

Final Minutes of the
Town of Cross Plains Plan Commission Meeting
May 7, 2012

Present: Wayne Parrell (acting Chair); Sherry Krantz; Greg Hyer, Tom Rhude
Absent: Mike Coyle;
Amelia Williams (Secretary)
Attending Board members: Vera Riley, Greg Haack
7 interested citizens
8:00 PM – 9:50 PM

Wayne Parrell called the meeting to order, then asked for any corrections to the minutes of the April 2nd meeting. After several corrections, Hyer moved approval, Krantz seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Parrell asked for public comment on any agenda item. There being none, he proceeded to the next item.

Fran and Ethel Furry – Rezone of 10 acres of parcel no. 0707-361-8190-1 from Ag-Ex to two 5 acre parcels zoned RH-2.

Doug Furry explained that the Furrys want to both correct the zoning and to take a one-time split, as allowed in the Town’s Land Use Plan. These parcels are referred to as “substandard, non-conforming” parcels (less than 35 acres for parcels which were created before 1981, most of which retain the Ag-Ex zoning). Furry presented an aerial view of the parcel, which showed a field as well as wooded areas. Parrell asked if the field was farmed, but Furry said that it is simply grass, and would be placed in the second of two lots. The family had applied for a waiver for a density study, but having been turned down, had then applied and was hoping to receive the study from the County before the next meeting. The Commission requested that copies of the density study be sent to the members, and will put the issue on the agenda for a decision at the June Plan Commission meeting.

Application for a CUP from KJK Enterprises for the property at 3752 County Highway P

The purpose of this application was to allow a duplex as a permitted use of the property. The applicant was not present, but Hyer explained that the County had requested this change to the CUP for the building. The property is zoned C-1 (commercial), and has recently been used as a residence. It was originally a bar, with a residential apartment on the top floor, which is a permitted use. Since it is now used wholly as a residence, but has never been re-permitted, the County asked the owners to submit an application for a CUP (Conditional Use Permit) as a duplex. Kitt Kalsheur, who is the agent for the owner (KJK Enterprises LLP) was not present at the meeting, so a decision was put off to the following meeting.

Ice Age Trail Discussion.

Presentations and public input sessions have been held by the National Park Service recently. They presented a “preferred alternative” as the plan for the park, which is on Old Sauk Pass Road. Z Usman, who lives across from the park, spoke to say that he hoped the quiet, peaceful nature of the area would not be disturbed – more traffic and development might have this effect. Others spoke as well: Rick Durbin, a forty year resident and a biologist added that the birds and other species which they hoped to protect should have a contiguous region unencumbered by toilets, trails, and buildings. He felt the planning should begin again, with consideration to emphasizing the prairie and gorge. Stephanie and Arnold Harris thought that many people might come to the interpretive center only, and not use the trails, so the center could just as easily be in the Village. Louise Klopp also argued for placing the interpretive center in the village, commenting that the Ice Age Trail Alliance is already there, and that no new building would be required, thus saving the parkland from the disruption caused by large earth-moving equipment. Amelia Williams, having toured the North Kettle Moraine, favored the educational uses of the park but felt that having a 14-person administrative

center would detract from its purposes. Jerry Kermicle agreed that the educational purposes of the park were important, but that administrative offices and camping might be overkill for the size of the park, the roads, and the land itself. He felt that the Town was being left out of the planning, and hoped that in the future Town representatives could be included with the State, the County, and National representatives. Rhude stated that the National Park Service is allowed by law to have only one site in the State, in the National Trail System. He thought that a visitor center would be acceptable but felt that it would not be possible for a long time to come due to lack of funds. Haack felt that people would like to use the park for recreation, and others felt that we could not prohibit trails, but rather that the center for administration would cause septic and land disruption. The center would cost \$7.9 million, which might be better spent on prairie restoration. Klopp felt that an administrative center in the Village would help solve traffic and cost problems, and that the town should have a “say” in what happens, since Townspeople had helped to acquire the land in the first place. Though Hyer thought that the funds would not be available for a very long time, Klopp countered that a wealthy donor could change this quickly.

