

**TOWN OF HULL
PLAN COMMISSION
MEETING**
Tuesday, July 20, 2010

- 1. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER:** The Town of Hull Plan Commission Meeting was called to order by Chairperson John Holdridge at 7:00 P.M. at the Town of Hull Municipal Building, 4550 Wojcik Memorial Drive, Stevens Point, WI 54482.

Present: John Holdridge, LaVerne Syens, Bob Bowen, Shelley Binder, Bob Enright, and Secretary Patty Amman.

Also present: Chuck Lucht, Associate Planner of Portage County Planning and Zoning and Town Supervisors, Dave Pederson and Dave Wilz.

Citizens: Jean Fox, Darren Krzanowski, G. Schoenhofer, Jocelyn Reid, Al Stemen

- 2. CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS. AGENDA ITEMS ARE FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION.**

Holdridge Anyone on a non-agenda item?

Bowen Will we have an opportunity to bring up new business later?

Holdridge We can't have new business.

Bowen We can't?

Holdridge It's against the open meeting law. You can't surprise the public.

Bowen You mean to bring up something.

Holdridge That's right. You could bring it up, but you can't take any action on it.

Bowen I realize that.

Holdridge You could inform, but if you want to take action, we have to put it on the next month's agenda. It's a pretty tough law.

Bowen Near the end of the evening when you say is there anything else, then can a committee member bring something up?

Holdridge Yes, you can do that. We just can't take any action. That's just information.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF the June 10, 2010 Plan Commission Meeting: *Motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of June 10, 2010- by LaVerne Syens, seconded by Bob Enright. Motion carried by voice vote.*

4. CERTIFIED SURVEY MAP FOR PHILIP RADOMSKI LAND IN SECTION 16, TOWN 24N, RANGE 8E, ABUTTING WILSHIRE DRIVE.

Holdridge There is a bigger map here that was provided by Janet Wolle so you can see approximately where that land is located. There is also a memo here from Phil Deffenbaugh our assessor/building inspector. He is the one that typically looks over our certified survey maps and renders his wisdom. I'll let you read that. If anybody else wants copies, we have some here.

Bowen Is Mr. Radomski present?

Holdridge Is Mr. Radomski here?

Krzanowski I'm the surveyor.

Holdridge Oh, you're Darren (Krzanowski).

Bowen I was going to ask John if someone could respond to the comment that Phil made (*in his memo*).

Krzanowski Yes, that 66 foot strip, that was in there. Its sole purpose is for future access into the back off the road.

Holdridge So it's a possible future road?

Krzanowski Correct. That's why we're going with 66 feet so that we've got enough room, we've got 4 rods in there.

Holdridge That's standard. He's talking about an annotation, "the area to be dedicated to the public as right of way".

Krzanowski Right. Currently he owns out to the section line and I can talk with Phil and tell him that's one of the stipulations, that we have to dedicate that portion of Wilshire for approval of a map.

Holdridge That's the right of way, right, that's 33 feet and your own?

Krzanowski Right, but the problem is that a lot of older deeds would just call out the quarter section and never take out the roadway, so now we come back through and try to make things right again.

Bowen So is that 33 feet from the center line of Wilshire?

Krzanowski It's from the section line. He owns out to the section line. We'll dedicate those 33 feet to Wilshire.

Holdridge Okay, that would resolve it. You'll put that on the map you'll sign?

Krzanowski Correct.

Holdridge Okay. Any other questions about this?

Enright So what we are doing is just accepting this with this map that looks fine.

Holdridge It does look fine. The question we have is that sometimes you put those strips in between the land and they become what are called a "spite" strip. You don't want anybody crossing into your land and so you put a strip there. We've got several of those in Hull and they really become a source of controversy with neighbors. Darren explained that is 66' wide so he is reserving that for any lots in the back. You can't land lock someone.

Bowen It's clearly marked with survey stakes.

Krzanowski It will be now that I've got your blessing, I can go out there and stake it and all that. But it doesn't pay for me to put irons in the ground unless I first get approval.

Holdridge You don't want to have to pull them out again.

Krzanowski Right. That 33' belongs to Phil (*Radomski*) because he owns the rest of the property in here. So this way, if he wants to do something back in here, he knows that he's got public access with a road.

Enright But this other plot back here belongs to somebody else?

Krzanowski Correct.

Holdridge I talked with Portage County today about that as to why it was so ambiguous and they were supportive because you've got to have access to lots in the back and if you don't put that in there, conceivably he could be land locked.

Krzanowski Correct.

A motion was made by LaVerne Syens to approve the certified survey map as amended. Motion was seconded by Bob Enright. Motion passed without further discussion.

5. CERTIFIED SURVEY MAP FOR JEAN FOX LAND IN SECTION 12, TOWN 24N, RANGE 8E IN VILLAGE OF JORDAN PLAT.

Holdridge This one was on a couple of months ago. We had sent a letter to both Darren K. and Jean Fox. Is she here? Okay, good. Chuck was here from Portage County Planning and Zoning and we talked about it. It seemed to us at that time that there were 2 options. One was that the lots were smaller, but they were lots of record.

Krzanowski Correct.

Holdridge You could do something with those lots but there were some hurdles you'd have to get through. Access, possible septic placement and so forth. But that would be an option to keep those lots as they are. The other option was combining the lots into one large lot and I think if you did that, you would still be less than 2 acres. That is in the Stevens Point wellhead protection area which requires 2 acre minimum lot size. You could, through the Board of Adjustment, handle that because it's just a little short of 2 acres. But none the less, that's in the wellhead protection area where 2 acre lots are sort of limited to that. With much discussion that night, that is what we came up with. Our basic problem was that we didn't know what you folks wanted to do with the lots. To us, it was a fishing expedition. I think we need some decision by you folks as to what you want to do. Then we will be able to decide if you can do it or how we work it out with you.

Krzanowski You guys have a copy of the proposed layout of lots on the back of the letter. The deal was that this land was originally platted in 1856. Here's a copy of the original plat with Jean's property being highlighted in the pink here. So she currently owns 7 lots in there that are 82 ½' x 148'. Those are existing lots that in theory, she could just turn around and sell. Working with Steve Brazzale before he retired, he had come up with a combining of the lots like you see on that layout there.

Holdridge Three lots here and 4 lots there, is that what you are saying?

