

TOWN OF HULL  
**PLAN COMMISSION  
MEETING**

Sept. 20, 2016  
TIME: 5:30 p.m.

- 1. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER:** The Town of Hull Plan Commission Meeting was called to order on Tuesday, Sept. 20, 2016 by Vice- Chair Robert Enright at 5:30 p.m. at the Town of Hull Municipal Building, 4550 Wojcik Memorial Dr., Stevens Point, WI 54482.

Present: Jan Way, Bob Enright, Bob Bowen, Jocelyn Reid, and Plan Commission Secretary Patty Amman.

Excused: Shelley Binder, John Holdridge  
Absent: Dennis Ferriter

Also present: Jeff Schuler and Kristen Johnson from Portage County Planning & Zoning Dept.

- 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 19, 2016 Hull Plan Commission meeting:**  
*Motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of July 19, 2016 was made by Jan Way, seconded by Joceyln Reid. Motion carried by voice vote.*
- 3. CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS. AGENDA ITEMS ARE FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION.**  
*None.*

- 4. ANNOUNCEMENTS; VICE-CHAIR AND PLAN COMMISSION MEMBERS.**

Enright I don't have any announcements. Do any members have any announcements?

Amman John had mentioned the R-2 work that is being done with Chris Mrdutt. They're working on a potential new district that would be optional for the various towns.

Schuler That was my understanding too but the work has been interrupted. I think they've been getting close to something they can come back with. How to look at suburban neighborhoods in a different way than just a residential zoning district. How to do something a little different.

- 5. Update on Hwy. 10 East revised plan.**

Enright Jan, you know a little bit about this.

Way I went to one of the meetings in early summer and they said they would re-visit that whole idea and they have to follow the rules about determining how to proceed with that. Even at that time, it sounded like it wasn't going to happen. It just wasn't in their future.

They called everybody back together on August 30<sup>th</sup>. I didn't attend but I did look up the Portage County Gazette archives and I'll read a couple of paragraphs here. This is from that meeting: *"The Wisconsin Dept. of Transportation announced during a public meeting, Tuesday, August 30<sup>th</sup>, it will seek to essentially drop its plans to re-route Highway 10 from Amherst Junction south of Stevens Point and connect to Interstate 39 South off the Highway HH interchange. The reason is simply a dire lack of funding for projects throughout the state which has forced them to prioritize all their projects. Highway 10 fell so low on their list that they decided to discontinue all land preservation on the project. A public hearing, the date of which is yet to be determined, will be held by the State regarding dropping the project but officials said there really is no way to complete a project of that magnitude with an estimated cost of between \$200 and \$250 million."*

Somebody was quoted as saying, *"As you move to the west from Amherst Junction the numbers go slightly up..."* They're talking about Hwy. 10 East. *"When you're out by Amherst, the numbers are much lower. Then when you get into the urban area of Stevens Point, you have roughly 29,000 cars per day. Now if we go in and construct a highway, just to be clear, this is only a preservation project, this is not a construction project. We're only looking at preserving right-of-way. You would only see roughly a 30% diversion of traffic along that corridor. That would not eliminate any congestion in the Stevens Point urban area."* So he goes on to say, *"Safety and bridges are at the top of the priority list and that's why we're on the bottom of that list. Unfortunately the money situation is such that a lot of that pro-active work we can't get to because it's not prioritized because we have so much that's already at that state. But again, Wisconsin DOT officials said the fact they've been budgeted so little funds, they're struggling to maintain the current state highway system much less take on new construction. If our new preferred decision is to no longer have it, we would have a public hearing on this decision hopefully in early 2017. We would then work with the Federal Highway Department to finalize the decision. At this point, the Wisconsin DOT would close the environmental document and the project would be off the table indefinitely."*

Bowen In other words, they're saying it's not our problem, it's your problem. You deal with it. That's what they say.

Way I don't know how we can deal with it.

Bowen My suggestion is either a humungous round-a-bout at Brilowski Road and Hwy. 10 or an underpass/overpass. That would solve the conflict of east/west, north/south traffic.

Way They give it a report card and at worst, we're at a "D" and at other times maybe we're at a "C" for the problems out here on Highway 10 East. So unless we get an "F", so we have to get an "F"!

Enright It seems the real problem is the design of Hwy. 10 East between Brilowski Road and I-39. Spending \$250 million to buy up a bunch of farmland in order to reduce the traffic by only 30%, they're still going to have the same problem. A far less expensive project

might be to redesign it. Actually go back to the ideas you mentioned many years ago. That if there were frontage roads and limited access points because there are just too many driveways.

Bowen            In August of 19??, they had their plan commission meeting on this. John Gardner had the whole thing laid out with frontage and backage roads but it died right there. All that work. And DOT didn't do anything. They could have done something, it's their road. That was 1992 when it could have been decided.

Enright            Maybe Jeff has some ideas. Could the Town say, maybe in cooperation with the City, that this is what the problem is? It sounds like the bypass serves the purpose of speeding traffic across the state. Not solving this problem of urban congestion. That's their thing, to try to speed traffic across the state. Our concern seems to be the safety and drivability of that 2-mile stretch that is designed very poorly and requires a high level of care to avoid making a mistake (*in driving along there*). That would be a State project because that's a State road, right?

Schuler            I think the places you would express yourself is in your comprehensive plan and in your transportation chapter and in your intergovernmental cooperation element. The things you're looking to establish in your transportation element would be that it's really been a problem for Town residents for a long time. Trying to get on or off the road and circulate. That's the major problem, right?

Enright            Getting on and off and just the backups.

Schuler            The only thing you can do is sit down at the table and work out a reasonable solution. That's technically a County road, isn't it, because it's a State highway? But it's within the City of Stevens Point. So the jurisdictions that are affected are the City, with the Town on either side that has access so City, Town and County. Has there ever been a discussion? Now would be a really good time now that there isn't going to be a bypass. What's the future of that stretch of road? I think you want to have something in your planning document that says, over this planning period, you need to try to participate in a process that discusses and tries to resolve the problem. You're not going to resolve it here at the Town Plan Commission or Town Board but you're interested in getting together to say what can happen with that stretch of roadway. I think you want to go on record as saying, especially now that the bypass is not going to happen, what is the future planning going to be for Hwy. 10 through the Town and City.

Enright            I would think, since we're doing the Intergovernmental Cooperation Chapter, that we could speak in there about that. We've already done the Transportation Chapter, but go back to that.

Johnson            I could look at that. Towards the end of the chapter. Find a way to word it.

Schuler            Right now you're likely frustrated because you have no idea how to impact anything that goes on out there. I know there has been talk over time about the City and Hull looking at some sort of intergovernmental agreement, whatever the structure might be.

Way But even if we do something with the chapter, if there's no money, what difference will it make?

Schuler At some point, you can't worry about the fact that there's no money.

Way You've got to be prepared.

Schuler It's still an issue that needs to be discussed somehow. If you have talked about it and there is an opportunity that comes up, then you're in a position to act immediately.

Way That makes sense.

Enright I think if there was money to build a bypass, we'd still have a problem.

Schuler But now is a very good time. If that was supposed to be some affect on this part of the road because you're relocating Highway 10 to the south, that's not going to happen. But what is going to happen with what is left? It's an opportune time to use that to leverage a conversation and say, it's really important now to do that. Reach out to the City and County highway and at least have a meeting and hear from the folks that are most directly involved with the road in the City and County about what they think is going to happen. Then you know what the playing board is and you can figure out how you want to make your statement and get involved in the discussion.

Enright I have a few things written down for when we come back to that to put in there.

## **6. FINAL Review of Hull Comprehensive Plan revised Chapter 9 – Intergovernmental Cooperation.**

Johnson Starting in the beginning of the chapter, I included the language right from the State Statutes that details what the elements of each chapter should include. It's where we want to look at the Town's relationship with other local governments, with the State and regional government. Identify any existing or potential conflicts that might be there and come up with some solutions or a process to resolve those. Or just have discussions.

The first section, 9.1 is the relationship with the City and villages, we added some information about the Mutual Aid Agreement with Stevens Point so that it better defines what that Mutual Aid is. It says when any piece of fire equipment is needed from another fire department, that fire department would supply it.

Then we added a new bullet point, the second one, that talks about the Metro Fire District. The Town is a member of that. There is an Automatic Aid Agreement with the Village of Plover and City of Stevens Point to provide response to fires, etc.

The last two, those remain the same. The maintenance agreement with the parks with the City and also for snow plowing the streets.

The next page, the second one I was maybe going to re-word. As you know, there are certain communities that are adjacent and the Town of Dewey is one of them. That's why it's

specifically called out here. The only agreement we know of at this time is for Mutual Aid to provide the fire protection. We could leave that. Otherwise I would say, the only cooperative agreement the Town has with Dewey is for Mutual Aid for fire protection. It's just re-wording it.

