



**CITY OF DELAFIELD
MEETING MINUTES
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
FOCUS GROUP**

Members: Ald Jackie Valde, Plan Commissioner Bob Weiler, Jonathan Kemman, John Siepmannn, Gerry Holton, Ken Beckman, David Simon, Scott Krienke, Craig Reinders

Tuesday, June 8, 2021

6:30 P.M.

City Hall, Council Chambers
500 Genesee St.

Regular Meeting

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:32 PM.

2. Roll Call

Committee Members Present:

Ald. Jackie Valde

Plan Commissioner Bob Weiler

Jonathan Kemman

John Siepmannn

Gerry Holton

Ken Beckman

David Simon

Scott Krienke

Craig Reinders

Also Present:

Amy Barrows, City Planner

Tom Hafner, City Administrator/Director of Public Works

Cassy Rivers, City Administrative Support

3. Approve Minutes from May 25, 2021

*Motion by Beckman seconded by Weiler to approve the minutes of the May 25, 2021 meeting as presented.
Motion carried.*

4. Public Comments

Mary Daniel, 309 Wisconsin Ave. – Presented pictures that are part of Hawks Inn Historical Society taken from 1920-1985 of Downtown Delafield. Explained how the two different business districts were formed. Spoke about the Downtown Development Plan done in 1991 and approved by the Common Council in 1993. Encouraged Focus Group to read to see what was proposed/recommended, what came to fruition and what did not 28 years later.

No further comments

5. Summary of Survey Results

Barrows stated the easiest way to find materials for City of Delafield Economic Development Focus Group is on website: delafieldgrowth.com. Barrows went over the different headers on this website and stated all documents including maps, agendas and minutes can be found under Focus Group Materials.

Barrows asked the group to take a look at the Community SWOT and Visual Preference Survey Summaries. If anyone comes up with different take-aways from what she did to bring up at the next meeting so her report to the Plan Commission and Council can reflect same.

A. Main themes from Community SWOT Survey Results:

1. What do you enjoy most about the City of Delafield?

- Quaint/rural/small town
- Downtown restaurants/retail/small business
- Parks/hiking/biking/trails/walkability
- Lake & accessibility to lake
- Large lots/single-family residential
- Safety/low crime
- Open green space
- Schools
- Accessibility and location of big box stores

2. What activities, services or development are currently missing from Delafield?

Barrows commented that much of what was listed as a strength was also listed as a weakness.

- Desire for more community events and activities, including downtown area.
- Several comments related to the desire for a bandshell/bands
- Desire for more diverse residential housing and neighborhoods, but also desire to avoid over-development
- Desire for more food options
- Desire for more park and trail access
- Desire for more access to water resources, need for maintenance
- Desire to have more retail shopping options
- Desire to have more multi-modal transportation options, including biking and trails
- Perceived lack of parking
- No weaknesses “nothing”

3. What do you see in other communities that you wish was available in Delafield?

- Thriving downtown development
- Unique restaurants
- Outdoor resources & recreation/parks
- Unique shops and small businesses
- Community events – music, farmer’s markets, beer gardens
- Development
- Sense of community
- “Nothing”

4. What current trends and/or issues, if not addressed, could pose negative threats/challenges to Delafield?

- Worry about potential tax increases
- Protection of water resources, the environment and green space
- Negative perceptions of apartments and multifamily housing
- Preservation of downtown
- Need for commercial development
- Desire for more young population, families, and professionals
- Perceived overdevelopment
- Concerns about growth and population increases
- Concern traffic will become congested
- Lack of affordable housing
- Senior living

Simon questioned if they were doing something from survey results with regards architectural design. Barrows responded they will not get into architectural design or aesthetics, however as this was a community survey, thought it would be helpful to include. Barrows stated a couple things to take away from results of visual survey were the dislike of industrial buildings and tiny houses. Barrows also explained the results may help guide developers and builders as to what is perceived as more desirable.

Krienke wanted clarification on definition of what is considered multi-family. Barrows stated some municipalities have "MF4" for example (no more than 4 units per buildings) to control the overall bulk. She stated they could certainly go in that direction; however, she would contact the attorney for clarification of ownership with regards to multifamily if the city wants to regulate ownership.

B. Notable Takeaways from Community Visual Survey Results: (Not already discussed)

- All three groups favored images #13 (includes community amenity), #24 (pedestrian friendly downtown environment), and #44 (high density single family along street edge).
- Clustered development was favored over traditional lots, although the Community was more neutral regarding the most recognizable conservation subdivision image (#40).
- The Plan Commission/Common Council favored image #18, whereas the Community was more neutral. This image may represent the future of transitional areas downtown from residential to business.
- All groups disliked many of the industrial building images and hotel images.
- All groups disliked several of the older one-story multi-tenant buildings.
- All groups disliked several of the larger scale multi-family & mixed-use developments.

Barrows discussed comments about under development and over development in the City of Delafield. In comparison, the Town of Oconomowoc had a total of 18 new home permits issued in 2020, and so far, this year 8 permits. The Village of Summit had a total of 90 new home permits issued in 2020 and so far, this year 41 permits. The City of Delafield had a total of 9 new home permits issued in 2020 and so far, this year 1 permit. She further explained it would be very difficult for someone to find a lot for a new home in this community. Discussion about reasons for lack of new home permits: Holton asked if this was directly tied to inventory and cost of lumber. Siepmann indicated it was lack of lots for sale. Hafner stated the feedback from developers were the 2-acre zoned lots were not appealing to property owners. Reinders brought up if the possibility of rezoning has been considered. Barrows stated part of this focus group may be to consider rezoning for that matter.

