

Primrose Comprehensive Planning Steering Committee meeting minutes

May 27, 2009

Attending: All members

Dien called the meeting to order at 7:35

Approval of minutes. Gibson moved the approval of the May 11 minutes with the following addition to item 2 (a): the sentence "The Clerk sent the minutes to the Administrator" should be added. Haack seconded the motion. The motion carried 7-0. Hayward moved, and Gibson seconded, the approval of the revised March 23 minutes. Motion carried 7-0.

Public Comment:

It was said that not all the documents that the Commission is seeking to revise are on the Website.

The Forum was down on May 19<sup>th</sup> and the Town Square on the 27<sup>th</sup>. The Forum seems to be locked.

Dien said that the Forum was not locked, but that one cannot post in that section. One can put posts in the public comment section. One can put comments in specific places designed for discussion, but not in headings.

(c) What are we talking about tonight? Reply— Housing and Agriculture

(d) When people ask questions and make comments when will they be answered.  
Reply— We will try to answer them in the same meeting.

(e) The Clerk said she would like to have the agenda earlier.

(f) Want clarification of whether the surveys were anonymous, whether people knew what names went with which surveys. Reply: This question has been answered many times already. But Standing will repeat the answer one last time. The surveys were entirely anonymous. In one case, he inadvertently left a survey number with a name in asking a question. To correct for that mistake, he reassigned numbers, so no one would know what numbers went with what names. He is the only person who had access to information matching the names with the numbers. The clerks who compiled the data worked only with the numbers and had no access to the names. After the survey was complete, the table matching the surveys to the numbers was destroyed, and so even he cannot now match names to numbers.

(g) Have all of the comments made in the survey been posted? Yes. In an earlier document, not all the comments had yet been posted, but in the completed survey results, all comments Standing received have been posted.

(h) Why is Standing using language and elements right out of other comprehensive plans in drafting the Primrose Plan? Reply: Standing said that he is using language out of other comprehensive plans with an eye to satisfying the statutory requirements for comprehensive planning. That language has worked and been tested.

(i) Why were people who didn't vote counted in the surveys? Reply: So long as people live in the Town, so long as they are residents, their view counts, whether they vote or not.

(j) What percentage of people returned the survey? Reply: Standing said that 58% returned the survey and that that is a very good response rate.

Public Comments closed:

(3) Update on the Survey:

Standing said that the different resident and non-resident results as well as the Demographic part of the survey will be complete in the next few weeks.

(4) Standing presented a draft of the Housing element.

(5) Public Comments for Housing element:

—Include more details and educational resources about housing rehabilitation options and programs available.

—Discuss type of housing preferred: single-family housing vs. multi-family housing. Should duplexes be allowed? Review existing plan language and density standards for duplexes. Are there other amendments that were developed, but not adopted.

—Consider design and installation standards for manufactured homes / trailers.

— Limits on sizes of housing?

—Consider allowing foundation-less trailers for farm workers or temporary use.

—Work with county to allow repair or reconstruction of existing residences without farm income determination.

—Allow for dependency living arrangements under conditional use permit, without using a density unit.

—Make sure dependency living arrangements aren't abused to turn it into an apartment. Have CUPs for dependency living arrangements expire on sale of property.

—Consider migrant farm worker residences. Should the plan address this?

—Young families coming into town and older families needing different types of housing. Make sure that housing types in the town meet ages and demand.

—Provide adequate infrastructure and public services and an adequate supply of developable land to meet existing and future market demand for housing.

— Explore alternative options for maintenance of aging housing, to supplement or substitute for assistance and/or loan programs.

Public Comment session closed.

(6) Standing presented a draft of 'Intergovernmental Cooperation'.

(7) Public Comment on the draft:

— Consider working with other communities on potential TDR options.

Public comment closed.

(8) Standing presented a draft of 'Agricultural Resources'.

(9) Public Comment on the draft of Agricultural Resources.

—Change “agriculturally productive lands” to “economically productive lands.”

—Provide a definition for agriculturally productive lands.

—Look at Town of York (Green County or Dane County) language for landowners to sign document that they are in a farming area, with noises, odors, livestock in yards, etc as part of permitting process. Also look at existing Primrose driveway

— Incorporate adopted town resolutions related to landowner notification into comprehensive plan.

—Consider soil depth as part of definition of agriculturally productive lands.

—Consider whether any history (one year?) of agricultural use is an adequate measure of best use of the land.

—Define timeline as to when land was considered agricultural.

—Single lots and farms may have differences in productivity.

—CRP land often is on Highly Erodible Land that shouldn't be cropped, while CREP land is often in wetlands or lowlands.

Should these lands be considered “productive agricultural lands?”

—Include language to encourage compliance with existing county and state regulations regarding CAFOs.

Public Comment session closed.

(10) Standing outlined the next steps for Land Use element.

He will present a draft of Land Use element on June 29. He will use the adopted town land use plan as starting point or draft. He will bring suggestions for clarifications based on other towns, department recommendations. The procedure will basically be the same as that of other elements. He will present a draft, there will be public discussion. The Commission will decide on revision, and he will redraft. For the first meeting, he hopes to brainstorm and get ideas on tables, rather than debate. We can debate and have further discussion in future meetings. We will provide access to the Planning Commission suggested revisions in 2005 and the pending amendment, so that they can be a part of the discussion.

(11) The meeting for June 8<sup>th</sup> was moved to the 22<sup>nd</sup>. At that meeting, we will revise earlier draft elements that have been presented in light of public comments and survey results. The next meeting for the presentation of the draft of the Land Use element will be on June 29<sup>th</sup>.

(12) Motion to adjourn made by J. Judd, seconded by Hayward. Motion carried 8-0.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Martha Gibson.