Hyer agreed to contact the planners to ask that the Town be included in future development planning. Others committed to resubmitting their objections and suggestions to the Parks administrators.

TDR Discussion. (Transfer of Development Rights)

Hyer showed the Town of Roxbury TDR plan, which differed greatly from the Springfield plan recently reviewed by the Commission. The criteria for sending and receiving areas used the LESA soil grading system. Roxbury tried to send new development from good soils to clusters of homes on poorer farmland. They targeted the land uses, rather than mapping areas of the town. When asked how well this was working, Hyer stated that they were thinking of throwing it out, and waiting for another town to develop a plan!

Hyer presented a paper with ideas for a TDR plan in the Town (Addendum #1), and hoped that the commission would consider it. The ideas, most of which are in line with the Town’s Land Use Plan, need to be discussed and decided upon. He mentioned that the County also has a paper with questions, which can be considered when developing a TDR plan. Many issues came up, such as Jerome Essers, whether splits could be transferred within a trust and whether parcel splits can be transferred, with the destination decided at a later date. After a short discussion of all the points on the paper, the Commission decided to try to come to agreements for a TDR policy at future meetings.

Other Matters:

Jim Garfoot asked about the ATC power line plans. He had noted that an alternative plan mentioned coming through the Town of Cross Plains. Hyer said that this had been written an alternative route, which would be more expensive, and thus much less likely to be adopted.

As there were no more comments, Hyer moved adjournment, Rhude seconded, and the meeting’s end was unanimously agreed upon at 9:50 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

Parrell: Agenda - due THURSDAY, May 24th for meeting June 4th (Thursday due to Labor Day weekend)

Hyer: Contact National Parks about Town’s comments and the desire to be a part of the park planning process.

All: read Addendum document and the paper from the County on TDRs be prepared to discuss detailed plans at the June meeting.

Corrected June 4, and Submitted June 6, 2012 by Amelia Williams, Secretary TCP-PC

Please see maps, letters, and papers discussed on the website at

<http://www.plancommissionTCP.com>

For the papers, select “Mtg Info Packets” at the top of the page.

ADDENDUM

TDR Proposal Revised
May 6, 2012

The mutually agreed, voluntary transfer of development rights between landowners in the Town of Cross Plains will be permitted under the following criteria:

All lands are in common ownership at the time of application and the transfer would further the goal of preserving productive farmland.

All lands not in common ownership at the time of application if the transfer will reduce development in the Black Earth Creek Water Quality and Ice Age Trail Corridors or further the goal of preserving productive farmland. (NOTE: Can further define preserving productive farmland: results in development occurring on soils not classified as LESA groups I, II or III; results in permanent protection of large blocks of contiguous farmland; results in clustered development adjacent to other existing development.)

Such transfers will be considered on a case-by-case basis. A density analysis by Dane County will be required. The Town will (NOTE: “may” now except when rights exhausted) recommend either recording Deed Restrictions or Deed Notices on “sending” and “receiving” parcels.

Substandard parcels, under 35 acres as of December 26, 1981, will not be permitted to transfer any development rights to other properties.

Transfers to Town properties within the Village of Cross Plains Urban Service Area will be permitted only if the Town and Village enter into a boundary agreement that addresses such transfers.

Transfers will meet the Development siting standards & criteria in the Town Land Use Plan for Agricultural Preservation and Rural Residential Districts. (Note: Lot Size Standards are a minimum of 2 acres in the Agricultural Preservation District and 1.5 acres in the Rural Residential District 20,000 square feet if CARPC indicates development would not result in unsafe levels of nitrate pollution or Public Health approves an onsite system that reduces nitrate effluent levels to acceptable levels and if permitted by County zoning, shore land zoning and land division ordinances.)

Transfers