6. Summary of Cost of Community Services Study

Barrows stated the city and the Economic Development Specialist with SEH are still working out the details so the report is not available. Barrows stated a takeaway from the study was that because the value of homes are so high in Delafield the cost is pretty close or under a 1 to 1 ratio. This ratio is lower than most areas. Hafner confirmed Delafield is found to be unique as the residential area sustains itself; for every \$1 of taxes received from residential there is 98¢ in cost. Hafner also stated commercial was 93¢ and manufacturing 67¢. Hafner explained different department heads went through the budget and gave best approximation for every budget line item and how much is attributable to each type of development, both revenues and expenses, and that is what was used for the calculation. Siepmann stated it will be important to wait for the results until discussion goes too much further. Reinders asked if the report could reflect consumer trends. Barrows stated more open spaces along the areas of subdivisions is favorable compared to larger lots.

7. Deeper Dive on Mapping Exercise

- Addressing the agricultural fields in Detail Maps 1 & 2

Detail Map #1 (NE Quadrant, along HWY 16 & STH 83)

Morris Property – Zoning A-1E Exclusive Agriculture (Min. 35 – acre lot size)

Sewer and water services available

Access: Access off HWY 83 or through adjacent property to the south, which is owned by CELA Holdings.

*See CELA property discussion

CELA Holding Property – Zoning A-1E Exclusive Agriculture (Min 35 -acre lot size) and A-1 (3-acre lot size)
Sewer and water services available

Access: off HWY 83. The site may want to provide access to the Morris property to the north. It may be best if the Morris and CELA Holdings properties were considered as part of a planned development. The existing cul-de-sac west of the acreage directly north of the river should be extended to serve as an ingress/egress to the development. The area located on the south side of the Bark River could be considered as part of a separate development and consideration should be given to a planned development with the adjacent property to the south owned by Lake Country Land LLC (72 – acres)

Siepmann stated for full disclosure he is part owner of the Lake Country Land and will not comment on that.

Barrows stated there were 3 stickers on the CELA property; conservation subdivision, commercial industrial and high density residential/institutional. Barrows discussed sticker #143 a conservatory area, to leave it preserved/potential public access. Siepmann stated there is a future trail map along that area.

Reinders questioned if it would be appropriate to have residential ingress/egress on HWY 83 or would that be avoided? Siepmann indicated the state will accept one on the Lake Country Land and one on the CELA property, where the wedding barn (Rustic Manor) access is.

Discussion on types of development from residential lower/higher density and transition to multi family or senior living outside near the highway or mixed use which includes commercial with using the Oakwood Church as a transition point. Zoning and land use changes.

JAG II, LLC/Nagawicka View Dairy Inc properties – Zoning A-1 Agriculture (Min 3-acre lot size) on west side of STH 83 and R-3 Single and Two-Family Residential on east side of STH 83 (Min 20,000 sq. ft. lot size)
Sewer and water services available

Access: is provided by STH 83. Consideration may want to be given to vacant agricultural lands located east and west of the properties.

Barrows stated there were 3 stickers, #138 (office), #160 (medium density residential/no retail allowed) and #161 (unknown)

Discussion about land: water, expense with infrastructure costs due to topography. NW corner would be challenging to build as property is steep. No road connections to the Town. Residential was the consensus with density variable with possible walking path. Agreement would need to be made with the Town of Delafield with regards to development. Hafner stated Town of Delafield agreement will be available on website.

Barrows recommended when voting to be more specific on what level of density as the city's current ordinance does not have a lot of options for variability.

Detail Map #2 (SE Quadrant, along I-94 & STH 83)
SEH Property – Zoning B-4 General Business – 8 acres
Sewer and water services are available
Access: is provided by Maple Ave, steep slopes.

Barrows indicated this property was not tagged by group; however, this is the SEH property which recently sold. She stated the new owners and developers are interested in maxing out density, ideally, they would like to put in apartments. Barrows described the property with a steep driveway and one entrance off of Maple, therefore, the footprint for industrial may be challenging. Currently zoned at B-4, which would require an amendment, recommending B-6.

Detail Map #3 (SW Quadrant, along I-94 & CTH C & Downtown)
Rock River Property Holdings, LLC – Zoning B-5 Office and Research Commercial – 26.7 acres
Sewer services are available, private well
Access: would be provided by Indian Spring Drive (potentially modified entrance location)

Barrows stated there were 4 stickers were placed on this property; medical office, commercial office, office/connect road to downtown and mixed use. All fits with existing zoning except mixed use. Hafner questioned if proposal of independent/memory care living would fit the existing zoning to which Barrows stated she would look into that closer. Discussion about possible senior care development or hotel use were discussed.

Discussion about St. John's property (Hendricks Commercial Properties LLC)/downtown was started however Barrows stated they will go through this at next meeting (June 15)

8. Action Steps for Next Meeting (June 15) & Schedule Future Meeting(s)

Barrows stated the next meeting on June 15th, 6:30pm-9:30pm, will be discussing downtown. Another meeting was set for Tuesday, July 20th, 6:30pm-9:30pm

9. Adjournment

Motion by Valde, seconded by Krienke, to adjourn the meeting at 9:16 PM. Motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cassy Rivers
Administrative Support