

**CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING 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  
Kent Attwell  
Michael Frede  
Kevin Fitzgerald  
Beth Leonard  
Roger Dupler, City Planner  
Christa Wollenzien, City Planning Assistant

Absent

Larry Chapman  
Dirilee Curtis-Costa

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

There was no one present wishing to speak at this time.

2. DISCUSSION OF SMART GROWTH CHAPTERS 1 THROUGH 4

R. Dupler explained the purpose of the meeting was to review Chapters 1 through 4 of the Smart Growth document for any changes prior to being placed on the Plan Commission and Council agendas for future approvals. He noted Chapter One was an introductory chapter about the document. Chapter Two included statistics specific to the City of Delafield. The third chapter included information about the natural resources found within the City and Chapter Four included information on community facilities. Further, he explained a log of changes had been kept throughout the Smart Growth planning process thus far from other committees, citizen comments, and comments received at the Open House meetings on these topics. He stated multiple goals and objectives for each chapter would be reviewed so that additional future planning and implementation could be designed for each chapter.

K. Fitzgerald expressed concern for review of these chapters without a vision statement being in place for the City as he thought there was the potential for mismatching goals and objectives between chapters in the document. He expressed concern for goals that looked good on paper but, due to inconsistencies, might never be realized in the implementation phase of the planning document.

## CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Mayor McAleer requested the City's Land Use Plan, completed thus far, be moved forward into the Smart Growth document.

B. Leonard stated she thought it was very important to include sessions and/or activities with residents to determine vision, goals, and objectives toward an overall vision for the City. This overall vision, as well as resulting goals and objectives, would then help to guide each chapter within the Smart Growth document for planning. She thought additional input should be gathered from residents prior to establishing this overall vision and she was also concerned that other committees could potentially have a different vision for the City when unifying goals related to City planning was, in her opinion, the desired outcome.

R. Dupler explained it was important to learn about each element of the Smart Growth document and allow the goals and objectives of each chapter to form a vision for the City. He further stated this process allowed for public input and comment after review of the chapters that would culminate into a basis for an overall vision for the City. He thought it was incorrect to create a vision for a planning process without thorough understanding of each element within the process.

Mayor McAleer stated he thought a statement of purpose for the Smart Growth document might be appropriate at this time.

In response to a question by M. Frede, R. Dupler explained that a Land Use plan and a Master Plan for the City are different. The Land Use Plan is one element found within the City's Master Plan.

C. Wollenzien stated the process the Plan Commission was undertaking as part of the Smart Growth initiative was exactly what the City should be doing at this time. Goals and objectives would come out of each chapter and would establish a direction for the City after analysis of each chapter of the Smart Growth document. The end result, after revisions, changes, and long term consideration was given to each element, would be the overall vision for the City that would help guide future planning decisions for the City.

Discussion further ensued regarding how the City's Master Plan would guide the planning process and be incorporated into Smart Growth documents. K. Fitzgerald stated he thought a purpose statement was desired by the Commission as various comments were being received from other Committees as they discussed pertinent issues. R. Dupler explained the charge of the Plan Commission should be to gather information from contributing sources, evaluate that information, weigh the benefits of all the elements presented, and then blend all the information into a document that would be presented to the public for comment. Additional revision would result at that point and final approvals would be requested after all information had been assembled into the Smart Growth document. In addition, he noted the purpose of the meeting this evening was to make sure the Commissioners were aware of all changes to date

## CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

so that the first four chapters could be considered complete for this portion of the Smart Growth planning process.

At this point, R. Dupler noted the revisions log included the following information to date and should be placed within the record of this meeting.

### REVISION LOG

**Updated: 07-17-2008**

**These are changes that the Plan Commission, City Staff and residents have requested to the Chapters.**

#### **Public Participation Plan:**

None requested.

#### **Chapter 1, Introduction:**

1. Plan Commission wanted to see the “community vision” a part of the introduction. This process of developing the 2030 Comprehensive Plan is defining the City of Delafield’s “community vision”. Once the entire plan is completed a “community vision” statement will be derived and added to the introduction.
2. Added reference to the 1970 Comprehensive Plan.

