

Meeting Minutes

REPORT OF CITY PLAN COMMISSION

Monday, February 1, 1999 - 4:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairman Mayor Wescott; Elbert Rackow; Lois Feldman; Fred Steffen; Bud Flood; Jeff Zabel (Excused, Art Davy)

ALSO PRESENT: Comm. Dev. Dir. John Gardner; Po. Co. Senior Planner Jeff Schuler; Mayor's Asst. Dan Folke; Park Dir. Tom Schrader; Ald. Sevenich, Kedrowski, Aldinger, Nealis, Phillips, & Perlak; Carl Lemke; Andy Gilbert; Susan Kampmeier, Journal; Anne Mackovec, WIZD;

INDEX:

1. APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 2, 1998 PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES
2. CREATE CANOPY SETBACK AS CONDITIONAL USE IN "B-4" COMMERCIAL ZONE
3. SEWER SERVICE AMENDMENT - ADDITION OF LAND NE CORNER OF BRILOWSKI RD. AND HWY 10 E.
4. LAND USE PLAN - RIVERVIEW AVENUE AREA
5. AMEND SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE REGARDING STREET LAYOUT AND DEDICATION
6. LEASE OF CONSOLIDATED PAPER LAND ON PATCH ST. FOR DISC GOLF
7. LEASE OF LAND FOR STORM WATER RUNOFF NEAR 1725 W. RIVER DRIVE
8. ACCEPTANCE OF R.O.W. - WILDWOOD DR. SOUTH OF HWY 10 E.
9. MAIN/CLARK ST. RECONSTRUCTION
- A) SALE OF LAND
- B) ACCEPTANCE OF PARK LAND - HWY 10 W./CO. HWY P

1. APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 2, 1998 PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

Elbert Rackow moved, seconded by Lois Feldman, to approve the minutes of the November 2, 1998 meeting. Ayes all; Nays none; Motion carried.
Back to Index

2. CREATE CANOPY SETBACK AS CONDITIONAL USE IN "B-4" COMMERCIAL ZONE

John Gardner reviewed his memo and noted he is proposing the amendment as a conditional use to allow review on a case-by-case basis.

Elbert Rackow moved, seconded by Bud Flood, to recommend approval of amending the zoning text to create a 10' street setback for canopies in the "B-4" Commercial Zoning District only. Ayes all; Nays none; Motion carried.

Back to Index

3. SEWER SERVICE AMENDMENT - ADDITION OF LAND NE CORNER OF BRILOWSKI RD. AND HWY 10 E.

John Gardner reviewed his memo and the increased economic activity figures. He noted the original sewer service plan was adopted in 1984 and city has filled all of the sewer service land that lies within the city limits. A study done by the Portage County Planning Department found almost no land available for development within the sewer service area. They propose the area be expanded in increments as the land is developed.

He stated owners/ buyers propose to implement the land use plan for the area north of Hwy. 10 and east of Brilowski Road. Property owners want to begin to sell property and the key to that is to be able to provide sewer and water. A Type II amendment is warranted if a community increases its total service area above what was projected in the sewer service area due to unanticipated new population or mercantile growth. Staff recommends a Type II amendment, as shown on the attached map, to the sewer service boundary because 1) there is very little undeveloped land available for commercial growth, 2) there has been an increase in sales activity beyond the city population growth alone, and 3) there has been an increase in city construction activity not anticipated in the plan. The proposed amendment is consistent with the Land Use Plan agreed upon between the city and Town of Hull.

Bud Flood questioned why commercial Lot E is not included in the proposed amendment.

John Gardner responded County Planning staff would like to do it on an incremental approach. They would like to see a justification with documentation that the land would be used sequentially from Brilowski Road to the east.

Jeff Zabel noted it doesn't make sense to exclude Lot E.

Jeff Schuler responded if all the land comes in, including Lot E, the County would oppose the amendment. The county believes that the development was to be phased in. You are adding a total of over 40 acres of commercial without Lot E. John Gardner has said that it appears that there is this demand out there and he has studies to show exactly how this new land would be taken up by commercial use. We would like to see if the demand is there and how those lands are used, then an application can be made to expand again. If you open up a large area like this, the possibility opens up that the far eastern portion could be developed leaving the western portion undeveloped. The city's best interests are served by knowing how it will unfold. Given the lack of real specifics, the county stance would be not include that additional 20 acres at this time.

Fred Steffen questioned why we don't square the area off. Why don't we do it today instead of tomorrow. Why was the entire Business Park added and not phased.

Jeff Schuler responded this is intended to be an extension of a commercial area, where the Business Park was intended to suit the industrial needs of the county into the future.

Jeff Zabel questioned if Lot E is not included now, can we have it when we want it.

Chairman Wescott noted he has not seen the marketing plan. He has heard that there is a development plan for Lot D. The next logical extension would be Lot E. Once a plan exists for how Lot E will be properly utilized, there is a greater level of comfort with the County than just bringing it in without an actual known purpose for the land. Is that fair paraphrasing?