Krzanowski It would be 4 lots. In the front, we're taking 1½ lots and in the back another 1 ½ lots and we're combining 2 lots. Steve's thoughts at the time was that it doesn't meet the wellhead protection area requirement and it doesn't meet the Town's current zoning, but that would be the best use of that property. The best use to meet setbacks and have the lots in there. Since Steve Brazzale retired, I've been working with Tracy Pelke at the County. The County's stance on it is that they will not take review over it because they are considering it as changing the boundaries between existing parcels. In which case, the County doesn't review the map.

Holdridge Now let me turn to Chuck. Chuck Lucht is the Associate Planner for the Portage County Planning and Zoning Department and he's really been the one we've been working with. We really haven't worked at all with Tracy on this. So go ahead.

Chuck I work with Tracy and so since that last meeting we've had, we've been trying to figure out how to crunch the problem ourselves. While we're not happy with the ultimate lot size, we've tried to decide what this was and it's not actually a subdivision. Like he said, it's a

rearranging of lot parcels inside of an existing lot or series of lots. Instead of 7 lots, it's like they're combining lots to create 4 lots instead of 7. We've talked with Mrs. Fox today and tried to help her understand what's going on with the parcel. What setbacks are and she understands there are certain sizes of an area that a house and septic could fit in. She doesn't seem to want to have 7 houses on the lots. They do feel its best if they combine lots so they would have less number of houses and that would make more sense. Department-wise internally, we agree it's not a minor subdivision because we're not creating anything new. We're just rearranging the boundaries. That would provide the 3rd option that Mrs. Fox could go with. The difference is if there was strong opposition for some reason, she might be able to sell off 3 chunks of property to people to put houses on as opposed to 4 lots.

Holdridge Do you have a redesign of this?

Krzanowski That's what you have, what I e-mailed to you. That's the current 4-parcel configuration.

Holdridge Where do you get the 4-parcel configuration?

Krzanowski I sent you another e-mail after you had called me.

Binder We don't have that one.

Holdridge I don't have that one.

Krzanowski Okay. This is what she's proposing. (*He showed us his map with split lots.*)

Lucht If she gets a new legal description of that, she can never revert back to the 7 lots.

Bowen What are the sizes of the 4 lots? About a third of an acre?

Holdridge Yes, about a third of an acre.

Lucht These are very wooded lots so you could hide a house in there very easily.

Bowen I know but when we finished our discussion last time, we were looking at the health and safety aspect of the reduced size.

Lucht Four lots are better than 7 lots.

Bowen I realize that and they have the privilege of that. But I thought we were trying to work towards the better compliance with the existing lot size.

Lucht We are trying to work towards that.

Holdridge But Chuck, we had this big discussion. When we left, we had these 2 options. Those 2 options were communicated. This is a third option.

Lucht We don't seem to have anything in our subdivision ordinance for the County that would stand in the way of recombining these into 4 lots in the configuration they show here.

Holdridge The big issue there is the wellhead protection area. Two acre minimum lot size.

Lucht Right, but it's not creating anything new. It's realigning property boundaries within what already exists. So we don't seem to have anything that would control or force it to be one big lot as opposed to 4 smaller lots. We have 7 existing lots and you're just rearranging the internal boundaries, you're not creating anything new. So we don't believe we have any control over it.

Bowen Chuck, has this land ever been perked?

Jean Fox Yes, we have the David Medin record of it. He tested it for every aspect of drainage, water, for space for driveways, for everything. I have a copy of what he mapped out. He did a thorough search on it.

Bowen So it's acceptable, not marginal?

Holdridge There's some pretty wet stuff out there.

Lucht Yes but there are some houses not too far away from that.

Holdridge I know there are houses out there. There's a house right at the end of that road.

Lucht There's a couple of them back in there.

Enright Is the issue that you're trying to solve here, that if you left these lots as 7 existing lots, then you might have a hard time using them because of the setbacks that make it difficult?

Lucht On one side she could sell off 3 lots (the west side), and she could sell off 2 lots a piece on the east side, then you would have 3 lots instead of 4. She can do whatever she wants with the 7 lots.

Enright Right, so why not just leave it that way?

Lucht With 7 lots, it could become a mobile home park, it's that easy.

Holdridge Chuck that was the point last time, that you could leave them as lots of record and she could sell them and someone could possibly build but there would be a number of hurdles to go through. There were setbacks, you have access issues.

Lucht The setbacks would be an issue. But if someone comes to you and says, I have 2 parcels that abut each other and I want to build in the middle of them, if they own it, they can do that. Then you're setbacks only apply to the outside. So you do have a larger building envelope

on the inside. In that sense, she could still accomplish 75% of her goal with creating 4 lots without any help.

Holdridge But you're convinced these are not 4 new lots. They're just reconfiguring the drawing. But if they were 4 new lots, would they be subject to the wellhead protection? If somebody went in there and had 40 acres and created 4 lots similar to this and they were all under 2 acres, would that be under wellhead protection?

Lucht Wellhead protection wouldn't have anything to do with this because they are existing lots.

Holdridge No, I'm saying if you had 40 acres out there and you come into it and there's some acreage there, and you decide to make 4 lots of this size.

Lucht You wouldn't be able to do that.

Holdridge Why?

Lucht Because they would be creating parcels from subdivisions.

Holdridge You couldn't do that because they'd be in the wellhead protection area which requires 2 acres, right?

Lucht That would be from new. This is a legacy of having plats that were never.....

Holdridge I agree with that. What I'm saying is that if someone has 20 or 40 acres and they want to create 4 lots out of that, they could do that. We just had a certified survey map creating a lot. If they wanted to create those in that area, they would have to be at least 2 acres because it's in the wellhead protection area.

Lucht Right. But that would be a brand new lot.

Holdridge That's what I'm saying.

Lucht These aren't technically brand new lots.

Holdridge That's right. We had talked last time about wellhead protection and if people don't have 2 acres in that area, then they would need to go through a number of steps because if you add up all those 7 lots, they would still be under 2 acres. We had that discussion. You said that if that's true, then they may be able to get that waived by going to the Board of Adjustment because the City would certainly insist on 2 acre lots. That's part of the wellhead protection, right?

Lucht If we thought we had the capability of enforcing 2 acre lots in this situation or sell it off as a forced combination as a single lot, we would do so. They are all under one ownership and they are legally existing lots. Everybody thought they had been combined, but they had only

been combined for tax purposes, not in reality. So what we have is a legacy from the middle 1800's coming back to show you what existed back then. This would have been great with the I-39 group. Existing lots of record. This is exactly what we were talking about. In this case, it's an old issue that lay dormant for many decades and now it doesn't fit with the idea of clean water or protecting that, but it is what it is. It's not new lots, it's not subdivision, it's rearranging parcels on a person's property. Once they do it, it gets accepted and recorded, they can't ever go back.

