

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, September 21, 2021

Time: 7:00 p.m.

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

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

Attendance List: Isaac Zickert (W5410 E Helke Rd), Charles Roesler (N1235 Kreutz Ln), Dave Beinborn (N1206 Continental Ln), Jerry Miller (N1166 Continental Ln), Kathy and Dave Lesky (N328 State Road 35), and Charles Roesler Jr. (N1178 Continental Ln).

1. Call meeting to order by Candahl at 7:01 p.m.
2. Introductions of Staff and Board Members.
3. Approve 8/17/21 Minutes. Motion by Heal, second by Kendhammer. Motion carried unanimously.
4. Comprehensive Plan – La Crosse County Comprehensive Plan Update- Brian Fukuda. Fukuda filling in for Charlie Handy. Important to maintain an open line of communication between the Town and the County to allow for our plans to work together for future planning. Public comment opportunity is important as well to hear from the residents. Explained the process of updating the plan. Explained where they are with their planning and explained the importance of Farmland Preservation. Plans for moving forward with the drafts and strategic planning explained. Currently, they're working on a public input model for scenarios for development which will provide a scenario and ask the public to answer questions regarding the scenarios. Surveys available online and in hard copy at the libraries. Sustainability elements added to the plan for the future of the County. It's not required to stand alone, it can be incorporated into the other elements, the county plan will include it in every element, and it will also be its own element. The goal is that in February of 2022, La Crosse County will put the elements all together and then recommend consideration to the County Board. Unsure if that is feasible based on staffing and workload. Encourages the Town to establish elements of the plan so that that county knows what the plans are and can try to mold to fit best for everyone. In 2008, the County adopted all town plans by reference, the County will not be handling land use plans that way. Peterson explained further why that is not going to be done for this county plan. Fukuda also added that if all the Town plan for plentiful development, that's not planning. Need to establish what areas make sense for residential development, farmland preservation, etc. Candahl noted that if the Town Map does not match the County Map, the County plan will supersede the Town's plan. Candahl encouraged residents with questions or intentions to develop their property, should voice those intentions to the County Board and the Board drafting this plan. Peterson explained what additional factors can be incorporated in making those decisions. Peterson also clarified that Farmland Preservation can also include areas with steep slopes, forest land, and other areas that are not developable. Peterson called on Kendhammer to give more information on how the farmland is being used in Shelby currently. Kendhammer noted less and less farms in La Crosse County areas, even leasing land is difficult because farmers and family farms are becoming scarce. Shelby is already losing development to the Holmen area due to restrictions and even more

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

restrictions could be detrimental to the growth of the Township.

Fukuda gave additional information about the County and Town superseding one another. It's not that one is superseding the other, it's that if they plans don't match, the plans need to be reworked so that they reflect the same plan for growth. Cost effectiveness and ability to provide services is considered as well. Fukuda also explained the option for Towns to do its own zoning and not rely on the county. If that were the case, the Town does not have to follow the County plan. Discussion on what the process really looks like. Peterson questioned the best way for the Town to communicate with the County while the process is ongoing. Fukuda encouraged all residents to participate in the surveys, draft letters, come to meetings, and communicate with County Board Representatives. Kendhammer noted growth in other areas is different than Shelby would want, i.e., multi-family units. Manage the population for the school district as well. Flege noted that she would like more information about where "pockets for development" are. Candahl noted the Planning Commission should take a tour of the Town. Ehler commented on the sales of homes in the last 3-5 years. Candahl also noted that development can lower the tax rates which would make lots in Shelby more desirable. Fukuda noted that this plan is going to be all encompassing and it includes intergovernmental cooperation.

5. Comprehensive Plan – Housing and Economic Development. Tabled until the next meeting.
6. Citizens' Concerns.
 - a. Dave Lesky. Concern with railroad bridge Highway 35. Candahl and Peterson agree it's a Town Board Problem. Candahl noted the board will be meeting with the DOT soon and they will have more information. Peterson noted they already have it designed, they're going to increase the capacity, but it's already set in motion. It will be an improvement. Candahl noted that the Town is also trying to make sure the DOT and railroad work together to help control flooding issues, although it is technically separate.
 - b. Peterson went on record with letter received by resident Barbara Miller. Asking the Town to revisit the ordinance that requires road frontage for driveways. In the future she requests we allow access to homes via easement. (Letter attached).
 - c. Roesler son- current development plans are tied up by the Boundary Agreement.
 - d. Beinborn- why does Shelby rely on the county for zoning/planning? Peterson explained the zoning process. Explained why the future land use plan exists and why it's followed so closely by the Town and County. Zoning exists under state statute. Peterson explained what it would mean for the Town to take care of its own zoning. Heal noted it would be very difficult to go back to County zoning after leaving.
 - e. Schulz noted the controversy with planning. Experience with planning in the past and its necessary to find a balance of state rules, transportation issues, development potential, etc. All while dealing with financial challenges. Without planning, land is wasted, developments become rundown. Reasonable planning can put Shelby ahead of the planning. Community is obligated to look forward knowing that we are dealing with challenges that can slow the process. Not everyone is going to get exactly what they want.
7. Comprehensive Plan – Future Land Use Plan. Candahl noted where the guests own property/live for reference for the Commissioners. Peterson explained where to get information for La Crosse County Meetings. Peterson noted that our consultant for the Comprehensive Plan will attend the next meeting and we will be able to see a more complete draft of this section then. Peterson gave

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

overview of current future land use plan. What needs to be updated and what is going to remain relatively unchanged. Explained why it would be easier for both the County and the Town if the plans match. Flege asked if there are any areas that would take precedence for example "Mixed Use" zoned parcels. Peterson explained how Agriculture parcels are set for residential development densities. Question regarding annexation by the city- do they have to plan it ahead of time. They do have to have a plan for growth. If their growth plan doesn't show the growth absorbing Shelby, then theoretically they shouldn't annex it, but it's still possible. Noted boundary agreement and comprehensive plan does need to match. Peterson wants the commissioners to go on record noting how we will communicate Shelby's interests periodically to the County, so they know what direction Shelby is heading in. Candahl reminded residents to contact their county board representatives. Instructed FW to put representative's information on the website. For next time- staff will figure out what the projections are. After that commission will start mapping.

8. Administrator Report. None.
9. Commissioners. None.
10. Adjournment. Motion by Benson, second by Kendhammer to adjourn at 8:39 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Next Planning Commission meeting October 19, 2021, at 7:00 p.m. at All Star Lanes.