Reid I think that sounds more positive the way it is.

Johnson If it sounds more positive the way it is, then we'll leave it that way.  
Then, there are no written agreements with the Town of Carson at this time.  
School districts have really stayed the same.

In your relationship with the County, there have been changes with the solid waste provider to Harter Disposal so I updated that. Waste is taken to the solid waste transfer facility.

Bowen Where is the solid waste transfer facility?

Johnson Both are located in Plover.

Schuler It's at the MRF. That's the trash hub.

Bowen Where does the solid waste go after that?

Johnson It goes to the transfer facility then I believe it goes to Marathon County landfill because the Portage County one is closed.

Schuler They have multi-year contracts with the facilities. It goes onto trucks and out it goes.

Johnson Then there's the Portage County Highway Department.

Schuler This is the first place the highway department is mentioned and it would be good to have a second paragraph that describes State Hwy. 10 which is a County maintained road that goes through the Town of Hull. However you want to express it, "*the congestion problems have increased over the years and we look to work with the County on working on solutions for this problem.*" Some way of introducing the relationship at that point.

Bowen Would that go in the Summary of Findings?

Schuler It can go in several places. But here I think you just want to say, I would check with the highway commissioner, Portage County is responsible somewhat for Highway 10 East, which is a very congested road through the Town of Hull. Just leave it at that and say the facility is there and the County is associated with it and in the next section, talk about what you want to accomplish. At some point say, this is a big issue for the Town of Hull and we want to find some way to be a part of the conversation that discusses solutions. That's what your goal is, to establish that. The whole point of this plan is to allow you to do stuff. You want to be part of the conversation. Put in your plan this is a really large issue and you need some way to find to do it, however the Plan Commission and Town Board wants to deal with it. You could set up a

little summit with the County and City officials saying, what will happen now? Specifics don't need to be in the plan but you want to put something in there that says, we've identified it in the plan and you know it's an issue for us, so we're going to be talking to you.

Enright                    At this stage, maybe just a statement that this is a main road connecting the Town to the City and it is maintained?

Schuler                  I would ask Nathan Check to give you the right word. But I think we can get you the intent of what you want there. We don't have to word-smith it right now.

Johnson                I can try something out and come back and show it to you and you can tweak it from there. I'll do that.

                              The next one, Portage County Sheriff and Ambulance, that stayed the same. They still do periodic patrols on an on-call basis and the Stevens Point Fire Dept. operates the ambulance service for Portage County.

                              The following bullet point for the Planning & Zoning Dept., that's been largely updated to include 7 different sections. Some of them were not fully talked about before so I wanted to make sure we did that this time.

Reid                      It mentions the 7 different items but I counted only 6.

Johnson                You're right. Jeff pointed it out to me earlier. Right after Water Resources, I'm going to put in Geographic Information Systems (*GIS*) because that's the one that is talked about on the next page. I forgot to include it in the list. I elaborated on the water resource section and then the GIS section too.

                              For the County Parks Department, that's mostly the same as well except there is a note in there about the Jordan (*Park*) West Lodge which may be rented year-round in case people were curious.

Bowen                  How is it Jordan West since its east?

Reid                      There's 2 lodges though. One in the park and one on the west side of the road (*County Road Y*).

Johnson                The park is open all year round but only maintained certain portions of the year. I don't remember the conversation about the lodge, do you remember?

Amman                  They were wondering if it could be used year-round, which you found out about.

Johnson                The Portage County Treasurer Department collects real and personal property taxes.

                              The State of Wisconsin, the DNR is still the same and the DOT is the same. Jeff, you wouldn't recommend adding anything in there about the Hwy. 10 East would you?

Schuler No. Because here you talk about the responsibility for planning and development of road networks. I think you can use that to get to the point you want to make in the later section, so that should be when we look at it.

Johnson Okay. The Government Accountability Board replaced the State Elections Board (WEC).

Way It's not the GAB anymore. It's the Wisconsin Elections and Ethics Commission.

Johnson So that's changing. When did that happen?

Schuler Within the last couple of months.

Way It was a while ago but it just went into effect.

Johnson I'll have to rewrite that because that's talking about elections and the Town's role.

Way I think their role is the same.

Johnson Okay, I'll double check that.

Schuler Paula can fill you in on that too.

Johnson The Summary of Findings, I'm skipping to that second paragraph where it says, 'the need exists to continue intergovernmental cooperation and planning in several very important areas: Land Use planning' then we added, "boundary agreements with the City of Stevens Point." John has stated that is an area the Town wants to work towards, but at this point, they're holding off, awaiting the resolution of Well #11 to see what happens there, before they jump into something like this with the City. But that is at least in there. We also added the groundwater protection policy and practices.

Schuler I would suggest a new third paragraph where you could say something about how important that road with multiple jurisdictions is to the Town and how you really want to be part of a discussion of its future. If you're going to have a finding out of this, you've had the annexation issues you've had over time, general boundary discussions, but here's a really specific, unique one too, for transportation, that, I think, warrants its own mention. So that's the place where you say, it really is a big deal to us.

Enright I thought they belonged in the next section because they were action items, but maybe we can put them in multiple places. Again, that similar language that the County controls that and this is an area of concern for us, U.S. Highway 10.

Johnson You wanted it in the summary you said?

Enright You said we should mention it multiple times. I thought it could go into potential existing issues, but I can live with it either way. If it's in the summary, some people

may only read the summary initially and it's important enough that it should be pointed out. Because a lot of things in this report are factual things. Maybe a statement that "*Highway 10 on the East side of Stevens Point adjoining the Town of Hull is an important issue that needs to be addressed.*"

Schuler To get after the point, because this is the intergovernmental cooperation element, you might want to mention how Hwy. 10, something like, "*traffic and travel on Hwy. 10 East is a major concern for Hull residents*". The second sentence would be, "*Hwy. 10 East is a multi-jurisdictional road involving the State, County, City and Town of Hull and the Town is very interested in discussing the future planning for that special roadway.*" That lets anyone know, that's a big deal for our community and we want to be involved. And it mentions the different layers of responsibility that are there that you will likely be calling upon to talk with.

Johnson I started to write that down, then wrote, see minutes.

Enright I had a little bit stronger language, instead of discussing, they're 'working with' these other entities to alleviate some of the traffic problems. Is it easy enough for you to pull that off of the minutes?

Johnson It is. Patty does a great job. So should we move down to the conflicts?

Enright Just an editorial comment on that third paragraph in 9.2, I think it would read better if there was a subject in that sentence. It says, 'develop a standard policy' so we're saying that 'The Town recognizes the need to develop a standard policy' The idea being we want annexation planning that takes into consideration all the governments. So just adding, 'The Town recognizes'.

Johnson Starting it out like that.

Enright It would be parallel to the other sentences.

Johnson Under #1 for Issues and Conflicts, "Improving the police services", then we added 'particularly for bicycle and pedestrian traffic'. So calling out specifically issues you had with both bikes and people walking and jogging on the roadways.

Enright It goes beyond police services which would be enforcement. It would also have to do with the design of roads with bike paths and pedestrian walkways.

Johnson This would be the police enforcing the ordinance. You have a bike and pedestrian ordinance, right? Did you adopt it?

Enright The safety things about where you're supposed to walk.

Amman We had a Safety Committee and I'm not exactly sure where they ended up and if they went for approval yet. The County developed a program, parts of which are being implemented but it's not 100% done yet.

Johnson I thought the sheriff dept. would have to be the enforcement to that.

Schuler I know in the early discussions, there were a lot of things happening on the roads that you didn't like, whether it be speeding or people walking and biking all over, the University and SPASH and some of their race training, XC training. The early thoughts were could the sheriff dept. do something about that, for speeding for sure but also for some of the non-motorized stuff. I'm assuming that's how that ended up in here like that.

Enright But I was also thinking that an example on Old Hwy. 18 where the road goes through back and forth between the City and the Town, then there was a bicycle lane. But Hull had it painted and Steven Point didn't. So the idea was we didn't want them to cross administrative boundaries and not have the same striping. It was broader than just police. It was also to try to get intergovernmental cooperation for consistency throughout the area.

Johnson Would that be tied to the bike and pedestrian plan somehow Jeff?

Schuler Yes. I think that would be a second issue. The first one identifies the problems with how people were using stuff and the second point would be that there should be coordination where facilities extend across boundaries to ensure consistency. So maybe a new #2.

Amman That sounds familiar to me because we had a Parks meeting last week and that stretch of Old Hwy. 18 came up in the discussion. We were talking about the bike lane there in the Town of Hull and the City was going to redo their section or something and supposedly the City was going to continue with that stripe for cycling but they never did. You've got this bike section and then all of a sudden, boom, there's nothing. Something got dropped, there, along the way.