#### **Chapter 2, Trends, Issues and Opportunities:**

1. Employment forecasting will appear in the Economic Development Chapter. Employment forecasting is difficult to do at the scale of the City. Especially when a large percentage of the City’s residents commute outside the City borders for employment. Utilizing employment forecasting at the County scale will be prudent.
2. Community Facilities and Utilities Goal 3f was changed from “Establish” to “Evaluate”.
3. Add Goal referring to encouraging less rentals and more single family. This was determined to be similar to the Housing goal 3(a) and will be evaluated further in the housing chapter.
4. In Table 20 changed “0.5 acres/unit” to “5 acres/unit”.
5. Requested the cost of reproduction “11x17” Maps. It was decided to keep the Maps at 8.5x11 due to and reformatting the maps.

#### **Chapter 3, Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural:**

1. Definitions of particular terms were added as footnotes: Drumlin fields, Ordovician fossil biota, Mayville Dolomite, Interlobate moraine, Kames, kettle holes, and esker.
2. Plan Commission asked if it is possible to specify where the Maquoketa shale layer ends west of Lake in Delafield. More detailed information regarding the location of the Maquoketa shale layer has been added to the plan in text on page 12 and Map 3-5.

### **CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

3. Added an objective about prohibiting density blending on agricultural land. To comply with the consistency requirement of the comprehensive planning legislation, the subdivision ordinance would need revision to reflect this objective.
4. Requested to add "Kettle Moraine Scenic Drive" to the historic sites as well as other rustic roads that may be in the area. This was added to the sites of cultural significance, but was also determined to be appropriate for the Transportation Chapter (Chapter 8) and will be added there as well.
5. Requested a resident survey be done to get the residents feedback on issues in chapter 3 and other chapters. This is in process of being developed.
6. Would like the updated flood map be added. This cannot be done until after the appeal is processed.
7. Mayor requested we verify the designation of the Kettle Moraine Scenic drive will not have any affect on development along that route. Mike Warwick called Paul Sandgren with the DNR (KM team leader). Paul Sandgren verified it has no effect or controls on development along the corridor.
8. Requested more information on a scenic protection ordinance. More information has been provided for review in form of a sample ordinance.
9. More information on how to make lake shoreline naturalization happen. Information on lake protection grants from the DNR has been provided.

#### **Chapter 4, Community Facilities and Utilities:**

1. Add the recently approved columbarium at St. John Chrysostom Church to cemetery list
2. Add Public Works building to other governmental facilities
3. Add Interceptor lines to Map 4-5. This is still in process.
4. Add zoning code amendment to allow for day care facilities as permitted use in downtown business districts to the implementation measures.
5. Revised the plan to state Downtown already has wireless internet access available for a fee.
6. Change "Establish a Lake District that includes Lake Nagawicka" to "Further investigate the potential of forming a Lake District or Lake Association that includes Lake Nagawicka". Provided more information on details of lake organizations.
7. Explore developing a district on the east side of the lake, in which new development would be required to hookup to the water system. Develop a water service map.
8. Add to implementation measures, explore developing a standard for bringing homes on septic within the SSA on to the sanitary sewer system.

#### **Chapter 5, Housing:**

#### **Chapter 6, Economic Development:**

#### **Chapter 7, Land Use:**

## CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

### **Chapter 8, Transportation:**

### **Chapter 9, Intergovernmental Cooperation:**

### **Chapter 10, Implementation:**

With regard to Chapter 1, the following comments were received and revisions were requested of these items. Review of subsequent chapters and related comments followed as noted. *Please note chapter numeration starts over at the beginning of each chapter within the Smart Growth chapters.*

- Concern for a bias in this chapter, particularly as it related to the information obtained from the South Eastern Regional Plan Commission (SEWRPC) and the overuse of the word “urban” in relation to the City of Delafield. Various Commissioners were concerned about overuse and unfair designation as it has the potential to create a feel for a different vision than what is desired by residents. Other terms such as rural and “ex-urban” were believed to be more appropriate and reflective of the desired community planning efforts. Consideration for removal of the word “urban” should be had throughout the entire document unless needed to make a point.
- Land Use Element, Community Plans section, paragraph 2, review for overuse of word “urban.”