Jeff Schuler responded that is correct. We also have several hundred thousand square feet of other commercial uses on smaller parcels that surround the larger lot.

Elbert Rackow moved, seconded by Bud Flood, to accept the proposed Type II amendment to the Sewer Service Boundary as presented.

Chairman Wescott noted we are willing to do business as the County recommends as long as we are hearing from the County that they are willing to be aggressive in expanding the sewer service area to include Lot E when a use is identified. If the Plan Commission has an identified use for Lot E or feels very strongly about squaring the area off, that is your prerogative. We have a developer who wishes to proceed. In the absolute perfect scenario, we would annex everything at once and we would make a good argument to bring most of it into the sewer service area with the understanding that we are going to phase it in. This proposal today gets the developer started in conjunction with the Town of Hull Land Use Plan. Several years from now, it will be far more difficult for the county to take a position in opposition to Lot E coming in because we have seen phased growth taking place to the west of the site. The county has said yes to us because they are willing to acknowledge a phased growth.

Ayes all; Nays none; Motion carried.

Back to Index

4. LAND USE PLAN - RIVERVIEW AVENUE AREA

Jeff Schuler identified the area on a 1992 aerial photograph, which is along Riverview Avenue between Whiting Avenue and the new bridge. Portions of this area were rezoned in 1992 from heavy industrial to multiple and two family. A 20-acre parcel right in the center of the area was rezoned from residential back to heavy industrial in 1994 for a bus facility for the school district. The school district has put their bus facility plans on hold and wish to maintain the current zoning of their property. Consolidated owns approximately 150 acres north and south of Riverview between Whiting Avenue and the river. Currently their lands are zoned residential, conservancy and heavy industrial. They have indicated they would not object to having their industrial property downzoned to residential and they would work with the city in that regard. The City Industrial Park and the new County Business Park take the industrial focus from this area and redirects it eastward. He reviewed the six different soils in the area and noted the soils south of Riverview have severe limitations for installation of basements, while the soils north of Riverview are more conducive to basements.

Staff recommends the following: 1) the property north of Riverview, from Echo Dells west to the electric transmission wire easement, should remain Two Family Zoning; 2) the Two Family Zoning should continue west of the transmission wire easement for a distance of approximately 1200 feet and should extend north from the edge of Riverview Ave./HH right-of-way to a depth of approximately 200 feet. The land north of this new two family designation should be zoned "R-1" Suburban Single Family; 3) The portion of property located west of the historic end of Riverview Ave. should be Two Family Zoning from the edge of Riverview Ave./HH right-of-way north to a depth of approximately 200 feet. The land north of this two family designation should be zoned "R-1" Suburban Single Family (a portion of this land may be wetlands and should be zoned conservancy); 4) The property south of Riverview Ave./HH right of way from the western extent of the current multiple family zoning to the conservancy zoning along the river should be rezoned to Two Family for a depth of approximately 500 feet. The property to the south of this 500' band should either remain in its current zoning classification or be rezoned to conservancy; and 5) the existing multiple family zoning on the south side of Riverview Ave. from Whiting Ave. approximately 1500 feet west should be maintained.

Jeff Zabel stated he has looked at the property and feels we should not have any industrial use in the area. He questioned if we are just dealing with the land use today or if we are also dealing with zoning. With possible severe soil limitations, does that hinder a developer if we rezone the property to "R-2" or "R-3".

John Gardner suggested we solicit zoning input and wait until early spring after the snow melts to get a better feel for the property. Shallow groundwater does not mean a house cannot be built, it means they will either be split levels, tri-levels, raised ranches, or a house without a basement.

Ald. Phillips noted we are building a 4-lane highway and now we want to build houses around it. It doesn't make sense. It should be something other than industrial.

Jeff Schuler noted the city is looking at how and where it wants to distribute commercial development across the city. From our perspective, this area doesn't seem right for commercial development. Its difficult to route a 4-lane highway through a residential neighborhood, but if people go into a housing situation knowing that a highway is there and the highway is developed in such a way to minimize the impact of the highway, there are possibilities for people that want to have access to the highway.

Ald. Nealis noted without basements, development would be nil. He suggests multiple family would be the highest and best use for this area.

Fred Steffen didn't feel the area should be industrial. He agrees that single family homes without basements are hard to sell.

Bud Flood noted a lot of us don't like the traffic noise, but some people are drawn to it. You find a lot of development adjacent to traffic corridors.

Carl Lemke, representing Consolidated Papers Inc., agreed that this is not an industrial area. He would like to maintain industrial zoning on the landfill site to the south.

Fred Steffen moved, seconded by Jeff Zabel, to recommend downzoning industrial lands to residential and direct staff to continue the analysis of the specific zoning for future consideration. Ayes all; Nays none; Motion carried.