Enright Exactly. Coordinating with the City on the designation of bike and pedestrian lanes in areas where the two municipalities join.

Way In #1 I hope we're not disregarding vehicular traffic. We're emphasizing improving police services particularly for bicycle and pedestrians. But I live along Wilshire and I get far more annoyed with speeding cars, trucks and motorcycles.

Johnson If you want, we can throw that word "vehicles" in there. Or maybe we want to take that out and not be so particular.

Amman It does kind of imply the normal things they would be doing which I assume would be vehicles then it pulls out, in particular the bicycles and pedestrians.

Way True. But sometimes I think we feel a bit neglected out here.

Enright                    That's also a problem along Hwy. 10 too where the speed limit drops just before you enter the east side of the City of Stevens Point. Reinforcement could make a difference there. Maybe just adding 'motor vehicles'.

Johnson                You have an idea Jeff?

Schuler                Instead of saying, 'particularly for bicycles and pedestrian', you could say, 'improving police services regarding both vehicular and non-vehicular traffic'. That would let them know you're concerned about both cars and non-cars.

Way                    That, or, 'improving police services, particular for bicycles and pedestrian traffic along with vehicular traffic'.

Enright                    That would be the county sheriff enforcing, right? The City enforces along Hwy. 10 within the City. Is that right? To get it out of the abstract, on very rare occasions, there's the City of Stevens Point police car that I've seen twice reinforcing the traffic speeds along Hwy. 10 East. Along Badger Ave., largely for traffic that is above the speed limit on that stretch. That affects the Town of Hull people like those in our neighborhood.

Amman                So where it comes down to 40 mph from 55.

Enright                    Where it comes down to 40, because nobody is going 40 mph. That's the City police that would be doing that in that border area that enforces the law there and if they slow the traffic down, it affects the Town of Hull. If they have a presence there, that would be a kind of intergovernmental cooperation.

Schuler                Technically the City police department can help you only coincidentally.

Enright                    That's what I'm getting at.

Schuler                Because they don't directly serve the Town of Hull. You wouldn't be coordinating with them, but you could say, keep up the good work hanging around the border because that helps Hull. That's an interesting question because their jurisdiction would end at the border but they can provide some useful service even if they're not directly doing it at the request of the Town of Hull.

Enright                    Right. People in Hull use that part of the road that is enforced by the City and no other residential area of the City uses that part of the road.

Bowen                I think the municipal departments that oversee these overlapping jurisdictions, you see the County out on I-39, and they can enforce the traffic rules in the City too. I'm sure that overlaps in other areas. They can't be restricted to where they have enforcement. It's all together.

Enright                    That area of that road is all within the City of Stevens Point. The Town of Hull residents use that as an access point.

Schuler        You might want to change police to law enforcement. “Improving police ‘or law enforcement’ particularly for bicycle and pedestrian traffic along with vehicular traffic through discussion with Portage County Sheriff’s Department and Stevens Point Police Department” and I would change the word ‘is’ to ‘as needed.’ You could talk with them. You’re going to talk with the County for sure. You might want to have a talk with the City. I think that it makes the statement that you think it’s important to do that. You’re not setting policy. You’re saying that’s an issue, vehicular and bike/ped stuff is important and we want to improve services by talking to the sheriff and the Stevens Point police.

Johnson        Okay, good. Moving on to #2, which would become #3 ‘An ongoing review of fire services and equipment is needed to ensure an efficient operation of the Metro Fire system and to maintain cooperative efforts with other area fire departments.’

                  #3 ‘Land Use decisions and development in neighboring municipalities will have an impact on the Town of Hull residents and neighborhoods. The Town of Hull will continue to work with surrounding units of government to help ensure efficient delivery of services and a desired quality of life.’

                  #4 ‘Jointly plan a boundary agreement’, that part was added specifically to say boundary agreement, ‘with the City of Stevens Point for potential expansion and development.’

                  #5 ‘Stevens Point, Plover and other urban area communities need a structure to improve communication, development practices and planning within the Stevens Point/Plover metropolitan area.’

                  Is there anything else you would want to add? Maybe that we haven’t thought of, as another conflict?

Enright                Maybe more explicit attention to, I’ll read you what I’ve roughed out here, “The Town of Hull and the City of Stevens Point need to jointly plan future Land Use and development in areas of Hull that are in the path of Stevens Point’s Commercial and residential expansion.” The reason why I’m saying this is because after we did our first comprehensive plan and then we saw the City’s, the City plan had a future Land Use map that we had not seen before and it was inconsistent with ours. In looking at intergovernmental cooperation, that our maps should match up with one another, rather than the Town of Hull thinking this is what this land is going to be used for and Stevens Point thinking it’s going to be used for something different. Then the land is annexed and we didn’t know that.

Johnson        So working towards the planning of Land Use, you said.

Enright                Right. Especially in the extra-territorial area. It seems obvious we should do that.

Johnson        Is that extra-territorial 3 miles? Jeff, do you know?

Schuler        From the City it is.

Enright                    Ideally the Town would like to have some understanding and say-so about that. I think that's what we should be doing. Our plan and set up doesn't mean anything if it can just be thrown out with annexation.

Amman                    Someplace in here, Jeff, would this also be where you would add another plug for the Hwy. 10 East? Mentioning it multiple times and that would be the first mention in this section.

Schuler                    Yes, I think that would be....

Johnson                   We could talk about that, I have stuff written.

Schuler                    We did for the 9.2 but not for the 9.3 yet. Do you recall why you removed your Goals and Action Plan?

Johnson                   John said to remove them. I don't know why. We haven't removed them anywhere else in the plan.

Schuler                    Maybe he was frustrated by the lack of traction.

Johnson                   I think he didn't like to see the redundancy of listing something as an issue, then listing it as a goal, then having an action plan. He felt he was seeing the same thing listed multiple times.

Amman                    I think he was trying to condense and simplify a bit.

Johnson                   Yes. Once we got to that part of the discussion, whether or not we should we bring that back (*and re-insert it*).

Schuler                    In the scheme of things, people say, what are your most important statements about a topic. It would be your Goals and Objectives, and your Policies, or, in this case, the Goals and Action statements. That is where it says, this is what we're going to do. Something to think about going forward. We don't have to resolve that tonight.

Enright                    Make a note of that.

Johnson                   We'll make a note of that because how we have it now, you don't get to see what we had as Goals and Action Plans. If we wanted to have a discussion about bringing it back, we can look at what is currently the language and see if those are something we would want to keep. We can condense it by at least having the Goals. Jeff, would you recommend having a Goal and an Action Plan?

Schuler                    I think the next time it's discussed would be a good time to say, what do you want to accomplish with the whole section. Do the statements you have in there already accomplish what you need to? Or is there a way to make one last, finer point on it? It's a discussion worth

having. Like you said, John may have had some very good reasons why he felt that way. It would be great to have him be part of the conversation.

Enright                    Okay. So we won't make the final approval on this one. The other thing I think about this section is the end point of this is that we can actually think about ways of intergovernmental cooperation that are things that are other than potential conflicts. It could be that just cooperation among the governmental entities could make things better. In fact, in this case we're talking about here, it is in the interest of Stevens Point and in the interest of Hull to improve Hwy. 10 East. It's nothing that we're on the opposite sides of. In fact, we're of the same mind. But working together might actually make it better for everybody who lives and works in that neighborhood. An expansion of this is, if we work together, we might be able to come up with a workable plan. Propose to the State, don't spend \$250 million. Instead spend a fraction of that and fix this. Is there a way we can work that in, you think?

Johnson                I think so. As a new #7.

Enright                    Or even in the subtitle section of 9.3, that it wouldn't just be problems.

Reid                      It says, 'identified some issues' which isn't necessarily problems.

Enright                    In language, 'issues' has sort of become a euphemism for 'problem'.

Johnson                I'll work it in. It's a good point, it doesn't have to be a problem or a conflict. It's an issue you'd like to have addressed or at least work towards addressing.

Reid                      Or, 'areas of concern'.

Enright                    So, we were going to have the final review of this chapter but I think we should have a motion to look at this again after these revisions are made.

*A motion was made by Jan Way to review this Chapter 9 on Intergovernmental Cooperation again by the Hull Plan Commission after these suggested changes have been put in by Kristen Johnson. Motion seconded by Jocelyn Reid. Motion passed.*

## **7. INITIAL Review of Hull Comprehensive Plan revised Chapter 10 – Land Use/Urban.**

Johnson                Chapter 10 is definitely a work in progress because we're still going through the mapping with the Land Use map and the Zoning. This is our first look at it here with the Plan Commission. Starting off with the Land Use Element, we wanted to look at the existing land use acreage in the Town of Hull. You have map 10.1 in all of your packets. That is the Existing Land Use Map. What our GIS department did is they went to the aerial photo and tried to update it where they could tell obviously if there was vacant land, if it would go to residential or commercial. I had given a large map to John and Patty as an exercise for them to look over and circle any properties that they knew had changed since the last look at this in 2005, I think it was. That's where those numbers in Table 10.1 come from. It's reflecting the acreage on your map

10.1. Those numbers are summarized on the following page, broken down by residential, commercial, industrial and so on.

Bowen            Kristen, what is 'net density'? In your opening statement, it's used a couple of times.