Holdridge They probably wouldn't want to, right?

Lucht Maybe not. But who knows.

Holdridge Mrs. Fox, I assume this is your plan, right? This is what you'd like to do right now?

Fox I would accept that right now because I guess I realize that as small as those lots are, I don't know who would really want to buy them since everyone wants a lot of space. I don't know if everyone is entitled to a lot of space for a house anymore since they can't afford them. But it would seem the way he has drawn them out, it would seem feasible because there is access. We had the water tested and Medin did a thorough job. Steven Brazzale certainly worked on these a long time and measured those out once or twice to work out so he had all the offsets, measurements that he needed. We got that in 4 different ways. We have the original deeds too, from 1856.

Holdridge Is that when they were laid out?

Fox Yes. It was meant to be part of the City of Stevens Point at one time.

Holdridge What did they call it, Jordan Village?

Fox I think so.

Krzanowski It was actually 1857. That's what the plat stated.

Holdridge Right before the Civil War.

Bowen What is the purpose of the wellhead protection area?

Lucht It's to try to make sure you have adequate supplies of water that could be properly treated and distributed.

Fox What about waste disposal? That's what Medin had to figure out. If there was space for drainage.

Lucht There is enough space for drainage to fit on the combined lots. Tracy's opinion is that with the combined lots, you would have more than enough space.

Bowen So there is not a public health issue? The requirement for a 2 acre lot size is overkill?

Lucht I don't know if I would agree with that last statement. But we don't seem to have anything that we can force 2 acres within this situation.

Bowen I just wanted to bring those points up.

Lucht If we had the ability to force that compliance, we would. These are isolated cases.

Holdridge Well it seems to me that we always get isolated cases. That's the nature of what we get here. We hear a lot of isolated situations. But clearly the wellhead protection doesn't apply to these lots or else they'd have to go to 2 acres.

Binder But most of us that have lived in this area for the last 20 or 30 years, all our lots are smaller than 2 acres so we all fall under that fact that we're not in compliance with what the future wants now. My lot is only $\frac{3}{4}$ acre. That was all acceptable years and years ago.

Holdridge I know but in 1857, they didn't have any zoning. We're going to look at the subdivision ordinance for the Town of Hull from 1971 and it appears in that ordinance that there is no mention of Portage County Zoning. Everything is pre-something.

Lucht Sometimes that is the case.

G. Schoenhofer I'm with Jean Fox and I was wondering what if the State steps in because of the Smart Growth issues and says you're not complying?

Lucht The Smart Growth has more to do with comprehensive planning than it does with zoning, dealing with legacy issues like this. That's the best way I can put it. It's not even like mid-1930 when zoning was the first time it was. These lots already existed for what, 40-70 years at that point. Here we are at another 80 years later.

Schoenhofer I've been to quite a few different planning commission meetings in other areas including the Towns of Reidfield, Sharon, Alban and Stockton and many of them are putting a 5 acre and 10 acre moratorium, not just 2 acre and I'm wondering, if you can get away with a 2 acre, that's wonderful. But what if later on, you get stepped on and she figures it's all settled and it isn't?

Lucht If this is what she wants for an idea, and it's eventually accepted and recorded, that is the way it is. The same as the 7 lots now, they're recorded and there is nothing anybody can do about that.

Holdridge It's a lot of record.

Lucht Right.

Holdridge Any other questions? I think my problem with this is that it is sort of a surprise (*the 4 lot split*). We had a long discussion with the 2 options and all of a sudden we are given this. When I called today, I didn't know anything about this. This is the first I've seen of this.

Krzanowski We had talked the other day and I e-mailed that over with the other lot.

Holdridge I didn't get it. Anyway, it's a resolution of an issue there and all 4 of these lots would front on a road. So they would not be landlocked in any way.

Bowen I thought when we finished our discussion last time, that we were moving towards 2 acre lots which this would just about make compliance with and so yes, this is a surprise to me too. But if it passes the public health test, and apparently Dave Medin has certified that it does, then I don't see any problem with the 4 lots.

Fox There were 4 equal pieces just like that way back 50 years ago maybe and one little old lady lived on each one of those 4 pieces. Nobody bothered about that. They lived there happily and had their wells and now you let Brizinski move in a house. They moved the old power house over, just up and over and you have to wonder what kind of foundation he has. He built it on 3 of those pieces because you can't build on the 4th one. So anything goes it seems when people want to do it and nobody else is looking.

Holdridge When did he move that in?

Fox It has to be closer to 20 years ago maybe.

Holdridge Sometime after the Civil War.

Fox Not too long ago.

Holdridge I don't think we were a part of that. But you're satisfied with what you have here with this 4 lot split?

Fox Yes. Because people want to live there, it's a beautiful area. Too bad you have Highway 66 there that you have to look over, blocking Jordan Pond. The park and stuff is just gorgeous. People are asking for it all the time. But I want to be a little conservative with it. I wouldn't want small lots, if it was me. I like bigger homes. It's desirable. These guys worked on this a long time and they measured every inch. Medin and Brazzale and now Darren and I just took it that they would be complying with all the ordinances looking out for every square inch.

Holdridge Does this go to the City, Chuck?

Lucht No. This is the Town of Hull.

Krzanowski Because it's in the territorial boundary.

Holdridge You still have the question of the wellhead protection area that someone is going to ask about I would think. That wellhead protection is to protect the City wells and I know they have a real interest in that.

Krzanowski That's part of this stepping process. Originally I came to the Town of Hull and you sent me to the County so I went to them. We worked it out on that end, now we're back here. Once the Town of Hull decides which way this is going to go, then I can go back to the City.

Binder Have you asked a realtor if you think those are viable lots to sell at that size out there?

Fox I never got that far. I just wanted to make sure. I keep hearing that people want space for the environmental protection and all that stuff. So I never pursued it. People want to buy it all the time for a \$1,000 maybe. They think you're going to give it to them, but that's not going to happen.

Binder I'm just wondering, because they are small lots, if people are going to be interested in them.

Fox People are looking all the time.

Bowen The thing is, Chuck is telling us that they are approved. The whole 7 lots don't even meet our minimum standard of 2 acres. It would only be 1.97 acres and now we are digressing to 4 lots because this 150 year old rule trumps comprehensive land use.

Holdridge What happens if we vote this down? What do you fellows do from the County?

Lucht That's a good question. I don't know.