Back to Index

5. AMEND SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE REGARDING STREET LAYOUT AND DEDICATION

John Gardner proposed the following language change when developers come in with plans for subdivision development. We want streets to be continuous within subdivisions and contiguous with adjacent properties, cul-de-sacs to be avoided where possible, neighborhood streets be reduced from 66' to 60', and if the subdivision or certified survey map adjoin an existing street or utility that is undersized, we want the ability to require dedication to make it a standard street rather than substandard street.

Fred Steffen felt the 66 feet should remain. If we were to install sidewalks, it would be better to have it than have to come back later to get it.

Bud Flood suggested also in paragraph (b) Width, add the word "in width" after 50 feet", and at the end of the paragraph, "larger" should be changed to "wider".

Ald. Kedrowski suggested in line 7 of paragraph (a) General Considerations, "may" should be changed to "shall".

Fred Steffen moved, seconded by Lois Feldman, to amend the Subdivision Ordinance as presented with the following changes: 1) General Considerations - last sentence of paragraph (a), the wording "may be required" should be changed to "shall be required"; 2) first sentence of

paragraph (b) Width - all neighborhood streets shall be not less than "66" feet in width, and 3) the last sentence of paragraph (b) Width - may be required to be at least 66 feet or "larger", should be changed to "wider". Ayes all; Nays none; Motion carried.

[Back to Index](#)

6. LEASE OF CONSOLIDATED PAPER LAND ON PATCH ST. FOR DISC GOLF

John Gardner stated leases of land come before Plan Commission. We have a proposal for a disc golf course and Tom Schrader from Parks Dept. is here to answer any questions.

Bud Flood felt this would be an ideal spot with the green circle trail right there.

Jeff Zabel agreed, but would like to see no parking allowed on the street.

Tom Schrader noted parking is allowed on the street. The city would have to put up no parking signs.

Ald. Phillips noted there is disc golf at Standing Rocks Park, how many do we need?
Will this require additional employees.

Ald. Kedrowski expressed disappointment that we don't have any drawings and concern with city liability, possibility of hazardous waste, and what the actual terms of the lease are.

Chairman Wescott stated we are to decide whether this is an acceptable use for the land for recreational purposes. Ald. Phillips and Kedrowski have raised valid questions, but those questions are the role of the Park Commission and Council.

Lois Feldman moved, seconded by Jeff Zabel, to recommend approval of the lease of Consolidated Paper land on Patch Street for disc golf, subject to approval by the Parks Commission. Ayes all; Nays none; Motion carried.
[Back to Index](#)

7. LEASE OF LAND FOR STORM WATER RUNOFF NEAR 1725 W. RIVER DRIVE

John Gardner stated the city is installing storm sewer on W. River Drive and the run-off crosses Consolidated Papers/WC Railroad land. Staff recommends approval of the lease.

Bud Flood moved, seconded by Fred Steffen, to recommend approval of the lease of land for storm water runoff near 1725 W. River Drive.
Ayes all; Nays none; Motion carried.

[Back to Index](#)

8. ACCEPTANCE OF R.O.W. - WILDWOOD DR. SOUTH OF HWY 10 E.

John Gardner stated the land is needed for the installation of traffic signals and staff recommends acceptance of the right-of-way.

Fred Steffen moved, seconded by Elbert Rackow to recommend acceptance of the right-of-way on Wildwood Drive south of Hwy. 10 E. as presented.

Ayes all; Nays none; Motion carried.

[Back to Index](#)

9. MAIN/CLARK ST. RECONSTRUCTION

A) SALE OF LAND

B) ACCEPTANCE OF PARK LAND - HWY 10 W./CO. HWY P

John Gardner reviewed attached maps indicating the land that is needed for the reconstruction project.

Fred Steffen moved, seconded by Bud Flood, to accept the sale of land and acceptance of park land as proposed for the Main/Clark St. reconstruction.

Ayes all; Nays none; Motion carried.

Chairman Wescott thanked Jeff Zabel for his time and effort spent as a consultant for the County-City remodeling project.

Chairman Wescott discussed the possibility of changing the regular meeting day for Plan Commission and urged Commissioners to let John Gardner or Barb know what days they are available and what days are not good for them.

Meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

The meeting minutes reproduced on this website are derived from the computer files used to produce the official minutes for the City of Stevens Point, but are unofficial. The minutes on this web site cannot be certified under s. 889.08, Wis. Stats., and cannot be considered prima facie evidence under s. 889.04, Wis. Stats. Certain tables, maps, and other documents that are a part of the official minutes are not included in the files reproduced on this website. Please consult the printed minutes, available in the City Clerk's Office, for the official text. The decisions made by City of Stevens Point boards, committees, and commissions (other than the Police & Fire Commission) are advisory only and are not binding on the City until affirmed at a meeting of the Common Council. Some of the minutes on this web site might not be approved by the Common Council as of today.

Bottom of Form