### Chapter 2

- A request was made for Land Use and Zoning maps to be sized to 11 by 17 for to allow different designations to be read easier. R. Dupler explained if the County Staff had provided the information, modifications could not be made to the page.
- On P.6, Footnote “a” is missing.
- Pages 8 and 9, Table 6, Graphs 3 and 4, check different growth rates as outlined in the Tables. C. Wollenzien noted two different projections had been utilized in this section of the Chapter with two different sources. She further noted the SEWRPC growth rates only went to the County level and did not include City data.

M. Frede questioned whether the role of the Commission was to establish a vision and educate residents on its benefits or to represent the constituent’s wishes and allow that to drive the process. B. Leonard stated good planning practices were always based on public input from constituents as it created the basis for consideration within the implementation process.

- On P. 12, Table 2-9, the number of residential households was questioned with regard to accuracy of future projections. C. Wollenzien explained these questions would be evaluated and addressed in the housing chapter of the Smart Growth document.

## CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Use of the current Land Use plan to establish “build out” projections was discussed. Discussion further ensued regarding current land use calculations and projections from other agencies.

- A suggestion was made to include a statement demonstrating all informational projections had been evaluated compared to the capabilities of the City and future capabilities of the City might need to be considered in response to anticipated community demands.
- P. 23, Table 2-20, should reflect 2 acres per unit under residential comment section. This is a change from the information presented in the Staff report.

M. Frede questioned how to balance community land use for the future with the wishes of the current private land owner. Mayor McAleer noted information would be gathered through public hearings and decisions would be made by the City based on that feedback. R. Dupler explained this was the “heart” of the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning map question that all planners face. He noted City planners typically help formulate a Comprehensive plan as a vision for the City’s best interest in the future. This planning would not pressure the land owner to change; however, the City would have an overriding vision to affect potential growth to be in conformance with the Master Land Use plan. Additional discussion took place on this topic related to a hypothetical situation and its resulting implications for planning.

### Chapter 2

#### Principle, Goals, Objectives and Implementation

- Overuse of the word “urban” noted in this section.
- P. 25, Goal 3C, F, and G-questioned whether an objective should be to evaluate various topics. R. Dupler noted evaluation would take place by the Plan Commission on these topics and determinations would be made at time of consideration.
- P. 25, Housing Goal A seems inconsistent with Goals 3A and B of same section. R. Dupler noted this would be sorted during consideration of the Housing element of the Smart Growth document. A potential survey question could be related to the topic of how residents view the City of Delafield-as a small town, suburb of Milwaukee, or independent small city between larger cities.
- Adult daycare should be addressed for inclusion in this section.
- P. 26, Land Use section, Goal 1-include the word “balanced” or other adjective to reflect possibility that community may think there is enough business/industrial in the City currently.
- P. 27, Transportation section, Goal 1, Objective B, want to discourage rather than encourage.
- Addition of a goal to “Encourage the design of a system to limit or eliminate cut-through traffic throughout the City.”

## CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

- Inclusion of verbiage needed to allow the City flexibility in consideration of new development being built with narrower private streets with “walkable” areas where appropriate.

### Chapter 3: Agricultural, Natural and Cultural Resources

#### Principle, Goals, Objectives and Implementation section

- P. 40, First Principle, Goal 1, Objective D (no land use designation for agricultural land-already noted in blue) and want to discourage density blending on RE-2 land.
- Include consideration of Nashotah House Seminary as historical resource. Also, future consideration of this resource as park land, if vacated, was desirable.
- With regard to light pollution information (on p. 35), would like to see additional goals placed in the Principle, Goals, Objectives and Implementation section to discourage light pollution. While understood that ordinances reflect discouraging non-shielding illumination, Mayor McAleer thought the Master plan should also reflect this same information.
- P. 41, First principle, Goal 1, last blue bullet point, concern for leaving the City open for higher density issues. K. Fitzgerald suggested moving this bullet point to Goal 3, action section of the same page.
- Language was suggested for inclusion within the Smart Growth document related to discouraging a “cascading effect” of densities and related impacts to land use.

Discussion took place regarding zoning ordinances and cluster developments through Planned Unit Developments (PUD). Consideration was given to discouraging cluster development; however there might be certain circumstances, such as in a protected environmental corridor area where it might be beneficial if allowed. It was determined that clustering language should be encouraging, rather than discouraging, but within specific areas, such as in environmentally protected areas near woodlands or wetlands, where the community’s best interests could be served through preservation of those areas. In this way, flexibility in working with developers could be maintained.