Krzanowski If you vote this down, worst case scenario is there would probably be 3 lots in there. Because Mrs. Fox can still turn around and sell lots #9 and #10 to somebody. So you're still going to have a lot that is 164' x 148' because lots #9 and #10 are existing parcels. So she could still turn around and sell those 2 lots to a single buyer. The same with lots #11 and #12 which is lot 3 on this map. She could turn around and sell those lots to a single person and they could build in there.

Holdridge They could buy 2 lots and build on them in the middle like Chuck was saying.

Krzanowski Right, because there are 2 existing subdivision lots. The only issue would be along Brilowski Road, if selling all of lot 3 and half of lot 2. That's what we've got divided there. It may be that she sells just lot 1, 2 and 3 and that would be one big lot. As it stands now, she could, in theory, sell and have 3 different homes in there.

Enright What would prevent her from putting homes on all 7?

Krzanowski The size of the lots. When we first started this, we were taking a bad situation that was created 160 years ago and we were trying to make it better.

Enright Would you not build on all 7 because you wouldn't be able to get houses on them with the needed setbacks? With the setbacks, it wouldn't leave enough room to build a house?

Krzanowski Correct.

Enright So you couldn't build 7 houses but you could build 3?

Krzanowski In theory, you could back a mobile home in there with a holding tank and if you've got a 14 foot wide trailer, it would meet setback requirements.

Enright But it wouldn't if it was a regular house.

Krzanowski Correct.

Holdridge I'm not so sure about a mobile home. That requires you notifying neighbors and we've been through some of that. A lot of neighbors don't want mobile homes in their area.

Bowen He's talking about a double wide.

Krzanowski Possibly a double wide, 24' wide. That still leaves you, they're currently 82' wide.

Lucht With a 10' setback, that would leave you with 62' wide. A 62' wide with 24' setback at the rear, there's 180', you're looking at a building envelope of roughly 50' or 60' wide by about 80'.

Holdridge Are those lots across that road all laid out too?

Lucht The same way, yes.

Krzanowski It's the same situation and once we cross this bridge with Jean, then we're going to....

Holdridge Cross another bridge across the road.

Krzanowski Tackle across the road.

Bowen Chuck, because Brilowski Road is a busy thoroughfare, are the driveway separation requirements any different, or are they the same for all of them?

Lucht Because the separation is from driveway to driveway, the separation to the next one north on the lots she is looking at would appear to have enough room for driveways.

Holdridge That was one of those conditions we talked about at that earlier meeting.

Lucht I suppose that could be an issue.

Bowen Is there a difference in the driveway separation for a county trunk or a busy road as opposed to a side street?

Lucht I can look it up quick.

Krzanowski I was just looking at Steve Brazzale's notes here and if you have a 28'x50' home, there would be plenty of room for your septic system and well and still be inside the setbacks. There you could put one on each one of those 7 lots.

Bowen Is the area for a mound system and conventional system the same or are they different?

Krzanowski I would say different because it's based on the number of bedrooms in the house.

Holdridge For those, would you need to put a mound type septic system in with those lots?

Fox No one ever determined which one of those things we'd have to do. But they thought there was plenty of room for drainage.

Bowen Dave Medin must have determined that when they perked it.

Fox Yes. You can read his notes.

Holdridge I think there are some mound systems around there.

Fox Yes, Brizinski certainly must have something.

Holdridge I'm saying some of those houses I think require a mound system rather than an in ground septic. While Chuck is looking that up, are there any other questions?

Enright Is this an anomaly where there are plots of land like this?

Lucht Yes, this is an anomaly, except for her sister's lots across the street and a few others directly to the south. There's nothing else like this that we're aware of that is platted in the Town of Hull.

Krzanowski Even some of the stuff that was in the past, they have been combined over the years so that they don't exist anymore in that form.

Holdridge Are there some Indian mounds out there?

Fox Yes, there used to be. But they are pretty much covered. There used to be a little wedge.

Holdridge Any other thoughts?

Lucht Collectors have a separation of about 150'. Planning and Zoning Committee may permit modifications with the provisions of this section when no viable alternative exists. But in no case shall modification be permitted which is less than, in this case, 150'.

Bowen Each lot is 123'. You'd put it in the corner of one?

Lucht That's a possibility. Stranger things have been done.

Krzanowski The option with this too could be one driveway shared between two lots.

Bowen I just thought I'd bring that up because there is a regulation on the separation of driveways.

Lucht If they would share driveways, that would definitely be possible.

Enright Would it have to be done that way?

Lucht No.

Holdridge Why? Why can't we?

Lucht Because if it works out that they could have separate driveways, there would be nothing that would prevent that.

Enright If they could not get 2 legal driveways on their space.

Lucht Right.

Holdridge What would you say, you need to cut back this?

Lucht But there is no legal means that I'm aware of that you can force someone to share their driveway if they each have the space for one.

Holdridge I'm just saying that if you look at it, it's very possible that you might not be able to have 2 driveways and so a shared driveway would make some sense. I'm saying that we would put a condition on there on the certified survey map that you ought to have shared driveways. But you're saying we can't do that?

Lucht I'm not aware of a way to do that, to put that condition on there. I suppose you could try.

Holdridge You're coming out on a road, Brilowski Road, which is a Town road.

Lucht Right. When I look at the functional classification of that road, it shows up as not a collector road but listed under "all other roads" category. It's not even a minor collector road. It's a road that is one step up from a private driveway.

Bowen What's that?

Holdridge Brilowski Road.

Bowen Brilowski?!

Lucht It doesn't have a special classification for it here. It's not a rotten gravel road, I'll give you that. It doesn't have a classification that would warrant the anxiety over the separation of driveways.

Bowen I understand. It depends upon which section of the road. Over here by Highway 66 might be different than the status near Highway 10.

Lucht I've driven the whole road because I thought I could take a shortcut from Wal-Mart to here. I found out it's the long way around, it's not a shortcut.

Tape ran out, some conversation lost.

Fox All 10 parcels from Brilowski to Highway 66, it circles out.

Lucht There is some sort of dirt path trail up there, that's true. I ducked back in there just before the meeting.

Holdridge The road called Brychell Drive, we maintain it, we plow it, and we collect State aid on it. That's a public road. Whealand is back in there, although it's gravel.

Bowen How do they get back in there, John?

Holdridge They have to go off Highway 66. There's one mail box there.

Fox Why were they allowed to block that entrance to that? There was another road that went right up to Whealand's.

Holdridge That probably happened after the Civil War. Between the Civil War and the First World War.

Fox I know and I have to wonder why they sneaked that in, putting a fence right in the middle of a road, a barricade.