Johnson        It's from the State Statutes.

Schuler        A net density is, say you have a large number of people who are going to be living in the Town in the future and you assume a certain density for development, like 2-acre lots, 3 acre lots, 1 acre lots. A certain amount of that land put in a subdivision would have to be road right-of-way. They're thinking, what are the actual buildable acres that they might need. When they talk about 'net density', it's how many acres for houses less whatever it would take to provide services to that. In this case, roads. I think that's the easiest example I could give. If you have a 40-acre piece of land and it is 1-acre density, you can't just put 40 houses on it. You'd have to have a 60 foot road right-of-way that would create a street that would lead to the driveways that lead to the houses. That would be your gross acreage. Your net acreage would be wherever the houses are less the roads. They put everything in this when they put together the statute.

Bowen            It sounds like a 'shop' term that the general public wouldn't be attuned to because it doesn't mean anything to me.

Schuler        No. But it's if you're going to guess how many acres you need, make sure you don't include the road as a part. You can't say, we need 40 acres, because it wouldn't be 40 acres, it would be the actual net.

Bowen            The actual net useable space.

Schuler        That's the idea behind that. I don't know if we've ever really dealt with that term in the past 10 years.

Johnson        The numbers you see in the table there, they're plugged into the text and the residential Land Use talks about the greatest areas of concentration which includes U.S. Hwy. 10 East corridor between the railroad on the south to Oakland Drive on the north. From the railroad to Oakland Drive there's a high concentration of residential. Then also the Highway 66 corridor. Then a little bit more along North Second Drive. Those would be the most obvious ones if you look on the map with some others scattered throughout the town.

Under Commercial, we've got about 215 acres with the largest portion of that being the Country Club. Depending upon the Future Land Use Map change, we might change the Existing Land Use acreage. What we're proposing for Future Land Use is to put just the buildings and the parking lot (*of the Country Club*) into commercial and then the remaining course itself would be agriculture. So the size of commercial acreage may change if we do go that route.

Industrial is about 27 acres. Institutional is about 26 acres.

Right-of-way went up just a little bit to 1,155 acres.

Reid I have a question on that. I don't know if it's my poor math skills but it says 'agriculture represents the third largest land use in Hull just 'ahead' of residential use. But the percentage is residential at 14.3% and agriculture 12.6 %. So ag is smaller.

Schuler Because it was, as it was written in the previous plan. There was 2,702 acres of ag and 2,500 acres of residential when the plan was done before. It's just a place we didn't catch.

Reid So could you change the wording to 'behind residential uses' instead of 'ahead of'?

Schuler Yes. That's an excellent catch, thank you.

Johnson Then for Parks and Recreation, I wanted to make it known that it could include private and public recreation. One example would be campgrounds, nature preserves, bike trails and boat landings, things like that. It talks about the bulk of it being Jordan Park and then a few other smaller parks across the Town. And that if you want to know where those parks are, you can refer to Chapter 4, the Utilities and Community Facilities Chapter in your comprehensive plan.

On page 73, Natural Areas used to be one of the categories but we've gotten away from that because most of the other towns do not talk about that. We want to be consistent across the board. What was Natural Areas is now lumped into and under 'Undeveloped/Vacant'. That is why Undeveloped/Vacant would have gone up considerably in acreage

Enright Is there a difference there? Because Natural Areas / Protected says that it's protected.

Johnson It's not really protected. It's the natural restrains for building like your flood plains, wetlands just as it says. That stuff is usually still vacant, like undevelopable land. That's why we moved it to Undeveloped.

Schuler And 'H' (*Natural Areas*) is kind of a misnomer because this part of the plan isn't talking about whether it's protected or not. You're just identifying the type of feature. When you talk about wetlands and those other type of things, they're generally in vacant areas.

Bowen Is that wetland area that they developed for mitigation out east of Town, is that in the Town of Sharon or the Town of Hull? It's just beyond Brilowski Road. It's a pretty big area.

*There was some review of the maps and where the different town lines start and stop. Jeff Schuler had a County map that was looked at. It was found to be in the Town of Stockton.*

Enright It's wetland mitigation?

Bowen When they put Hwy. 10 in, they destroyed a lot of riparian wetland. They had to re-establish wetland someplace because some of the natural stuff was gone. What they do is to

meet the regulation. I'm sure there is some wildlife out there but it's not like it was when it was by the river. That was a big issue as to why they shouldn't cross the river there.

Johnson We added a new Land Use to include water by itself. Instead of where it used to be included. We put that as a stand-alone section (*J*). The bulk of that would be the Wisconsin River, Plover River, Hay Meadow Creek. It's just over 2,000 acres.

The next section is for Land Use Trends and what we're projecting as Land Use. The Trend is looking at some planning documents you did since 1978. You have a 1978 development guide and then the 2005 comprehensive plan and then today's update with 2016 acreage in here now. You can look across the board where you can see how much residential you've gained. If that's going up, then something else is going to go down, most likely I'd say ag. For commercial, it does say it excluded the golf course back in 1978. You can see it was as low as 44 acres for commercial in 1978.

Bowen Did we actually lose that much natural wetland area or is that because it's gone into a new category?

Johnson It's because it's a new category. Certain things have changed. I can state that if you want, or just leave it.

Enright So where did it go?

Johnson It went into the Undeveloped/Vacant category in 2016. Then some of the water went to its own category.

Schuler The general theme there is how much of the land has been considered developed, and however you account for it, what is considered undeveloped. If you look at the Agricultural & Idle plus Natural categories, what's in them in the individual years mapping-wise has changed but you've got about 20,000 acres in 1978 and it's down to 15,000 to 16,000 acres of the undeveloped portion of it by 2005. Now you're looking at right around 14,000 or 15,000. So that's the trend. That there is more developed land over time. It's the obvious other part of the total developed land going up that it shows where it's coming out of.

Bowen What is the bottom line in terms of total acreage in the Town of Hull?

Schuler That's a good question. There is an answer but we have this discussion with our GIS folks all the time. We have so many different layers of information that the actual number of acres can shift depending upon how you draw the line. You haven't lost 3,000 acres. You've lost some land over time through annexation. There will be a little variability in our numbers but that's as close as we can get. We try to be as consistent as we can in keeping up with the approved annexations. We're accountable to the census folks for boundaries. When it comes to totaling land use, we total the colors on a map. When you do a map, you say, red is commercial, yellow is residential. Sometimes through those layers, you'll get a little bit of difference in the bottom line. It's the nature of the electronic world. What you see here should be a pretty good representation of what has happened over time with annexations.

Johnson Do you want me to pick out all the red/underlined? If you have questions. There is one change I need to make to 'A' on page 74. That last paragraph talks about road right-of-way averages of residential development. It says, 'it would equate to an additional 125 acres of right-of-way.' I didn't do the math on that.

Schuler It's based on an additional 1,000 acres. My guess is that, like we talked about before, how do you get to that net thing. It says here, if you figure residential development is going to be 10-15%, they'll tell you how much extra right-of-way you need. So if you look at the previous plan, it says we're going to have 1,000 acres. I think what we probably did was to split the difference between 10% and 15% which is 12.5%. 12.5% of 1,000 acres is going to be 125 extra acres of road. If you're going to say, we're going to need to have so much more residential, you make an assumption of how much of that is going to be road and there you go. In this case it would be 12.5% of 140 acres instead of 1,000. So that '125' will be much smaller.

Johnson Yes, it will be like 17.5 acres.

Schuler That's where that calculation came from. So that 125 will change based on whatever percentage that is of 140 acres.

Johnson There's not a whole lot of change here for commercial and institutional. It's just stating that we're updating the year from 2005 to 2016. The development guide that is mentioned throughout here, we had the wrong date on it before. We had it listed as 1973 but we confirmed that it's actually 1978.

Going on to the next page (75), Trends in Land Values. Here we're looking at the Equalized Assessed Property Values from 1990 to 2000 and then from 2000 to 2015 to see how those have changed. The classes of property have changed a little bit. That is why in Table 10.3 you'll see on the notes on the bottom (*1 and 2*) where it says the Undeveloped category used to be called the Swamp and Waste property classification. Then the Ag Forest classification wasn't created until 2006 so we wouldn't have data on that for 1990 and 2000. You can see across the board where property values have gone up and where they've gone down. I think only agriculture was where it went down.

