

TOWN OF SHELBY

County of La Crosse

State of Wisconsin



2800 Ward Ave

La Crosse, WI 54601

Phone: (608)788-1032

Email: info@townofshelby.com

APPROVED

Planning Commission Draft Minutes

Date: Tuesday, November 16, 2021

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Location: All Star Lanes, 4735 Mormon Coulee Rd, La Crosse, WI 54601

Town Officials Present: Planning Commission Chairperson Elliott Bujan, Commissioners Mike Kendhammer, Al Schulz, Rebecca Flege, Karen Kouba, Brian Benson, Administrator Christina Peterson, Clerk Fortune Weaver, Treasurer Sara Jarr, Town Board Chairperson Tim Candahl, and Marlene Heal.

Attendance List: Abbey Nicewander (MRRPC), Jamie O'Neill, Charlie Handy and Karl Green (La Crosse County) and Jed Olson (3401 Farnam Street).

1. Call meeting to order by Bujan at 7:00 p.m.
2. Approve 10/19/2021 Minutes. Motion by Kouba to approve minutes from 10/19/2021, second by Kendhammer. Motion carried unanimously.
3. Citizens' Concerns. None
4. Comprehensive Plan- Future Land Use Plan (continued). Handy gave information on La Crosse County Planning and how it relates to the Town's Comprehensive Plan and what both plans will mean for the future. Handy noted La Crosse County is hoping to finish most of their plan before March of 2022; however, it is unlikely that they will finish on time. The County plan includes guidance for the County Board for land use and other decisions that will be brought in front of them. Handy reiterated that the basics for land use planning is supply and demand. Handy explained issue with a different municipality over estimating development demand. La Crosse County had to generate demand there to avoid bankruptcy and it ended up costing the whole county money. Handy noted that historical data is used to create projections to determine how much potential for development exists within the Town. Handy noted that the projections have not been completed, but it's being worked on currently. Noted the projections will look different than the preliminary numbers due to the suppression from the City of La Crosse. Handy noted the importance of structuring public transportation and sustainability of La Crosse County. Green understands the need for increase in tax base while keeping taxes low for residents. Discussion on Tax Exempt properties such as the parklands, churches, hospitals, and universities and school district tax rates. Green explained another issue is that many homes are older and not worth as much which brings in less tax revenue. Candahl asked for guidance on how Shelby moves forward with tax exempt properties and homes that have lower values to give more tax base. Handy reiterated that more density where services exist makes the most sense in terms of planning. Additional comments on the tax base for the school district. Handy noted that annexation in some areas would be too expensive for the city and boundary lines are being drawn wherever makes financial sense. Peterson reviewed the tour taken and noted where parcels that have been previously considered exist on the map. Peterson noted the areas marked for development total around 1,200 acres. Peterson also noted that areas marked that are likely to go into the City of La Crosse in the Boundary Agreement combined with areas that have a 30% slope reduce the number of acres that the town has indicated on the map. Peterson noted that there is no commercial or mixed use or smaller areas for development marked on the map and would like to have those added. Peterson asked the Planning Commission and Handy for input for areas of potential commercial/mixed use areas available in

TOWN OF SHELBY

County of La Crosse

State of Wisconsin

2800 Ward Ave

La Crosse, WI 54601

Phone: (608)788-1032

Email: info@townofshelby.com

Shelby. Handy gave interpretation of mixed use. Mixed use in urban setting is typically positive with commercial below and residential above. In a suburban or rural setting there are essentially no restrictions on what can be put in there which gets difficult for zoning. If mixed use is meant to be residential friendly or commercial friendly it needs to be further explained in the future land use plan. Discussion on Conditional Zoning. Bujan clarified conditional zoning or conditional use permits give enough flexibility to fit several options for land use, but also allows restrictions. Handy noted commercial parcels can be spread out, but shouldn't be in random areas, should be joined together where it makes sense. Peterson clarified that La Crosse County classifies zoning as residential or non-residential for their plan and the Town's plan needs to be more specific for when the questions come through at the Town level, so the Town can decide what type of residential/ density and same with commercial. Peterson and Handy discussed the deadlines, likelihood of the timeline changing, and what the town needs to have complete for the county planning to work in conjunction with what the town has created. Handy explained the process of approving and recommending the plan at the town level, adopting, and amending the plan and how it relates to the county. Handy explained the importance of the language in the plan and the responses to the public input. Handy and Peterson discussed demand for Agricultural zoning. Jed Olson commented that some restrictions encourage large operation farming instead of small hobby farms or sustainability farms for people who have day jobs. Peterson clarified that Olson would like to encourage small scale farming. Handy explained that zoning restrictions are meant to control development demand not to encourage large scale farming. Discussion on lot sizes and zoning. Candahl asked for clarification on adding sewer connections, need to negotiate a certain number of new sewer hookups, to service existing homes and allow for potential growth. Peterson noted that demand will restrict development more than available number of hookups, Peterson also touched on the sewer agreement that will be negotiated. Handy agreed with Peterson and noted that unless a large apartment complex or large development comes to Shelby, sewer connections shouldn't be a concern. County would like the map before December 2nd, that meeting will focus on Future Land Use but doesn't need to be the final draft. Peterson explained goals and objectives and gave some examples. Peterson discussed survey results and asked for Commission to read the responses and put objectives or action items on each goal that has been created based on survey responses. Flege asked for clarification on how specific the language needs to be for the goals. Peterson clarified about the objectives and action items being more specific. Some goals combined to avoid redundancy. Discussion on goals, objectives, and action items. Commission solidified goals and made suggestions for topics of objectives. Weaver, Nicewander and Peterson will draft a new document reflecting the goals, objectives, and action items for the Future Land Use Plan. (See attached)

5. MPO Goals Evaluation. Commission agrees that Candahl and Weaver can complete the evaluation and return to MRRPC.
6. Administrator Report. None.
7. Commissioners. None.
8. Adjournment. Motion by Kouba, second by Benson to adjourn at 8:54 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Next Planning Commission meeting December 21, 2021, at 7:00 p.m. at All Star Lanes.