

OFFICE OF
Town of New Glarus

**MINUTES
TOWN OF NEW GLARUS
Plan Commission Meeting
Thursday December 21, 2016**

ATTENDING: Chris Narveson, John Ott, Craig Galhouse, Robert Elkins, Reginald Reis and Susan McCallum, Deputy Clerk.

ALSO ATTENDING:

ABSENT: Dean Streiff, John Freitag

1. Call Meeting to Order: C. Narveson called the meeting to order at 7:06 pm.
2. Review Proof of Posting: S. McCallum attested to proper posting.
3. Public Comments: None.
4. Approve Minutes from November 19, 2015: J. Ott moved to approve the November 19, 2015 minutes, 2nd by B. Elkins. Motion carried.
5. Discuss and Consider Commission Chair: C. Narveson was present for chairmanship. Meeting days were discussed, so that the commission members could work with Narveson's schedule, and plan far enough in advance.
6. Utility Committee Update: C. Narveson spoke about the focus of the board's committee, working to get broadband to the subdivisions and then throughout the town. They are planning to have a guest speaker to discuss creating a utility for the process. J. Ott asked what would be the cost to the town? C. Narveson responded that the people within the district would share the costs of the district. There was continued discussion regarding the general concept and need for the expansion.
7. Discuss continuation of Chapter 110 review:
 - a. Discuss and consider follow-up regarding utility districts for light industrial or technology park developments. S. McCallum presented to each member, a final version of Ord. 110 with appendixes. B. Elkins asked if it has been posted to the website, she responded no not yet but it will be. J. Ott asked if the updates had a public hearing, she replied yes as they were sent to the board for approval.
 - i. Deputy Clerk regarding zoning at the county level and what is allowed. S. McCallum informed the commissioners that she included information from Green County zoning for Commercial and Agricultural zoning and what types of businesses are allowed. J. Ott asked about an Industrial classification, like Faith Industries. S. McCallum read the classifications that are primarily heavy industries that are conditional uses. C. Galhouse recounted discussion with the former chairman regarding the failure of the Boundary Agreement and whether the town needed to identify business development in the town. He stated that he felt the corridors would be the locations, Hwy 69 and 39. General discussion included; land potentials, flat lands and the need to identify areas outside the ETZ in case someone is interested. C. Galhouse spoke about Klondike cheese in the town of Jordan which is a large tax base that residents don't want to live near. The company has bought surrounding land to alleviate the issue. R. Reis recounted his experience trying to locate a non-profit animal shelter in the town and the local resident's objections. J. Ott said he understands the need for increased tax base and the concept of either homes or commercial development. C. Galhouse stated we are the third largest tax base town in the County, with Exeter and Decatur greater. There was general discussion regarding possibility of increasing density in

OFFICE OF
Town of New Glarus

specific locations for residential and commercial uses. There was consensus that the town is and with good continued planning will, remain a beautiful place to live, which is its draw.

ii. Resources are available to achieve the utility district. C. Galhouse asked the question, would we be looking at siting a light industrial out in the rural areas or closer to residential. He also informed the group that town's as of 2015 can create TIFs. S. McCallum researched the criteria for a Town to create a TIF; 500,000,000 equalized value, 3,500 population and sewer service is or will be provided. In addition the town could join with a village or city. J. Ott stated that past experience with the Village negotiations he would not see a joint venture as possible. B. Elkins said if we were to combine with another municipality he suggests Monticello, because of the flat land and existing development on the Hwy 69 corridor.

iii. Determine size of parcel needed to develop the concept. C. Galhouse stated that Faith Industries is on 5 acres in the rural area, and this is what we should be looking for, this size parcel. They had moved out of Monroe onto family owned land. He felt we could identify the parcels of this size in a corridor if a business was looking.

iv. Determine what types of utilities would be needed. C. Galhouse recounted that the brewery had to install a pre-treatment plant.

v. Determine locations for a development to include; state highways, flat land, or county roads that do or do not connect to a state highway. Discussion included the Campbell lands on Hwy 69 and C. J. Ott said that the members had gotten together and identified potential lands previously. R. Reis felt that something like the Verona industrial park is the answer as opposed to residential. He said that a business needs to be in a corridor, federal or state highway, and the town doesn't have that. He said that people oppose siting next to them. C. Galhouse recounted a scenario in the town of Exeter, where a previous hog testing location is being bought for a larger operation, which is allowed by zoning and previous use. C. Narveson spoke about the Hwy 39 corridor. There was general discussion regarding current business locations and general resident's concerns. B. Elkins questioned how the splits regulations would be affected, if a piece of land is on a farm that has no more splits but is a desirable location. J. Ott said he is very happy with how the land division ordinance has worked and we have had high end residential development. There was discussion regarding the future of large homes and population demographics. C. Galhouse suggested making a map of what we currently have platted to provide for inquiries. R. Reis suggested doing this with future potential of land along Hwy 69 or along Airport Rd which is close to the sewer plant. C. Narveson stated that there is three phase power and other utilities along that road but does not have good access. C. Galhouse suggested identifying where the utilities currently are located. J. Ott agreed that if anything along 69 becomes available that a developer is going to buy, we need to be ready. S. McCallum provided the members with a list she compiled in 2014 of platted and available 170 residential lots less 6 homes built in 2015. C. Galhouse said the county could create a map from the data in an excel spreadsheet, if the Deputy Clerk could update the chart. J. Ott suggested reviewing these to determine how many would be needed to be sold per year to increase the tax base to cover increased costs. It was decided not to map a corridor for commercial development.

Discussion included creating a document stating the plan commission would be in favor of light industry development in the town. S. McCallum will create a document for the next meeting to review to send to board for approval.

b. Review Chapter 110 in regards to buildable lot exchange and effect on number of splits.
Consensus to postpone until next meeting.

c. Discuss and consider determining or expanding guidelines for Developer Agreements.

S. McCallum informed the group that there aren't any developer agreements on file in the town
P.O. Box 448 ~ 1101 Hwy. 69 South ~ New Glarus, WI 53574-0448 ~ Phone 608/527-2390 ~ Fax 608/527-3390

OFFICE OF
Town of New Glarus

files for previous developments. Discussion included the reasons for a developer's agreements. S. McCallum will research agreement forms.

8. Discuss and Consider Ordinance for Tree Removal and Maintenance in Town Right of Way:

S. McCallum provided the members with 5 town ROW ordinances. Discussion is postponed until next month.

9. Discuss and Consider IOH resolution option choice and 2015 ACT 15: S. McCallum presented information regarding the original state law and the new ACT in April 2015 amending the law. The members reviewed the data and laws. C. Narveson explained what happened at the Town Board meeting when this was presented at the public hearing. A resident questioned why the town had chosen an option different from the other towns and county. S. McCallum explained that their option allows for restriction per axle instead of total unit which follows state law. She explained the process to this point and the differences with the new law. J. Ott felt we should be consistent with the surrounding towns. C. Narveson stated that he is interested in protecting the town's road, like with the quarry being responsible for maintenance where they drive. R. Reis stated that he is in favor because the highways can only handle what the mix is rated for and the increased size of machinery is damaging.

It was decided to discuss this topic again at the next meeting before making a recommendation to the board.

10. Set Next Meeting Date and Agenda: February 18th, third Thursday, 7pm.

B. Elkins moved to adjourn at 9:24 pm, 2nd by Reginald Reis . Motion carried.