Enright In the previous page where you were talking about commercial (page 74) and industrial land use, there are several sentences in here about commercial development without annexation to Stevens Point. Is this really a possibility? That the City would go for the extension of utilities?

Johnson Until you have a conversation with them, I guess I wouldn't know. Talking about the Wellhead Protection Zone, any new commercial activity within those zones has to be developed utilizing municipal sewer and water. That's where it says, "This would preclude commercial development without annexation to Stevens Point, unless an agreement can be reached regarding" providing those utilities.

Enright There really wouldn't be any motivation for the City to do that, right? They would do annexation because of the tax revenue, right?

Schuler Well, sure. But you have the experience of the Village of Plover and the Town of Plover who 10 years ago created an intergovernmental agreement that reserved a portion of the town as town with sewer and water available to them allowing the value to remain in the town. So the precedence exists in the County. Was there a specific set of circumstances? That was where Crossroads Commons was going to go out of the town and into the village. Was there a way to compensate for that? That probably drove that. Would you have the same circumstances that could exist between the City of Stevens Point and the Town of Hull? Maybe not, but you never know. There might be a circumstance that we don't know about now that would make it advantageous to enter into a relationship like that. Logic or past experience would dictate it's not likely. But all of a sudden the Plovers did it so I guess it is a possibility. I know since Mayor Wiza has been in office, there has been a lot of expectation that communication would be a little more open, honest and free. I know there haven't been a lot of meetings yet, but I hope that there can be. The Town of Stockton Plan Commission and Board met with the Stevens Point Plan Commission. They had a joint meeting held at a City Plan Commission meeting where they talked about what their thoughts were on Land Use. The town brought their perspective on what they wanted to see. I would recommend Hull doing something like that too. Either invite those committees out here, or, have a joint meeting there. You brought up the point earlier, it would be really good for the Town if they had a discussion with the City on what they were thinking about in the extra-territorial area. What I like about the joint meetings is that everybody is on the record. You're at an official meeting where you expect what you're hearing is the sincere feedback of the City and vice-versa. I would say that would be something to shoot for. Before you finalize your Land-Use chapter, within the next couple of months, see if it's possible to have a meeting with the City Plan Commission. I saw on Monday night, I think they've hired a consultant to help them draft some of their text. So they're starting up again. They've been on hold for several years actually doing work on the comprehensive plan update. So they're moving forward with it now. Now is a good time to reach out.

Enright They haven't finished this section yet.

Schuler No. They're just on Chapter 1 so they're just getting into it. Even before that, they were talking with the Town of Stockton on prospective Land Use so they don't have to be at a certain place to conduct the conversation. You don't have to wait for them to catch up. They can have the conversation any time. And you, having talked about it a little bit, can represent what your thoughts are. Especially the adjacent fringe issues, which is where you really want to have communication and the long-range dialogs.

Enright In a concrete instance, like when there is a parcel of land that the owner wants to sell it for commercial, that would be the time to talk with them and say, you want to sell it as commercial and we want to keep it in the Town of Hull. Maybe we can work this out in a way that it can be developed commercially.

Schuler Right. In that moment is not the best time to have that conversation. You want to establish the fact you want to be involved with those types of decisions ahead of time so they know, okay, if someone approaches the City, they really need to talk to the Town. It puts the process in place where the City knows that it has to be part of a larger conversation that you may

want to share information. The Town would say, we're really interested in maintaining value because the only way we can do the best things we want to for the Town is if we have revenue to support services. Right?

Enright                      Right.

Schuler                      That's the point of value in the community. You're allowed to do whatever you want to do and part of this is prioritizing what sort of services you can provide. I would say the sooner the better and not based on a reaction to a single thing because then you're vying for this one thing and you want to establish the general idea that we want to talk about this stuff.

Enright                      Yes, maybe we should ask John to set up a meeting. I've mentioned this over time. I think it would be a great idea to do that.

Schuler                      Now is a very good time to do that.

Bowen                      Kristen, what is the difference between Ag Forest and Forest? Does it have something to do with managed crop acreage?

Johnson                    I don't have the definitions in front of me but....

Bowen                      My guess is that Ag Forest is in managed crop and the plain Forest is not.

Schuler                      Oh, looking for the definitions of those categories. Those State definitions.

Amman                      It does say Ag Forest was created in 2006 as a new classification.

Schuler                      But you're wondering why.

Johnson                    Here it is; Ag Forest is land that is producing or capable of producing commercial forest products if the land satisfies any one of the following: if it's contiguous to a parcel that has been classified in whole as Ag Land, the parcel and the contiguous parcel must have the same owner. Or, the forest land is located on a parcel that contains ag land before the January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2004 assessment. Or, the forest land is located on a parcel where at least 50% of the acreage was converted to ag land as of a certain date. So it strongly ties it to ag land and ag assessment. Productive forest land is land that is producing or capable of producing commercial forest products. It says the same things. Forest land cannot include buildings or improvements. Forested areas that are being managed or set aside to grow tree crops for industrial wood or to obtain tree products such as sap, bark or wood or seeds. Forest areas with no commercial use may have trees including cut-over.

Way                          A family farm that has a piece of wooded area on it would be the ag-forest.

Johnson                    That's what I would think too.

Way                          Where as Consolidated Papers property would be forest.

Johnson Or tree crops for industrial wood. Does that help?

Bowen I go with my assumption that stuff that's in managed forest crop is Ag Forest and the other stuff is just Forest.

Johnson We'll go with that. On page 76 Land Use Conflicts. I'm not going to go through every one of them, unless you have some comments.

#7 was added new so the identified conflict would be, "Groundwater usage by Hull that may conflict with the City of Stevens Point Municipal Well #11."

Reid I wonder if you should reverse the wording on that because it almost sounds like it's our fault.

Johnson I think there was concern there was going to be the lack of water for use by Hull residents because of Municipal Well #11. May impact the use of water by residents of Hull.

Reid Otherwise it sounds like something we're doing.

Johnson Okay, I'll reverse that around.

Reid We were here first.

Johnson Then Future Land Use Recommendations is talking about the City of Stevens Point comprehensive planning process. The third paragraph got a little tricky for me because they are in the process, the City, of working through their comp. plan, updating it. At the time, in 2006, they did say they were going to expand. I'm assuming they are going to anticipate further growth, maybe not that much. I guess it's a good idea to have that conversation with them at a future meeting. Maybe we could update this section a little better.

Schuler The basic point remains very true, though.

Johnson It does, okay.

Schuler The first part of that paragraph.

Johnson Towards the bottom of that page we talk about redevelopment encouraged in an orderly pattern adjacent to and compatible with existing development. Then we have the constraints map showing where development is less likely to occur along with the Wellhead Protection zones. You have that map in your packets in case you want to look at that.

Table 10.3 would show the Future Land Use acreage. It's a work in progress with the Future Land Use map. I highlighted all those numbers (*in yellow because they will change*). I don't know if I attempted to put new numbers in there or not, but those numbers aren't going to stay. Both tables you see on this page 80 are going to change depending upon how the map changes. I don't know how much you want to talk about that.

Bowen Is there a reason why the Stevens Point Airport is not displayed on any of these maps?

Johnson It's in the City of Stevens Point. That would be the reason why it doesn't have a color. Because it's not in the Town of Hull.

Amman Not so much a color but just the run way crossings.

Schuler You want the run ways on there?

Bowen Well it would give some information to people as to all that land area which belongs to the Stevens Point Airport.

Schuler We'll talk to our mapping guys.

Johnson I think there was maybe one of the maps that included the run ways.

Amman I think I've seen it in some of the previous chapters but not on these.

Johnson I will note that down here.

Bowen It's no big deal, but it would indicate what that land is being used for. Otherwise it looks like a lot of City land that isn't being used for anything.

Amman It's a helpful point of reference when you see where the airport is. You get your bearings and boundaries when you see that. That's where the airport is so you know where other things are at from there.

Johnson I'll see about having that added to your maps.

On page 81 we talk about Land Use Goals, Objectives and Policies starting with Issues Outstanding. One of the items would be to control not just unlicensed vehicles but also licensed vehicles on properties and the accumulation of junk on properties. I know you have some issues with the selling of cars from private properties.

#9 is also newly added to touch on Well #11 and the need to protect groundwater for Hull residents.

Enright Could we add a phrase onto that, "The continuing need to protect groundwater for Hull residents as a result of the City of Stevens Point's Well #11 and other developments in areas close to the Town of Hull." We don't know if there's going to be other developments.

Johnson True. For Goals, nothing changed until we got to #4. Developing a safety plan for Hull roads running north from Stevens Point. Just a small distinction on how that was worded.