Holdridge It's an interesting situation.

Bowen If we can be assured by Chuck and Mrs. Fox that these parcels have passed all the public health and safety rules and regulations, I can't see any objection on my part.

Holdridge There's a separate septic permit that is used by your department. When somebody comes in here to build, they've got to get a septic permit. They've got to come to Phil D. to get a building permit. All we're doing is relocating some lots here. The questions of septic, building permit, etc., that's all in the future with whomever buys it.

Bowen But we are looking ahead at those issues and trying not to create future problems.

Holdridge It's conceivable that someone might come in and want to build on one of these and can't get a septic permit.

Lucht It would seem to be unlikely.

Bowen Are we talking about David Medin?

Fox Yes. I can't see how you get more thorough than we have on that paper. They measured every inch.

Holdridge Sometimes we don't trust the experts, we question the experts.

Enright If we pass this and it goes this way, then there's no going back, right? You can't then later combine these lots in a different way other than buying the whole lot of each of these bigger ones that you make, right?

Fox I would hate to see that happen because this was a gift many years ago. I hate to destroy it but the way things are going with regulations, what can you do? Who's going to want it?

Syens Assuming someone would want to buy 2 of the parcels as proposed, they could enlarge the size but they can't reduce it, is that correct? If they bought 2, they could come back and say can we plot this into one lot?

Lucht No, if they bought 2, they would have 2. If they say they want to downgrade their house situation, they would have 2 buildable lots. If you sell them by 2, you have 2. If you combine them and it's recorded as the new legal description, that's what you have for a lot.

Holdridge They can't go from 1 to 2 again?

Lucht You're right, they can't go from 1 to 2.

Holdridge It's conceivable that someone could buy all 4 and have a sizeable parcel out there. If they make it one lot, then you've only got one lot.

Lucht That's assuming the person would change the legal description. If they buy 4 and don't change the legal description. They still have 4.

Holdridge They could have one house on 4 lots.

Lucht They could always rip that one house down and have 4 lots again.

Syens But it's permissible for them to change the legal description to make that entire area one lot but it would never be permissible for them to go back to 7 lots.

Krzanowski It depends upon how they purchased it. If they purchase lots 9, 10, 11 and 12 of the Village of Jordan Plat, then they would have 4 lots there and they could be sitting in front of you 2 years from now trying to do a similar thing.

Enright If they bought it before we make this change.

Syens If we approve this change.

Lucht Then the new legal description takes effect.

Enright I think it's a good compromise. With the difference, if anything, with the new lots, you'll get a smaller number of houses on them.

Lucht Right. You are not increasing the non-conforming issue, you are lessening the non-conforming issue. It's still non-conforming but less so than it was before.

Holdridge But the non-conforming doesn't mean anything because they could use the lots anyway.

Bowen Given all the discussion we had over developing the comprehensive plan and the highway, I-39 West area, I feel we need to put something into this motion that explains to people why we are doing this. If we simply pass it and don't have any explanation that this is a decision that puts these parcels outside the standards of our current comprehensive plan, people will wonder what kind of stuff are we doing here.

Enright This must have come up at some point when we did the comprehensive plan, minimum lot sizes as we have done, then there are these old lots. What's happened with this identical type of situation? Something like this must have happened before, right? What holds sway, the lot of record idea?

Lucht The lot of record holds sway. Everybody that was upset and didn't understand the idea of non-conforming versus lot of record, this is the perfect teaching tool right here for what

the lot of record really means. It's non-conforming since zoning came into the County and it's never come up. It exists just fine the way it is until somebody decides to do something with the land. Now you see what we mean when we're trying to tell people on I-39 West, if your lot is smaller than 2 acres, you can still use your land. You're not being denied the use of the land.

Holdridge But this would say to them, well what we'll do is combine a bunch of those lots and create larger lots, because that's what is happening right here, right?

Lucht This Jordan Village plat is a unique circumstance that exists in the Town of Hull that predates every other land control that the United States had. We've had surveying since the very beginning of the country but all that was to make sure that they could understand how to sell off chunks of land to those that could afford certain sizes. The idea that they are nice little squares means that a surveyor/developer in 1856 could say, "I could get more parcels out of what I can sell to the people working at the sawmill right across the river."

Enright Are there any houses on any of this? Do you live on this land now?

Fox No, not on my 7 pieces.

Krzanowski You said in the past, there had been somebody living there.

Fox The lady that we bought it from, she died and her daughter sold it to my mother.

Holdridge Was the house torn down then?

Fox Yes, we burnt it down, it was really bad. A lot of diseased oak trees.

Holdridge Bob, what motion did you want to make?

Bowen I would say something like this, I wrote this out to verify my own thinking,
MOTION: "On the condition that the proposed reconfiguration of the Fox parcels as driven by the historic lot of record regulations, the Hull Plan Commission approves the Jordan Village plat as submitted by Jean Fox on this date."

Fox What was that, I didn't hear it.

Bowen You submitted this to us and we're approving it, only because this lot of record business trumps our current comprehensive plan.

Holdridge It took us about 2 years to understand the lot of record when doing the I-39 project and we finally got it. We never did the lot averaging and we never have understood that.

Syens I'll second the motion.

Holdridge Any discussion?

Enright What we're passing is more restrictive on you than it was before because on those 2 lots, anyone could have bought 2 of them like it is right now. We're just saying you can't buy one of them and build on it.

Krzanowski Correct.

Enright On the other hand, what we're saying is we're taking the middle lot and allowing you to split it into two different ones so that means you're getting something back from making those initial size lots, making them 50% bigger. It seems to me a reasonable way of handling the inconsistency of the lot of record and the plan. Half of what you're asking for, you could have done anyway. You're just giving something away by doing this and that's fine with me.

Holdridge But doesn't this make it more sellable?

Enright I'm not a realtor, so I wouldn't know, but I don't think it takes a rocket scientist to figure out that you could buy 2 adjacent lots and build a house on the combination. Maybe if they don't know how zoning works, but realtors could figure that out very quickly. I think that your statement as to why we are doing it is pretty good.

Bowen It's a concession and a step backwards in what we're supposed to be doing, but we don't have any choice if what Chuck has told us is true.

Fox Could you tell me again? I don't really understand what you said about that.

Enright Take the 4 lots on the east side of your property; what we're doing is putting the 2 most northern ones into 1 lot, and the 2 southern ones in another lot, but anyone could have that anyway if you were willing to sell them that way. I don't know why you wouldn't be if you're trying to sell the property.