- P. 41, Goal 3, Objective A, would like to see stronger action and implementation to minimize events that took place with the recent record rainfall and related mud spill into Zastrow’s Bay. R. Dupler commented perhaps inspections and enforcement need to be increased and stormwater control ordinances enacted.

### Chapter 4, Community Facilities and Utilities

- P. 2, Table 4-1, Lake Country School should be listed under the Arrowhead School District. After a brief review of the associated School District map (4-1) it was noted consideration should be given to

## CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

establishing a connector road or school district boundary modification in the northwestern portion of the map with new development in effort to provide a more direct route for bussing.

- P. 18, Map 4-5-questioned whether the Regional Water Supply planning document from SEWRPC was to be included in the Smart Growth document. C. Wollenzien noted SEWRPC would provide this document in November of this year.
- P. 20, Water Supply Policy-requires development by City.
- P. 21, Water Service Area map 4-7, regarding Water Service Area 2-it was questioned whether this service area was still in existence.

Discussion ensued regarding possibilities for water service in undeveloped areas. It was noted that it was the Public Works Committee's recommendation that all undeveloped lands along Highway 83, in the area to be identified on a map by Yaggy Colby in the Northeast quadrant of the City, be required to hook up to the water system as the land is developed. Current homeowners would not be required to hook-up. Stormwater utility districts were also discussed.

- P. 27, Lake Associations section, Paragraph 2, last sentence-should reflect intent to represent each district, but Mayor is not always able have true aldermanic district representation.

### Principle, Goals, Objectives and Implementation

- P. 30, Goal 3, include action language reflecting policy to avoid condemnation in order to obtain park land.
- P. 30, Goal 4, remove the verb "evaluate" from objectives. It was suggested whole city should be in service area whether all residents were utilizing City water.
- P. 30, Goal 4, Objective H, would like to see more information on establishment of private roads prior to making recommendations on service requirements.

Mayor McAleer recessed the meeting at 9:15 P.M. and reconvened at 9:20 P.M.

### Review of PWC recommendations

R. Dupler briefly reviewed the list of recommendations from the August 6, 2008, Public Works Committee (PWC) meeting related to sanitary sewer service areas, stormwater utility districts, rate schedule for the Cemetery, hook-ups to the water system in the Northeast quadrant of the City, pursuit of a municipal water system utility in the central business districts, and encouragement of development of regional wells in the Northwest quadrant, Southeast corner of I94 and Highway C and in other areas deemed appropriate. In addition, recommendations related to the transportation chapter of the Smart Growth document were also reviewed.

**CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

Mayor McAleer stated he thought the idea of a water system in the downtown business district had been thoroughly discussed and a decision reached when the reconstruction of Genesee Street took place without water lines being placed at that time.

R. Dupler requested a policy direction be given from the Plan Commission for consideration by the Common Council. Discussion on this topic ensued.

K. Fitzgerald questioned the process of consideration for this issue. Mayor McAleer expressed concern for the potential of this one issue to become a political decision that would affect approval of this planning document.

R. Dupler stated he anticipated the justification for a water system in the downtown area would be found after working through this Smart Growth process. In response to a question, he further explained, while the downtown water system has been found to be adequate for fire protection, typically a water system in a downtown area would be ideal.

B. Leonard expressed interest in establishment of a formal process to consult with residents to formulate a process where water improvements are made. She suggested this formal process be utilized in areas where water improvements could be made. In addition, it might include specific implementations, such as a focus group for certain portions of the City considering water improvements.

R. Dupler stated enough direction had been given as a result of this meeting that would allow Staff to develop a portion of a policy for planning purposes. He thanked the Commission for its attention to these chapters and noted Chapters 5 through 8 would be reviewed by the Plan Commission on September 17, 2008.

3. ADJOURNMENT

**K. ATTWELL MOTIONED TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 13, 2008, SPECIAL PLAN COMMISSION MEETING AT 9:38 P.M. K. FITZGERALD SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.**

Minutes prepared by:

Accurate Business Communications, Inc.