

Minutes of Plan Commission Meeting April 6, 2009
Held at the Town Hall on County Highway G
Town of Holland, Sheboygan County, Wisconsin

The numbering of the Minutes corresponds to that of the Agenda:

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:07 p.m. by acting chairman David Huenink.
2. The assembly recited the Pledge of Allegiance.
3. Acting Chairman David Huenink certified that the requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meetings law had been met.
4. Record Retention Certification: Clerk Syd Rader certified that hard-copied and electronic files of the Plan Commission are filed at Town Hall through February 2009. Files more recent than that are in the Clerk's hands.
5. The Agenda was adopted as the official order of business on a motion by David Mueller. The motion was supported by Eugene Schmitz and passed by a unanimous voice vote.
6. Roll Call showed in attendance Chairman Donald Becker (arriving in time for agenda item #9), Roy Teunissen, David Mueller, Jack Stokdyk, David Huenink, Eugene Schmitz, Jan Rauwerdink, Trevor Mentink. Excused were Joel Van Ess and Tom Huenink. Ken Nyhuis was absent.
7. The Minutes of the meeting on March 2, 2009 were approved on a motion by Roy Teunissen. The motion was supported by David Mueller, passing by a unanimous voice vote.
8. Public input:

Syd Rader: He will be absent at the May 4, 2009 Plan Commission meeting and needs a substitute clerk for the meeting time only. And would the Plan Commission pose for a photograph to be used potentially to illustrate the Comprehensive Plan.

Craig Droppers expressed concern about the lack of provision in the zoning ordinance for setbacks for trees. Over a time of years, trees planted on a borderline extend their branches many feet across the borderline.

Dan Posthuma:

1: Question - Does the Town of Holland future land use map provide adequate protection in controlling development of the Bluff corridor overlooking lake MI. If so is this addressed in the comprehensive plan and the land use map?

2: Question – Does the comprehensive plan and land use map match the results of the Citizen Input Survey?

Specifically question #5 “Within the Town of Holland, there is a strong desire for building residences in the country, but also a desire for preserving open space and farmland. Do you feel the quality/rural country atmosphere/uniqueness of the Town of Holland can be preserved while allowing residential development?” The highest answer was 51.4% YES.

Specifically question #9 of which the last sentence and question is, “For future residential development in the town, which one of the following do you favor?” The highest answer is 30.2% NO subdivisions, just scattered residential development throughout the town.

Specifically question #10 “Should residential development be concentrated in specific areas or dispersed throughout the town?” The highest answer is 44.0% Dispersed

Are these results of the survey specifically addressed in the comprehensive plan and the land use map?

3: Question – The answers to Citizen Input Survey seem to indicate that the Agricultural and Woodland Transition district may be one of the preferred land uses for the Town of Holland. If so does the Land use Map allow for adequate area for this land use?

4: Question – Chapter 8 in the Agricultural Preservation paragraphs mentions a maximum residential lot size of 2 acres and a density of one unit per 50 acres. Is this practical? Is there a minimum lot size? Is this enforceable? If a 2 acre parcel is created, by state and county rule can the land owner purchase additional land to be added to the original 2 acre parcel? A maximum parcel size seems to complicate this section of the Comprehensive Plan. After counting dwellings per section there are only six sections in the Town of Holland that do not already exceed the density of one unit per 50 acres.

5: Question – Should the Planning Committee use a larger and more diverse group of town citizens in the development of the Town of Holland Future Land Use Map?

Dave Huenink: The Town website has moved to a new server, meaning the old bookmarks will not work. Just type Town of Holland to find the new link. Mr. Huenink reported on a tentative plan/proposal by Sheboygan County to buy land for a public/private development called Amsterdam Dunes.

Chairmanship of the meeting passed from David Huenink to Donald Becker.

9. Discussion and action on Comprehensive Plan arising from the public information meeting or relating to completion of the plan – with Jamie Rybarczyk of Foth. Mr. Rybarczyk passed out copies of the Final Draft Comprehensive Plan. See below, notes by Jamie Rybarczyk, regarding Project Schedule and Topics for discussion. Mr. Rybarczyk recommends that on May 4 the Plan Commission make a recommendation to the Board to adopt the Comprehensive Plan. This would be in the form of a resolution, the language for which Mr. Rybarczyk will provide.

David Mueller passed out a flyer by Ozaukee Washington Land Trust, Inc., citing their work as a model that may be emulated by Town of Holland. A year ago Chairman Becker had contacted National Heritage Land Trust. That was premature but now the time may be ripe to renew that contact.