G. Schoenhofer I am a realtor and I would say that increasing the size of the lots, because of the privacy, the only reason you'd go back in there would be because of the privacy. You certainly wouldn't want 6 neighbors around you.

Enright I see.

Schoenhofer I'm no expert but I'm a realtor out in Outagamie County, not Portage County.

Holdridge All in favor of the motion signify by saying aye, MOTION CARRIES. There you are Chuck and Darren, Mrs. Fox.

Krzanowski Like I said before, I imagine within the next couple of months, we'll probably get the ball rolling on the property east of this one that her sister owns.

Holdridge We can hardly wait!

Binder How long has it been in the family Mrs. Fox?

Fox A long time, 40 years maybe.

Binder You said your mother purchased it?

Fox She bought it from the lady that lived there and her daughter from Chicago sold it. If you want to see the deeds, I've got a big pack of them.

Binder From 1856?

Fox Yes, the originals.

Binder Frame those.

Holdridge We have a historian sitting behind you that would be very interested in those. You have an interesting parcel of land.

Fox I hope it stays as beautiful as it is now. Because of that Plover River, that's getting more gorgeous by the day but you've got to take that Hwy. 66 out of there though so we can get a better view. It's too high up. But it is really gorgeous and it's grown. The tree growth out there, every year I come, it's even thicker.

Holdridge Yes, it's a beautiful spot.

6. REVISED SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE FOR TOWN OF HULL – COMBINATION OF PORTAGE COUNTY, WISCONSIN TOWN'S ASSOCIATION AND TOWN OF HULL SUBDIVISION ORDINANCES.

Holdridge Al Stemen is a forthcoming Plan Commission member who will formally be approved at the Hull Board meeting in August. Joceyln Reid is another forthcoming one who lives in Meadow Manor subdivision. Al is a leading citizen on Old Wausau Road. Both are very active. They will join us. In going to this subdivision ordinance in looking over the Town of Hull's old one, which goes back to 1971, it does not mention that I could see Portage County subdivision ordinances. Why is that? Was there no Portage county subdivision ordinance in 1971?

Lucht Or it was brand new. I want to say it was 1968.

Holdridge Somehow, they just simply ignored you folks.

Lucht That's not unbelievable.

Holdridge It's amazing. Then the Wisconsin Towns Association, which also has a model ordinance which is 1998, it hardly has anything in there on County zoning. Every other paragraph is "town of...." whatever it is. That is really very comprehensive. It does have a good

section on certified survey maps. As you look at Portage County's, and that's what we took this from, reformatting it in triple space, I went through and crossed out things, but as I recall, there's no mention in here of a certified survey map. I don't know what that means, but we just dealt with a certified survey map tonight.

Lucht A note of things to update.

Holdridge I would say that anything we put together and adopt should include certified survey maps along with the terminology in here of minor subdivisions. In the Hull subdivision ordinance, they talk about primary and secondary subdivisions. The County talks about major and minor subdivisions. Those are clear differences. The one thing the Wisconsin Towns Association's does is talk about land division ordinance. We always refer to this as a subdivision ordinance. I think that is confusing. When people view subdivision, they think you've got a plot of land and you build all these parcels and that's the subdivision. But if a subdivision, by this as I understand it, is one lot, that's a minor subdivision, isn't it?

Lucht Yes.

Holdridge In the first part, we've got "Purpose" in there. I changed the County's numbering system and just went with Roman numerals for our draft. Then there's "Definitions". That's pretty self explanatory. We'd want to add a couple as I look at these others. But what I'm using really is the Portage County subdivision ordinance as the model for the Town of Hull subdivision ordinance. One thing that would be really helpful is if the County at some point would work with the towns in developing an ordinance that would incorporate the Towns Association ordinances. Right now, we're going to have to look through this, look at what you guys are doing and look at what we've done with ours so far. It's the old problem of you being an intermediary government, we're a local government and somehow they have to get meshed if we're going to have any power.

Lucht The way it's going to work when it comes to your subdivision ordinance is you will apply yours when people come to you first because we mandate that they come and talk to their town first before they try to push any project through the County.

Holdridge I don't think that's in here Chuck. They talk about a sketch that they come in with and see you about.

Lucht A sketch plat which is the idea that they should have that when they come to see you. You send them to us and then we send them back to you.

Holdridge We ought to decide, who they go to. I would argue that they should go to the County because you have the staff and the expertise. We don't have any zoning administrator.

Lucht Then we send them back to you.

Holdridge But you write up that one report.

Lucht Right. But sometimes people don't know where to start so they call the Town of Hull asking what they need to do to get this done and you send them to us. It sounds like a soccer game, but in reality, it's getting people in the right place first.

Holdridge But they get into surface water management plan, groundwater management plan. On page 26 is this preliminary consultation. That's what we're talking about. "Prior to the final application for approval of the preliminary plan, the subdivider shall consult with the Planning and Zoning Dept." That's you. It doesn't say anything in here about the town. That's fine, we don't want them coming here.

Lucht You're right, it's good.

Holdridge If we can just sort out the roles. If we don't do that, we're going to end up hiring some kind of zoning administrator because the task will become so much greater. Penalty's, fees and so forth. I would say this is not an easy task to mesh all three of these together in some kind of coherent manner, but I think that one of the biggest things we need, Chuck, is once we do that, we get an understanding of your role and the Town's role. We are under County zoning.

Lucht You can be more restrictive than we are. In that sense, the only thing you really need to monitor in your subdivision ordinance is which things you are more restrictive on. The more stuff you put in your ordinance, the more things you'll need to track. So the idea is to have certain sections that are mandatory. That accounts for about 2 to 3 pages before it starts getting into things that are Town related. There are certain parts of the subdivision ordinance that every town must have. The first 2 pages account for "Statutory Authority". The first 2 pages of our ordinance lays out certain section you must have. What statutory authority gives you the right to do that. It's the same one the County would have. It might be an added section, part of the research looking up the State statutes. The "Purpose", what I'm looking at is what Portage County's goals are trying to do.

Holdridge Right. Right up front. We've taken those and modified them for the Town of Hull.

Lucht The definitions section is important.

Holdridge In the definitions, why doesn't your ordinance have certified survey map?

Lucht I don't have a good answer for you right off the bat. The certified survey maps we deal with are usually proposed. They're not permanent until they get all the way through the County Board. Often times a project comes to us at the County. It gets through the Planning and Zoning Committee and we have the ability, not as a condition from the Planning and Zoning Committee not to move a project forward until we have the final certified survey map. It's not required, but we create that as a condition with the Planning and Zoning Committee so that they don't change it once it's been accepted. It's what's agreed upon, not necessarily required, but good to have for that kind of stuff. It's a way to make sure it happens prior to the County board so everybody knows exactly what's going on. Exclusions, abrogation's, those are import. Those

are the things that talk about if somebody sues you and if those aren't in your subdivision ordinance, they could invalidate your entire subdivision ordinance instead of that little section.

