

**Town of West Point  
Plan Commission Minutes  
July 7, 2016**

Pursuant to Wisconsin State Statutes s. 19.84 the Plan Commission of the Town of West Point held its semi-monthly meeting on Thursday, July 7, 2016 at the West Point Town Hall, N2114 Rausch Road, Lodi, Wisconsin. The meeting agenda was posted in three places as required by law and on the town's web site. Chairman Kevin Kessler called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. Members present were Kevin Kessler, Gordon Carncross (Town Board Representative), Byron Olson, Ron Grasshoff, Renee Nair, Nathan Sawyer (7:07pm), and Fred Madison. Also present was Taffy Buchanan, Town Clerk.

Agenda #2 – Approval of Agenda – A motion was made by Fred Madison to approve the agenda, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Ron Grasshoff – motion carried unanimously.

Agenda #3 Approve Minutes – Copies of the June 2, 2016 Plan Commission minutes had been emailed to each member for their review. A motion was made by Ron Grasshoff to approve the minutes, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Fred Madison - motion carried unanimously.

Agenda #4 Correspondence – Columbia County Planning & Zoning had a public hearing and acted on July 5, 2016 about modifying the Shoreline & Wetland Ordinance, it passed 5 to 1.

Agenda #5 Citizen Input – None

Agenda #6 Review 3 different layout proposals by Grothman & Associates about Subdivision & Rezoning Plans for the Amalia W Ryan Revocable Living Trust property off of Unke Road – Jim Grothman explained the 3 different layouts they designed: 10-lot, 12-lot, and 22-lot. After looking at the 3 layouts the Plan Commission gave him feedback about the plans by filling out a questionnaire, Kevin Kessler made, ranking the layouts. The questionnaire results are incorporated as part of these minutes indicating that the Plan Commission most favored the 12-lot layout out of the choices they were presented. Jim Grothman is going to put together an Initial Application based on the 12-lot layout for the Plan Commission to review for the next meeting.

Agenda #7 Town Board Report – Gordon Carncross gave a report on the

June Town Board meeting.

Agenda #8 Next Meeting Agenda and Date – The next meeting will be scheduled for July 21, 2016.

Agenda #9 Adjourn Meeting. A motion was made by Fred Madison to adjourn the July 7, 2016 Plan Commission meeting at 9:15 pm, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Renee Nair – motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted by  
*Taffy Buchanan*, Town Clerk

Summary

Town of West Point Plan Commission

July 7, 2016

Amalia Ryan Trust Property

Compilation  
p. 1

The developer of this property is preparing but has not yet submitted an initial application under s. 6.08 of the Town Ordinance for a land division of the subject property on Unke Road. On July 7, 2016 the developer is presenting preliminary alternatives to the Plan Commission for the purpose of receiving informal feedback. The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide informal opinion and feedback from individual members of the Plan Commission regarding the proposed subdivision and re-zoning of the Amalia Ryan Trust property. The scores from this questionnaire are intended to provide preliminary feedback to the developer and do not represent any commitment whatsoever regarding votes by individual members on future decisions.

**Question #1:** In your opinion, how likely is it that this preliminary alternative could be developed into an "initial application" and a "preliminary plat" that would meet the requirements of the Town of West Point on a 1-5 scale?

1 = very unlikely    5 = very likely

Alternative # 1: Your score on a 1-5 scale:

4 4 3 2 5 3 2 = 33/7 = 3.3    2-5

Alternative # 2: Your score on a 1-5 scale:

5 5 4 3 4 4 3 = 28/7 = 4.0    3-5

Alternative # 3: Your score on a 1-5 scale:

1 1 2 1 1 1 1 = 8/7 = 1.1    1-2

Avg    Range

**Question #2:** To the extent that this alternative would require a change in the Future Land Use map in the Town's Comprehensive Plan and re-zoning of some of the land within the proposed subdivision, on a scale of 1-5 to what extent would you support the necessary re-zoning and the changes to the Town's Comprehensive Plan?

1 = I would not support required changes    5 = I would support the required changes

Alternative # 1: Your score on a 1-5 scale:

3 5 2 2 3 3 3 = 21/7 = 3.0    2-5

Alternative # 2: Your score on a 1-5 scale:

5 5 4 4 3 3 3 = 27/7 = 3.9    3-5

Alternative # 3: Your score on a 1-5 scale:

1 1 1 5 1 1 3 = 13/7 = 1.9    1-5

# Summary p. 2

**Question #3:** Unless there is an approved waiver, all alternatives will have to comply with the Town and County ordinance requirements regarding lot size and lot density. To what extent do you believe that there are issues with respect to the number of lots proposed under this alternative?

1 = significant issues on number of lots      5 = no issues on number of lots

			<u>Avg.</u>	<u>Range</u>
<u>Alternative # 1:</u>	Your score on a 1-5 scale:	<u>5 5 3 4 1 4 1</u>	$= 23/7 = 3.3$	1-5
<u>Alternative # 2:</u>	Your score on a 1-5 scale:	<u>5 5 5 4 1 4 1</u>	$= 25/7 = 3.6$	1-5
<u>Alternative # 3:</u>	Your score on a 1-5 scale:	<u>1 1 1 <del>4</del> 1 1 1</u>	$= 7/7 = 1.0$	1-1

**Question #4:** Chapter 6 of the Town of West Point Code of Ordinances requires that all new residential "major land divisions" be designed as a "conservation development" as described in s. 6.18 of the Ordinance. (See s. 6.18 for details.) Among other things, a conservation development is required to have clusters of dwelling units surrounded by common open space. The common open space must be at least 60% of the gross area of the development and at least 10% cannot be steep slopes or floodplains. To what extent would you favor recommending that the Town Board waive some or all of these requirements?

1 = strongly oppose a waiver of any kind      5 = strongly favor at least some form of waiver

Your score on a 1-5 scale: 4 5 5 2 5 3 5 =  $29/7 = 4.1$

**Question #5:** None of the alternatives presented to date has included a conservation development design as described in s. 6.18 of the Ordinance. How strongly do you feel that at least one of the alternatives considered must include a conservation design?

1 = no conservation design alternative should be required

5 = a conservation design alternative must be provided and considered

Your score on a 1-5 scale: 5 2 5 5 5 3 5 =  $30/7 = 4.3$

Provide any additional comments below or on an additional page.