The next page (82). Nothing until we get to the bottom talking about Future Land Use categories and the mapping criteria. When you look at the map, all the different colors, you're

supposed to be able to look at this language and say, this is exactly how we're mapping that. I don't know if you remember all the proposals we had for mapping changes but one of them is to eliminate the Rural Residential Future Land Use category. The reason behind that was the middle map here, that dark orange color. You have areas that are either residential or more rural agricultural land. That was the point of taking Rural Residential away, because you could either list it as Residential or there's an Ag category for Future Land Use, L-3. Zoning allows for 2-acre minimum all the way up to 10 acres. You could still have your larger lots, 2 acres or greater. So that is why that wording is stricken.

Enright                      On that page (82) under Action Plan, this might be the place to mention what Jeff was talking about, the work with the Stevens Point Planning Commission on issues related to future Land Use.

Schuler                      So that would be a new #5 under Action Plan.

Johnson                    On page 83, Commercial and Industrial Mapping Criteria, you had the Commercial Mixed Use category which is currently this property out here (*on the map*) in the pink. It looks like 2 big, 40-acre properties but there is a sliver across the road from them. Technically it's 4 parcels. The idea there is that there are only 4 parcels. That district (*category*) is not being used (*anywhere else*) so we thought we'd get that eliminated. Last time when we talked, you were interested in that land going to become ag.

Enright                      South of Old Hwy. 18 off Brilowski Road.

Reid                          We talked about the area adjacent to that.

Amman                      If you remember from our last meeting, Shelley Binder brought that up when we were talking about potentially changing it to Industrial and she said, "I don't think the neighbors there would want that to be industrial." They decided agricultural might be a better (*category*).

Reid                          It's a corn field right now.

Johnson                    So we'll jump down to Natural Areas Mapping Criteria. Mapping your sensitive areas, wetlands, flood plains, any land you think is important for wildlife habitat and generally for public resources. Currently the light green on the map is Natural Areas Limited and that is not being mapped based on what we just said with the wetlands, the flood plains. It's the area the Town chose to put into Natural Areas Limited and I don't know why. I can tell why up there because of the park area by Jordan Park could be one reason. We were proposing to remove Natural Areas Limited and put the light green either into Natural Areas Protected or put it into ag or whatever else is surrounding it. I don't know if there is another way to explain that.

Schuler                      There didn't seem to be an environmental reason for mapping those, right?

Johnson                    You could also put Natural Areas Protected, on the next page, your criteria are #1 - #6. That's how you are mapping your natural areas in general. What I'm trying to say is those

light green areas are not actually following those 1-6 criteria. It's like #6, you deemed some of those areas important. Chris Mrdutt can explain that better.

I have this note added at the bottom that, "Designation of navigable waters and wetlands are based on DNR determination." They can actually be adjusted based on a survey that's done and they submit it to the DNR.

Schuler           It's staked or identified merges.

Johnson          I don't have anything else on there except maybe talking about transition area and mapping area. That's really hard to see but it's a hash mark on your Current Future Land Use map. That would be the growth area between the Town and the City of Stevens Point. I don't know if you still desired to have that overlay district. We haven't talked about that at all.

Amman            Again, this was just the initial (*or first*) review of this chapter by the Plan Commission. There are a lot of things we're still working our way through. Kristen and John and I have had a lot of meetings and still have a few more to go to make it all come together.

Enright            I had a question on page 83, the Commercial Mixed Use. We're proposing eliminating that. Wouldn't that be a useful category to have? Mixed Use would probably have residential and commercial mixed in. Is that what that was for?

Johnson          As it says, this category "is intended to be used in or near urban/suburban interface. Uses within this category include a mix of smaller scale retail, office, professional service and residential."

Enright            We were talking about that when we were talking about border issues. That's what we were trying to work out with the City on the piece east of the U.S. Bank and that fell apart but that was the idea. It would be something commercial, but not high intensity. I'm asking would it complicate things to keep that and wouldn't it be of some use to maintain that so you would have businesses of the type we're talking about here. As opposed to an intensive type.

Johnson          Like a big box store. That type of commercial.

Enright            Right.

Johnson          It doesn't complicate anything. It wouldn't change our proposal in any negative way. It's just whether or not you feel you would use it.

Enright            I think that is what we might have considered doing with the property that I just described, if it had not already been annexed. If that would have been on the map like that, we would have shown that to the City to get their agreement on that. That was basically the ultimate objective.

Johnson          Is it the area you have planned, by the U.S. Bank? Where is it? I'm not sure where you are talking about.

Enright                    The U.S. Bank, that is Elizabeth Road there, then it's the place where there is that old white house. That's what we were working on with the City.

Amman                    You're talking about the Urbanek property?

Enright                    Yes.

Schuler                    There was a lot of work done on that. Back when we were working on the language.

Enright                    The Community Development Director left it and we were expecting them to come back and revise both maps but it just ended. We were trying to work on a creation of this but it was rather difficult. It seems there could be a possibility for room for that, like the land we were just talking about along Old Hwy. 18 and Brilowski Road. The City of Stevens Point residents who live just north of Old Hwy. 18 probably would not want a high intensity commercial area. We might want, if it ever went out of agricultural and into commercial use, something that would be less commercially intense. It might be something more compatible with that neighborhood. That's not even the Town of Hull (*the neighborhood*). The land there where the ag is the Town of Hull but across the street is the City of Stevens Point.

Schuler                    I think some of the disconnect might be the difference between what the category is intended for and where it might be mapped now. It's a corn field right now. If it's only used there and not anywhere else, then why do you need it. So the better question would be, when you look at your mapping, maybe take it off the map where it is now but keep the category.

Enright                    That's what I'm saying. That is might be a useful category to use and if it doesn't harm anything by keeping it as a defined category, maybe we would find a use for it in the next couple of instances.

Johnson                    If you want to keep it, that's fine.

Schuler                    You have Commercial Mixed Use and then you've got the transition area mapping which is called Urban Area/Discussion Area Overlay. On page 84 at the very bottom you've got Urban Expansion Discussion Area Overlay and I think Kristen mentioned maybe having some criteria for that but it seems it's an extension of the Commercial/Mixed Use. I think you're looking at a Commercial/Mixed use in a fringe area. Maybe the next time around you can think about what you really want to accomplish. The one on page 84 is based on the discussions you're going to have with the City, what areas do you want to identify as being areas of concern. Back in the day, with Shavy we also had an edge study. An area of likely transition discussions. You had a map with the hash marks down Brilowski between Hwy. 10 and the railroad. An area to talk about where the City and the Town are going to have discussions because it's adjacent and there's stuff going on. Chances are that is still the area. So that is maybe where you want to look at some of your mapping stuff, using either that Commercial/Mixed Use and this Urban Expansion Discussion Area, how you want to map that. So keeping it is a good idea.

Johnson Then you can decide if you want other properties to have that designation.

Enright Yes, right.

Johnson So I will keep that category.

Schuler You'll have discussions back and forth with the City but you'll also have a chance, based on what you've heard, to come back and say this is where we think we'll have areas of concern and we'd like to identify.

Johnson Just to be clear, are we going to propose to keep that area down by Old Hwy. 18 and Brilowski the same color? It's zoned industrial.

Enright It's zoned industrial but it's use is agricultural.

Reid We decided to get rid of the industrial.

Johnson Yes, Shelley had said that. I just want to make sure that is still moving forward with ag.

Enright Was that one of the areas that potentially would be an issue, that the owner might say we had it commercial and now you moved it to ag and object to that?

Johnson Anybody could object to it if we're changing the zoning. That's why you have to think if you really want to change the zoning or leave it as industrial for now.

Reid I don't think anyone would want an industrial application there.

Schuler It's not a decision you have to make tonight. But it's one of those instances you want to think about when you get down to the final version.

Enright It could have made sense in an earlier time if the City hadn't annexed and made the area across the street from it into a residential area. That would be a situation where they may actually be favorable to it being a mixed use zone because of the undesirable affect it would have on their residence.

Amman Considering how it has developed now.

Enright Exactly.

Johnson I'll put it as proposed to go to ag. We did finish talking about Transition Area Mapping Criteria.

Schuler So the question is, do the changes so far meet what you were thinking the Land Use Chapter might move toward and is it a good starting place for additional conversations? You're not doing the final review tonight. Is there anything that is not in there? We identified

that there needs to be some clarification for the discussion about Commercial/Mixed Use and Urban Expansion Discussion Area Overlay to see how they best apply. Do they get at what you need to get at?

Enright                      You'll put these in and we'll have another chance to review this?

Johnson                    We'll have another review.

## **8. Process and procedures to bring current zoning map into compliance with revised zoning map.**

Amman                    That's the attachment we sent out via e-mail and regular mail of that list we had discussed before in previous meetings. But it has been refined and adjusted a little. You have Draft #4 plus the one just sent out with the P&Z memo.

Schuler                    The basic question is, when you figure out what you want to do, how do you go about doing it? That's what the agenda item is about.