10. Review/recommendation of final markup of Gerry Antoine's approved draft of changes in the zoning ordinances, aimed at providing at least one permitted use for each zoning district. The final markup is not back from Mr. Antoine; Plan Commission took no action.
11. Discussion/action regarding model site plan ordinance (final markup). David Huenink said a committee of three had met in March 2009, marking up the draft ordinance, but concluding that a two-part approach is justified: one for residential/agricultural cases, another for commercial/industrial. The Town Belgium model would be suitable for residential/agricultural. The Town Wilson model would be suitable for all other cases, especially commercial/industrial proposals. David Mueller is to follow up on large farm operations, referencing Wisconsin statutes and/or regulations.

Chairman Becker concluded that the Plan Commission may slow down work on this topic, letting Foth get involved with the topic during the implementation phase to come. The Plan Commission took no action regarding adoption of a new ordinance.

12. Public Input: none
13. The attendance record for March 2009 was approved on a motion by David Huenink, supported by David Mueller, passing by a unanimous voice vote.
14. The meeting adjourned at 9:14 p.m. on a motion by David Mueller, supported by Jan Rauwerdink, passing by a unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,
Syd Rader, Clerk of the Plan Commission, Town of Holland
April 7, 2009

Re agenda item #9 (see above). Notes by Foth consultant Jamie Rybarczyk:

April 6, 2009
Town of Holland
Plan Commission Meeting

Project Schedule

1. DOA Performance Report
 - a. April 17, 2009
2. 98% Complete
 - a. Update Introductory Sections, page 1-10 and page 9-1 after Town Board action with adoption dates
 - b. Update footer in Chapter 8 & 9
 - c. Update title pages
3. Adoption Process
 - a. May 4, 2009 – Plan Commission adopts Comprehensive Plan by resolution
 - b. May 8, 2009 – Class #1 Notice published
 - c. May 8 thru June 8, 2009 – Public review period (where will the document be on display?) – **distribute to required agencies by Statutes**
 - d. June 8, 2009 – Board holds public hearing on Comprehensive Plan
 - e. June 8, 2009 – Board adopts Comprehensive Plan by ordinance
4. Prepare final document after by end of June
 - a. Four (4) hard copies & sufficient CDs
5. July 1, 2009 started Plan Implementation process

Topics of Discussion

1. What is the difference between conservation & cluster development as it relates to the Future Land Use Map?

Conservation subdivision requires the concentration or grouping of lots or building sites on smaller lots with the residual lands being preserved as open space for the purpose of protecting valued community features (e.g. environmental corridors).

Cluster subdivision requires concentration or grouping of lots or building sites on smaller lots.

2. Where and when should the Town review, approve and deny a proposal for a conservation or cluster development? How will the plan implementation process address this issue?

In most cases, cluster subdivisions should be used in the Agricultural Preservation land use

areas and on a case-by-case basis in the Agricultural & Woodland Transition and Rural Residential land use areas for the purpose of protecting valued community features. In most cases, conservation subdivisions should be used in the Rural Residential land use areas and on a case-by-case basis in the Agricultural Preservation and Agricultural & Woodland Transition land use areas for the purpose of protecting valued community features.

The Land Division & Zoning Ordinance will work together to establish the strategy (e.g. management of density, mandatory vs. voluntary, applicable districts, lot sizes, density bonus) and mechanics (administration, review process) to implement the development scenarios.

3. What are the incentives for property owners or developers to use conservation or cluster development?

Political support, density bonuses, alternative development option for difficult sites, reacting to market trends, providing alternative housing options, etc.

4. What are the disincentives for property owners or developers to use conventional development?

Negative political support, lack of density bonus, etc.

5. What can be done with the Land Division or Zoning Ordinance to stop residential “spot” zoning in the agricultural areas.

Limited; however, need to review the existing process and determine if a change in zoning is necessary for minor land divisions.

6. What about developing a PDR and/or TDR program?

Purchase of Development Rights

- *Administrative burden on Town*
- *Successful programs require continued citizen tax*
-

Transfer of Development Rights

- *Little administrative burden on Town*
- *Requires a sending and receiving area*
- *Requires more program work and consistency among existing Plans*
- *More successful than PDRs*
-

7. What recourse do Towns have with respect to mega-farming (e.g. 4,000 head of cattle near Rosendale, WI)?

Foth has dealt with this in Calumet County. Mainly regulated at County and State levels with permitting, Act 235, NR 215, manure management, etc.

