title was “Undeveloped” and will be changed to “Underdeveloped”), Delafield Assessed Value of Land, Undeveloped Land Use Assessed Value (title will be changed to “Underdeveloped”), Implementation Recommendations – Goals, Goals 1 & 2 – Respond to need of Business Community, Goal 3 – Adequate Economic Base Supporting Range of Employment Opportunities, Goal 4 – Conservation and Renewal, Goal 5 – Preservation, development and redevelopment of commercial/industrial sites, Implementation Strategies, Tax Increment – Example (Mayor McAleer requested a detailed explanation of what “Developer Financed TIF” means prior to going to the public hearing. The role that Yaggy Colby plays in a TIF was discussed. B. Leonard discussed “FutureWisconsin.com” and how something similar could be used for Delafield; she will forward the information to R. Dupler.).

K. Fitzgerald stated that the goal is the 80/20 mix between residential and commercial. D. Curtis-Costa stated that she was looking at the types of businesses that were in decline and those on the rise and how to attract businesses on the rise. J. West stated that you need to determine what the needs of the rising businesses might be, i.e. creation of certain training programs, particular sites, etc. You want to show what you have matches their need. Websites and working with the community to go more in depth in the economic plan in order to market to the businesses. T. Schuenke discussed other strategies such as land banking. D. Curtis-Costa stated that Delafield has never shopped for particular types of businesses to come to the City. Mayor McAleer stated that this is because of the location of Delafield. B. Leonard asked if there is something that the City would like to see in an actual locale, how you market it. J. West stated that you could work out a cooperative agreement with the owner and work with the owners to set the price on the land. K. Fitzgerald stated that a lot of it would have to do with how the land is zoned. M. Frede stated that the City cannot determine what should be done with an owner’s property. However, it was stated that this was the role of the Master Plan. Mayor McAleer stated that zoning was in place to protect everyone’s property values. The City has the responsibility to create zoning categories appropriate for those particular areas. General discussion took place regarding particular areas in the City.

On Table 6-5 and Table 2-15, the 97.7 should be changed 98.7.

Tim Eicher, 211 East Laurel Circle – Regarding Table 6-14 where it talks about developing land to the potential and multipliers are used for the per acreage tax rate, he asked if it translates into revenue for the City if you just took the plat of land, if you just develop the land in that manner, does it bring the overall mill rate down in the City. He thought that you would have to increase the City’s tax levy in order to realize that new tax revenue. T. Schuenke stated that this year there is a

**CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES**

State limit of 2% on the levy limit. However, the State also allows the City to capture new growth. T. Eicher asked if part of the goal would be to minimize or grow the City in way so that future developments would lower the tax burden overall across the other citizens ideally optimizing the type of growth that the City has so that property values go up across all properties. He was not sure that the number reflected in the table was as linear as it looked. J. West stated that it starts to work for a while, and then services catch up. T. Eicher stated that this is not typically how he has seen it occur as Delafield has grown over the years, it usually has been a benefit to the other citizens when more people move in and the tax base increases and services that have been built in grow gradually with the growth – this is worth noting that this should be an objective in the Goals & Objectives. In general overall growth should help bring more efficiencies to the City, not just linearly with the expenses per citizen. Mayor McAleer stated that in the past one of the benchmarks that was looked at was the value of a home in order to pay for the children to go to public school. There has always been a desire to keep the values as high as possible. Mayor McAleer stated that you needed to quantify what values you wanted to develop.

This Chapter was recommended to go to the Common Council.

6. DISCUSSION OF SMART GROWTH CHAPTER 5 - HOUSING CHAPTER.

This will be discussed at a later date.

7. ADJOURNMENT.

**B. LEONARD MOTIONED TO ADJOURN FROM THE MEETING. D. CURTIS-COSTA SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:20 P.M.**

Minutes Prepared By:

Accurate Business Communications, Inc.