We have a situation where Kristen J. and Chris Mrdutt have talked a couple of times about this. When we do the comprehensive plan process, in the case of the Town of Hull, it's been a long time since you did a comprehensive review of what zoning you have. The whole point of the comprehensive plan process is to establish what the Town feels are good land uses going forward that make the community a good place to live in, work, recreate, and circulate with transportation, that type of thing. You're doing that after you've had zoning on the ground for 40 or 50 years.

One of the big things about the State Statute is your zoning is supposed to be consistent and based on your Future Land Use Map. Now your zoning is supposed to be based on this Future Land Use Map you have.

Part of our work is to have towns look at the Future Land Use Map they have now and does the zoning implement it or are there areas where it's inconsistent. Like if you have a residential area that you want to be commercial for the future. Those are the type of discrepancies we look for. Normally we do that after the plan is adopted and you've had all your thoughts about what the Future Land Use should be. In this case, we are doing it at the same time, and that's confusing. Say you want something to be commercial in the future and it's residential now. That's a conflict. Part of our questions are, as you go through the planning process, do you want to change the zoning to match what the Land Use is, or are you going to re-think what your Land Use thoughts were and say, maybe that zoning should stay in place and we should have a Land Use category to support it. That's what a lot of our questions end up being.

The basic process is you would have discussions on what you think the Future Land Use should be. What is the best mix of uses across the town? You have your map with the colors on it. Every town plan in the Implementation chapter has that table that says, these are all the Land Uses we have, these are the County zoning districts, and you put an X under the ones you think are good for these Land Use categories.

The exercise would be, is every zoning listed as being a good idea by the Town Plan Commission for those Land Use categories. Chris and Kristen started this process of looking at

both maps to see if there are areas of inconsistencies. That is what led to the lists you have seen of the various properties (*that P&Z are suggesting changes for*).

One thing to keep in mind, it's kind of an abstract process. We're trying to make it easy for people to live and use the Town of Hull, the way you think is a good idea.

If you look at your map, part of the comments from Chris and Kristen have been that you have a checker board with some of the zonings you have. You've got a big mixture of stuff that is, maybe, more that it needs to be.

That's a description of what we're trying to do. Where are your questions about what you need to do? Let's figure out what it takes to get it done.

Enright                    I have one. I seem to recall that we did this. After we wrote the comprehensive plan, then we had all these Land Use categories, then we went through and assigned zoning categories. Do you remember that Bob? So it wasn't 1968. You remember doing this, right? We had the discussion about the area that was north of Hwy. 10 and going all the way up to Hwy. 66 and we put R-2 on it.

Johnson                It wasn't in July, though, right? When Christ was here?

Enright                    No, this was like years ago.

Bowen                    15 years ago, when we started the state (*mandated*) comprehensive plan.

Enright                    We were told, very similar to what you said.

Schuler                  Maybe the actual re-zoning maps may have been identified, but what we have now are adopted maps that have the inconsistencies that have been identified. If they got fixed before, now we really have to fix them. It's terrible that you feel you went through it before, but when we looked at the official documents we have, they still have these inconsistencies. So I don't know if there was some step that was missed 15 years ago.

Bowen                    At that time, we didn't have any issues. People weren't coming to us saying they want to change their zoning, except Klismith with commercial. Other than that, we didn't really have any issues so we accepted what we had.

Enright                    We had to make a few decisions on a few things where we changed where we had ag and we made them into R-2 with 2 acre lots. But we didn't really have a strong sense of why we were doing things other than it would probably be residential development. What I'm saying is, if we could find that document, that might be a starting point.

Johnson                It would be the 2006 plan.

Enright                    It's just not 1968 is what we're saying.

Johnson                But you're talking about zoning.

Schuler In terms of a comprehensive change to your zoning, you look at if the zonings are what you want. We don't have any record of that. There's been piece-meal stuff, but never an in-depth review of zoning all across the Town to see if there's any different way to make sense of it. That is where that long-term view comes from.

You felt comfortable 15 years ago based on what your Land Use map was and what the zoning review was at the time. That's what I'm hearing.

Enright No. I'm not saying we shouldn't review it. I think we probably should. But I'm just saying that we might have done some of that work and we build off of that. It would be really confusing if we had created that and we come to a different decision without how we reached that conclusion this time and 10-15 years ago.

Schuler We had a series of suggestions on the bottom of page 1 and going into page 2 that are a summary of what Chris and Kristen have talked with you about. Those are the ones that seem to help clean up your mapping now in a general way.

Amman It seems you're trying to simplify it and eliminate some categories that we don't really use either at all or not very much or very little.

Johnson Categories and districts, both.

Enright The one that sticks out is the last one on the second page. I-39 West. How long was that one, Bob, 2 years? This was a very hot issue because there was one contingent in that area that wanted a real large lot size, then there were the people who were on the smaller lots who would be kind of stuck and they were extremely worried about it because if their house burned down, they were afraid they couldn't rebuild. Remember that? If you wanted to have a big crowd here, this would be a good way to do it. After a meeting John and I had with Mr. Brazalle, just before he retired, we worked out a way although I can't remember all the complexities of it. It was based upon existing lot size. If it was a real large lot, then the minimum lot size would be 5 acres. But if it was a smaller one, it was 2 acres minimum. After we came back and proposed that, the crowds all disappeared and people were happy, complimenting us on the fine job we did. Then the issue was gone. So I'm just saying you have to be careful with this. If you raise this, we'll have a lot of company here again.

Schuler We apologize that Chris (*Mrdutt*) couldn't be here tonight to give the finer points because the finer points of zoning angles are lost on Kristen and I. That is not one we're suggesting that is absolutely needing to be attended to. Just that now is the time to think about it.

Enright That's the one that struck me the most out of all of these.

Amman There are some that are not controversial. There are some that are somewhat controversial. Then there is that one that is so controversial that we probably wouldn't take that one up for awhile.

Enright I would think that we should give this another reading and then work on it at the next meeting. John may have some insights on this as well and Dennis (*Ferriter*) as well.

Just let John know we got introduced to this and had some discussion on it, but we'll come back to it. Will you or Chris be here at the next meeting?

Schuler Yes, absolutely.

Enright Okay, good.

Amman I think part of the basic question, regardless of what things we might pick out of here, if anything, to talk about changing, was that John wanted some discussion about the process of how to go about informing the public about any change or the possibility of changes and what that process is.

Enright Maybe we can talk about that for a few minutes.

Schuler That's a tough one. Because it's a time and cost issue. Like we say in the memo, notifying everybody is the best way to do it, but it costs a lot of money because it's a lot of work. Just a regular meeting notice is not enough. There has to be a way of inviting people in. Another part of this is, you're not necessarily in a position now to tell people exactly what you want to do with every bit of land across the Town and where the changes might be. You have an idea. We've made some suggestions on what you might want to do in terms of larger area mapping, standardizing lot size, or future Land Use across here, eliminating some of the options either because they never get used or they are going away in the County ordinance. I think the time to bring everybody in is after you've discussed it a bit. You have to focus more on what you might want to change. Right now you have an idea of several changes you might be thinking about but you haven't had the discussions. Part of this is going to be, if you meet with the City of Stevens Point, are you going to come back and have the same perspective on what you want to consider for areas within X amount of distance from the border. There's that zone where the Town meets the City where changes are possible. Annexation is going to move out from the City. Those are the areas you might want to think about Land Use in a different way. Whether it be a transition thing or saying it should absolutely stay as this. You may be thinking residential and the City commercial, or something like that. You're going to want to make some strong conclusions about that.

In terms of the interior areas of the Town, I think we can understand that Stevens Point is going to grow but it's not going to grow super fast based on anybody's population projections.

Bowen Not north anyway.

Schuler Right. And certainly not a lot to the east from the middle either because they already added 700 plus acres to that industrial area. You are probably looking at the Old Highway 18 to Highway 10 corridor as being the primary area for residential expansion.

In terms of straight up north, up Torun or up North Second Drive, chances are that's not going to be an active area of expansion.

What I'm talking about is can you target how you want to bring people in to discuss it. In the north and the west part of the Town, are there going to be a lot of changes where you would need to notify everybody to say, big things are changing.

Bowen I don't think you have any choice if we're actually going to change the zoning. The property owner has to be notified and in that letter, they have to be made aware that the permitted uses are not going to change significantly so they're not going to be non-compliant. That's what I would expect would happen with each of these before we can take specific action on it. We have to let them know. That's just common, general, democratic courtesy as John would say.

Enright If Stevens Point is still on Chapter 1, it may be a while before they get to Land Use and Intergovernmental Cooperation. Are we talking about a year before they are ready?

Amman Weren't you saying, Jeff, we don't have to wait for them to get to that point?

Schuler No, you don't.