Holdridge Isn't that serviceability?

Lucht Yes, those kind of things.

Enright Protecting ourselves against that.

Lucht Yes. They're more like bookkeeping.

Holdridge That's on page 8.

Amman Top of page 6 of the draft.

Binder Oh, the draft, I'm looking at 2 different documents.

Holdridge We'd want that in our ordinance.

Lucht Yes, you'd want that in your ordinance. Some of those seem more like bookkeeping or dry reading intending to put you to sleep, which is true, but they are very important just the same. In our ordinances, once you get past 7.44, you start hitting the meat that is town-specific.

Holdridge On page 13 of the draft, it says public and private roads. Do you think it would be useful, rather than repeating all of your stuff, we should maybe make a reference to the County ordinance and just put in what we think is pertinent to us?

Lucht Yes.

Holdridge We don't need to repeat all your stuff. We're using it right now as an example.

Lucht If you refer to the County language and the County language in the subdivision ordinance, if it changed, you wouldn't need to change your own ordinance. It might be worth reviewing. Like tonight at the County Board. The new text changes, I don't know if anyone here went to the meeting. The last couple of P and Z meetings we've been going through a stack of ordinance changes like that, that were strikethrough and underlined and included things like references to allow campers in the County. It's at the County Board tonight. If it passes, it'll be 40 days before those text amendments take effect. So in essence, you would have 40 days to review your subdivision ordinance to see if there was anything in those texts that would make you want to update yours.

Holdridge We're supposed to do that?

Chuck Staying on top of it if you need any changes, that's part of the function of having your own subdivision ordinance. If you put references to the County ordinances that you are

good with, then you're only worried about having those references that you're not agreeing with. That you need something extra on it.

Binder Is it necessary or recommended for each town to have their own subdivision ordinance, or do some fall under just adopting the Portage County subdivision ordinance?

Lucht Only if there is some sort of need that you feel should be addressed that are things you want to have in your subdivision ordinance.

Enright Can you give us an example?

Lucht That's what I was trying to do. That's what I was getting at last time. You need to get together and decide: what in the Town of Hull is a real issue, town-wide, that you need to deal with that is really important to Hull that's different from the County? I can give you an example of the Town of Linwood. Linwood has just passed or updated some of their own subdivision ordinances and they want to make sure there are no cul-de-sacs in Linwood unless they're eventually going to turn into a through street. They want to have their road ordinance say you need to have 2 points of ingress and egress out of the subdivision. That's not in the County subdivision ordinances, or road ordinances but they wanted it. There's no problem with that but they felt that was important to them because they feel they got burned by a development alongside the river.

Holdridge You have a definition of cul-de-sacs in here, but they say they don't want them, so what happens?

Lucht They put it in their road ordinance but they wanted it so that they would have 2 ways in and out of a subdivision, not just one.

Holdridge See we've taken almost the opposite approach on that in our Town.

Lucht Bob Enright had asked for an example, so this was just meant as an example.

Enright Well John, do you have examples of things for our Town?

Holdridge I do, but I can't think of them. The Parks Commission is concerned about getting money for parks and in your ordinance, you have a good provision for that. We had in our old ordinance a paragraph about that too. When people form subdivisions, they either pay money or they give land for parkland. We're running into situations now where the Parks Commission thinks we need more parks or we have to reserve for those.

Enright That one says the land is dedicated for 20 years and the Town has to develop the park within that time or else the ownership returns to the owner.

Holdridge There was some State law done recently to correct an abuse where towns were taking the park money and were not using it for parks, they were using it for general revenue.

Lucht Ours never did that.

Holdridge We'd never do that. There was a State law passed on that.

Pederson I think one of the issues that came up with the I-39 thing was addressing the condominium issue.

Holdridge Is that in the County's, I can't remember?

Lucht How we've dealt with condominiums is that we've made sure we've addressed that through different sections of text and different zoning districts. You can't have separate rules for condominiums that you wouldn't apply to any other form of ownership. There's no difference between a 2 unit condominium and a duplex. There's no difference between an apartment building with 6 units and 6 condominiums, or one and one. You can't discriminate in any way, shape or form against the form of ownership of condominiums.

Enright But you could restrict multi-ownership?

Lucht Yes and you could insist that the condominium be a single unit, stand alone structure. That you can do. You can apply the same A-3, 5 acre limit which is for one unit per lot. If they try to put up a condominium on a 5 acre zoning district, you can say that you're not discriminating against condominium owners. You can have your condominium, but it has to be a single family structure like any other home that would go up in an A-3 zone.

Enright How can you say a condominium is 1 unit?

Lucht It's not actually a building style, it's a form of ownership. You're not discriminating against the form of ownership. You're saying the form of ownership is equally liable to the density the same way any other ownership would be. Does that make sense? You set the density and who owns it or the form of ownership doesn't matter, but the density is what matters and is how we've addressed it. We have a case right now in the County where someone has a whole bunch of commercial property that is really densely built and they want to put 14 condominium units on it but it would never support that. Even so, it would be a less intense use on the shores of Lake Dubai than exists now. So is it a good thing? Is it a bad thing? Is it worth dealing with the person to get a less intense use on the lakeshore or do you stick with blind code? A lot of these things come up and that's what we get paid to deal with. It's not always an easy answer.

Holdridge Page 25 has storm water management. I think that's a fairly new requirement. If someone puts in a subdivision, usually they have to hire an engineer and come up with an engineering structure for water runoff.

Lucht I believe ours says commercial, industrial property, but I'm not sure. I don't remember having read it.

Holdridge It says, “surface and water management prevention of erosion and flooding shall be provided by the subdivider at the determination of the Portage County Planning and Zoning Department. The subdivider or agent shall submit recommendations for surface water management.” That’s where the engineer gets involved. We had Dave Glodowski look over the plan that was done for Northstar for that subdivision. That was a real wet one. But that’s a relatively new requirement. That’s fairly short. If you look at page 25, there are a number of provisions that have to be taken into account. So if we wanted to add anything, we would put that in there.

Enright What about lot averaging? Is this where that goes?

Holdridge I took that section out. I just dropped it, didn’t include it. That shortened it by 3 to 6 pages. Someday you’ll have to explain that to us Chuck.