Enright One way to do this would be to take off on your suggestion, if there are areas in the heart of Hull that don't border Stevens Point, where there would be minor changes, we could do this in stages. Maybe by the time we get done doing that, probably the Spring Newsletter would be a good communication device to reach people to see that part. When we're far enough along with the other things with Stevens Point, then maybe we could do even more of it. We're looking at this in September and the newsletter comes out in April or late March?

Schuler Nothing until then?

Amman They were talking about a Fall newsletter.

Way That is all ready to go I guess.

Enright Of course it would be better to do it before spring, but the newsletter is a good communication media since I think a lot of people read it.

Schuler Is it ready, ready to go? Like licking the envelopes kind of thing?

Way Yes, it might be. Because it's information on voting and that's starting around October 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Enright At the pace we move at, we only meet once every month or two, we might have up to 4 meetings before that (*the Spring newsletter*). That might be a little later than we want but it might be outweighed by the fact that we reach people who might be affected by it. So it might be worth it. Sooner is better, I have no doubt about that, but it is also important to make sure everybody has time to think about this. In fact, once it's ready, people could be invited in with maps on display for a period of 6 weeks.

Way We'd probably be meeting only 3 times before April (2017).

Enright                    That's not really so far off then. That would be one way. We can be working on this as early as next month and some of these decisions will be pretty easy. Then we take on the harder ones.

Schuler                  How many newsletters go out? Total distribution? If you had a little checkbox and everybody gave it neighbor to neighbor but that might take awhile.

Enright                    It would be about 2,000 I would guess, right?

Amman                  There are 2,020 households. (*approx. 2,200 newsletter go out*)

Schuler                  In a perfect world it would have been nice to say, check our website for on-going Land Use discussions, or something like that. You can use the website to say this is what we're going to be getting into now and these are the types of discussion points we're going to be having. The maps are available at the Town Hall.

Enright                    Yes, if they see it on the web. How about postcards? Have we done that before?

Amman                  We've done postcards for some different things. I think for the yard waste site we did a postcard mailing.

Enright                    Did that work pretty well?

Amman                  We still got phone calls with people asking about stuff and they didn't all read the postcards. It had a certain amount of success.

Enright                    Also before we would do this, the Town Board would have to look at it too. Even if it's not finalized and just a proposal, we would put it up for a public hearing, right? Or is it going to be the other way around. We're not going to put up a proposal that the Plan Commission has recommended but hasn't been approved by the Board.

Schuler                  I think part of it is getting people's feedback on whether or not they think your ideas are for their property is a good idea. We could maybe help with some educational materials you could post on your website. How often do people come in to the Town Hall? Is there a lot of traffic in and out?

Amman                  No.

Schuler                  A way to post something to say go to the website to find out more information. An easy way to let people know.

Amman                  Other than the election coming up this November. We'll have a lot of traffic for that.

Schuler That's true. If you wanted to advertise what is coming up. A flyer to hand out to people that come in to vote. That's one way to start. It could say check the Town's website and there could be something on there that explains we've been working on the Town's Comprehensive Plan (*updating/revising*). We've appreciated those of you who have shown up in the past. If this is part of what we are thinking about.

Enright We're unlikely to have much to show them between now and the election.

Schuler But you let them know you are working on it and over the next couple of months, some decisions will be made on future Land Use and zoning in the Town, that will get people's attention. It's an opportunity. If you're looking to have contact with a lot of people, voting day is going to be a good thing to do and you've got a month to plan to make a short and sweet communication for them. This is really what is going on now, please take an interest and ask us questions.

Bowen But we don't want them to take an interest unless there is a process or progress.

Schuler How about, 'we're coming after you'! If you start it with that, you might get somewhere.

Enright One concern I would have if we're doing this is people will want us to show them what we've got. And we're not even going to meet again until November 29<sup>th</sup>, three weeks after the election. You're going to be answering a lot of questions. We haven't done anything yet. We just told you we were going to.

Amman It would have to be pretty vague.

Schuler Just consider it an opportunity where you'll have contact with people and, without having to manufacture your contact with people, is there a way to use that to your advantage to let people know what you're trying to get at.

Amman It's one of the rare opportunities that we have where we have a lot of people come through here. A lot of our citizens come through in a very short period of time. That's what's unique about it.

Bowen What are you thinking of? Handing out a little fact sheet, or something like that?

Schuler That's got potential. I haven't given it much thought, but I certainly will.

Bowen And is it coming from the Hull Plan Commission?

Schuler It isn't coming from the County!

Bowen Alright.

Schuler People want to know what their plan commission is doing. It's not the County working on the comp. plan. It's the Town leadership taking a look at the future. There has to be a productive and positive way to do that. We will put our brain to looking at some suggestions.

Amman Have you ever done that? Put together a general little announcement of sorts and handed it out to a given population to give them a heads up that these are things we're going to be looking at down the road? Does it sound familiar?

Schuler Not really. Because in most Land Use chapter planning stuff, it's always done like the town would run an ad in the paper saying on this night we're talking about this, come and learn about it and ask questions. That's why part of when we talk about the list, there are some things you really want to do and there are other things you might want to do. You don't have to make the changes.

Amman Some are higher priorities than others.

Schuler If you look at all of it, you're looking at a lot of people. Your first inclination is, we have to tell everybody everything. But at some point, the Plan Commission has to say, you know what, that is not an issue we need to pursue because that Land Use and that zoning, even though they're a little bit different, they're fine. And if the person wants to change their zoning in the future, it's going to have to comply with the categories we think are good for that Land Use area. You want to pick your spots. Out of 20 on a list of things that are a little different, you might want to decide those 5 are really important and we should talk about our thoughts on how they should change. So you've already reduced the amount of people that would be impacted by a lot. But in this case, you're having questions about when is the Plan Commission in a position to talk and make decisions, because you want people to know about it. I think you want to take a unique opportunity like that to say, you know, we're talking about this stuff so please show up.

Enright What do you think we should do to prepare for the November 29<sup>th</sup> meeting when we really talk about this to get this done? What should we have in front of us and what should we be looking at so the people know what to do?

Amman November 29<sup>th</sup> is our next Plan Commission meeting and it's just a little later in the month in order to avoid Thanksgiving week.

Enright And we probably won't meet in December?

Amman Correct, we don't have a Plan Commission meeting scheduled for December.

Enright So we won't meet again after that until January or February. It would seem we would need at least 2 if not 3 meetings to have come up with a proposed zoning map. Wouldn't you think? Because we still have some more on the comprehensive plan to do too.

Amman We're getting towards the end. I think we have one chapter left. But this one chapter (*Land Use*) is almost an entity in and of itself in terms of complexity and what we may or may not do with it.

Enright                    So an old zoning map or some kind of overlay with the categories we're talking about?

Schuler                  Kristen is going to be gone by October (*until January*). Based upon what you've talked about tonight, you have some initial ideas on the Land Use chapter we talked about. We'll get more of the information gaps filled in. If you're going to have that meeting, you'll want to figure out how best to talk to Stevens Point. You'll want to have a very good bead on what your take on intergovernmental outreach should be. We started that tonight by suggesting things you want to follow through on. In November, talk about what we need to do in the coming year and set the table for that stage in your planning process. Our goal at the County would be to make sure you are totally set with the content of your plan. We'll take a look at Chapter 3 to make sure that any additional comments about Hwy. 10 traffic, access, circulation concerns are in there and emphasized properly. We'll summarize the things to bring back to you to say, these are all the points from your planning to date that you can use as a platform to get this Land Use discussion done, both internally and with the City. That would be my suggestion.

Enright                    In terms of looking at maps and changing any zoning, that would come later than that?

Johnson                I would hope they would decide from the list, those changes.

Schuler                  I'm sure some of our staff will be meeting with John and Patty to catch John up on what was going on tonight and what the thoughts are on moving forward. Maybe have him get a really good focus on what he wants to do with the Land Use discussion.

Amman                  That might be our next small comp. plan meeting. What you said, focusing more on what do we really want to work with out of that list.

Schuler                  I think the goal would be to have the plan done by early spring. It's time to be done with it. There's been a lot of discussion.

Enright                    The zoning map is not actually part of the plan.

Schuler                  No. It's not.

Enright                    Okay. We'll see what John says about that too.

## **9. Plans for modernizing Community/Meeting Room in Hull Administrative Center.**

Enright                    I know nothing about that.

Amman                  They're talking about artwork for these walls. As you know, it echoes a bit in here and so we're trying to soften the walls a little bit. Also dealing with technical and audio-visual equipment for needs we possibly have in here with screens and wiring.

**10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:** *The next Plan Commission meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 29, 2016. Later in the month than usual to avoid the Thanksgiving week.*

**11. ADJOURNMENT:** *Motion made by Bob Bowen to adjourn meeting, seconded by Jan Way. Motion carried by voice vote. Meeting closed at 8:15 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Patty Amman, Plan Commission Secretary  
Town of Hull, Portage County