Lucht I’ve got it right here.

Binder No – No! Maybe we’d understand pictures better.

Lucht I even have them in color pictures.

Holdridge We will come back and hopefully have a fairly good plan but we’ll use this as the model because we’re under it anyway. We’ll pick and choose some things.

Binder So let me just understand what you’ve got here. You’ve done this draft, which is consistent with Portage County’s subdivision ordinance except for this front page as you explained.

Holdridge Yes, this is right out of the Portage County one.

Binder Except you deleted out lot averaging.

Enright Basically it’s their plan with some minor changes.

Binder My question is going back to what Chuck said, if 90% of this is already the County’s, we should just address the specific things that are unique to the Town of Hull, such as I-39 with the acreage over there.

Holdridge I see that as an appendix we would add. That’s a whole separate thing with no commercial development, for example.

Syens You covered that under the section of land suitability on page 9 of the draft. (*He read the section.*) Wouldn’t the I-39 situation be included in this under the comprehensive plan?

Holdridge Yes, it’s really sort of an appendage of that. With that whole area of 20 acre, 5 acre lots sizes, that to me would seem to trump the subdivision ordinance, right Chuck? That’s

part of our comprehensive plan. If somebody comes in and wants to put in a subdivision, if they have 20 acres, they need to have 5 acre lots, don't they?

Lucht Yes.

Holdridge Under our comprehensive plan.

Lucht You're going to change the zoning so that it is hand and hand with the subdivision ordinance, the specific details of the way the lot is going to develop. The ordinance says this is the size and the things you can do on the lot. They are supposed to be consistent with the comprehensive plan that says this is how it fits into the total landscape of the Town.

Holdridge That's unique, that's the only thing we have like that in the Town of Hull. I would think you would want some reference to that. We put it in the comprehensive plan but somebody might look at this and say well here's the subdivision ordinance for Hull and we'd want it to be understood that there is a separate section over there west of the Highway.

Lucht Another way you might do that instead of referring section by section of the County subdivision ordinance, you could also put the section in there that's the equivalent to the County section and under that section put, for later use. That way it would still be not a constant reference to the County subdivision ordinance, it would be just a place holder in your subdivision ordinance that would say that here is the section that is relevant to the County in.....

Holdridge This is not easy to do. You have to go back and forth and I think you need to make an outline and then go back to procedures which are very, very important. This is useable but citizens have to have some procedures, is that correct?

Lucht Are you guys going to work with this good enough so that when you think you have a draft that is ready, you would let us see it and comment on it for you?

Holdridge Oh yes.

Lucht Okay, that's good.

Holdridge You and our attorney. We're all for transparency.

Lucht Sometimes we can spot something.

Holdridge You guys are the experts, that's why we refer to you. We don't want to be at your expertise level.

Enright Regarding the I-39 West portion with the acreage limits, what would be here when we already said what the acreage limits would be, what would we be doing in here?

Lucht I'm not sure the subdivision ordinance would need special reference to I-39 West.

Holdridge You might just create a section that says I-39 West area and make that reference. We've got about 6 pages on that thing with no commercial development and the acreage, etc. the notion about water and all the rest of it. I think you can just make a separate paragraph in here and title it I-39 West and then just refer to that and have the whole document as an appendix. Say that is a special area in which most of this wouldn't even apply, although some would.

Enright So we're going to start with this document then? This is an editorial that we might not catch later on, on page 7, this was the County's statement; "This ordinance shall not require approval or be subject to disapproval of a town or town boards." I don't want to forget that one, we don't have to approve it ourselves.

Bowen Page 9, first paragraph, there's something wrong. "The Planning and Zoning Committee in applying provisions of the section, shall be writing recite the particular facts..."

Binder I think it might be "shall recite in writing"?

General discussion on what they thought it was supposed to say – in looking at the original from the County, it was copied exactly as they put it, but it still doesn't make sense that way.

Holdridge I don't know if we need that.

Binder That's my point, most of this is already in an ordinance and we just need to make our specific things that we need to adopt for the Town of Hull, which the I-39 amendment might be one. We've discussed condominiums but that's kind of handled by the lot size.

Bowen If this is a Town subdivision ordinance, I don't know how exclusive you want to make I-39 West. I think there is something about the lot sizes of 20 acres, 5 acres that has to be in there. As you were mentioning this before, it sounded very exclusive. If it could be applied broadly....

Lucht This could be where other parts of the Town of Hull can incorporate 2 acres. Say you have A-4 or rural residential where you need enough buildable land to meet your setbacks, place your house and structures and have a septic system, the rest of that 2 acres could be wetlands. That part in the subdivision ordinance will be where you place, if you feel it's the appropriate place to put such a thing, in the I-39 West area, you must have 2 acres of buildable land, or, you must have 5 acres of buildable land to create a lot. In which case you are saying, that would be a further limitation. You could do that because you are applying it to the area and you're being specific about a lot, not an individual area. You're applying it to the whole area.

Enright So we could say the whole acreage has to be buildable.

Lucht You could say that, yes. It's up to you.

Holdridge This is a pain in the neck to try to incorporate all of this stuff but someone has to do it.

Lucht That's where you should put restrictions but they should apply to whole areas of the Town, not to specific lots in a sense that you're applying it. This subdivision restriction is the nuts and bolts of how we're going to administer these lots. It's up to you. I'm just saying that's how you might actually phrase something in a subdivision ordinance for I-39 West.

Holdridge I wish you guys would develop a model for the 16 towns that incorporates the County and then have provisions for the towns. That would be great. Because all we do is keep re-inventing the wheel down here. I've done that with weight limit ordinance and several others and it takes forever to do that stuff.

Lucht It does.

Binder Could I make a recommendation that for the new Plan Commission members that they get a copy of the draft and a copy of the County subdivision ordinance and Towns Association one so that they could be on board for the August meeting? Some light reading!

Holdridge And our current Town of Hull which is 1971. You'll be handing in your comprehensive plan spiral notebooks to Patty so she can take them apart, 3 hole punch them and put them in a 3 ring binder for you so it will make it easier to add and amend things.

7. Date of future meeting. *The next Plan Commission meeting will be held on Tuesday, August 17, 2010 at 7:00 p.m. LaVerne Syens reminded us that he will not be at the meeting and John said that he would be excused.*

8. Adjournment

*Motion made by Shelley Binder to adjourn meeting, seconded by Bob Bowen.
Motion carried by voice vote. Meeting closed at 8:45 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Patty Amman, Plan Commission Secretary
Town of Hull, Portage County