

**TOWN OF ALGOMA  
WINNEBAGO COUNTY, WISCONSIN  
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING  
Wednesday, October 10, 2018**

**Summary of Proceedings**

**1. Call to Order:**

The Town of Algoma Plan Commission meeting was called to order by Ms. Clark at 6:05 p.m.

**2. Roll Call:**

**The following Committee Members were in attendance:** Petey Clark, Audra Hoy, Dan Martin, Mark Thompson.

**The following Committee Members were absent:** Kristine Timm, Dewey Nelson

**The following were also present:** Benjamin Krumenauer, Administrator

Ms. Clark (Chair) thanked the Planning Commission and audience for their participation and involvement in the meeting. She explained the process of the meeting as well as how the public forum component will be handled.

**3. Discussion and possible action re: Minutes of the July 11, 2018 meeting.**

Motion to approve the minutes of the July 11, 2018 meeting was made by Ms. Hoy, Mr. Martin

Motion carried (4-0).

**4. Discussion and possible action re: Rezoning of lots 00200281905 and 0020030 to R-2 Suburban Residential and R-3 Two-Family Residential.**

Mr. Krumenauer explained the details of the rezoning request including site particulars and a brief overview of the subdivision concept being proposed by Lakeview Estates LLC. He went on to describe the different rezoning components and stipulated that the proposal is consistent with the Town of Algoma Comprehensive Plan and Winnebago County Zoning. The zoning process is one of many steps that are required prior to final approval of the proposed subdivision development.

Ms. Clark asked if there were any technical questions.

No technical questions were asked by the Planning Commission members.

Ms. Clark opened the discussion up to the audience for any questions or comments.

Caleb Ihrig, 3550 Bambi Lane: stated concerns regarding the density and house size in areas of the proposed development. Mr. Ihrig also has traffic concerns regarding the development and whether or not it would decrease the usability of Leonard Point Road for current residents.

Russell Schwandt, 3292 Leonard Point Lane: expressed his concerns of future traffic issues along Leonard Point Road relating to traffic density. He continued by stating his concerns regarding duplex developments and stated that nowhere in the area where duplexes built. Lastly, he wanted to state his support for the continuation of a rural Town of Algoma and requested that a rural atmosphere be promoted by Town officials.

Robert Reigh, 3308 Leonard Point Lane: submitted for the record a petition signed by over 250 local residents (un-confirmed total). The petition recommends only R-1 Rural Residential Developments in the Town of Algoma and was not in support of R-2 or above zoning or development densities. Mr. Reigh continued by stating his concern for the development as proposed and is not in support of high density developments.

Jon Reiland, 3356 Leonard Point Lane: reminded the Planning Commission of the 5 P's planning process and further recommended that the proposed area remain single-family. He went on to state his concerns over safety along Leonard Point Road and if higher density is permitted, than safety may be compromised. Lastly, Mr Reiland stated his concerns over stormwater if the development is permitted.

Dick Hanusa, 3368 Leonard Point Lane: references various pieces of the Town of Algoma Municipal Code and recommended that these regulations be followed at all times. The sections in reference included Chapter 225: Land Use, Article V.

Connie McDonald, 3218 Leonard Point Lane: asked for clarification between R-2 and R-3 zoning designations and stated her general concerns of overdeveloping the area. She also stated that given the recent flooding in SW Wisconsin, what is being done to ensure that this area will not see that volume of flooding?

Mr. Krumenauer clarified the zoning related questions and stated that stormwater management is a component of the platting process and will be clarified in the next item.

Matt Everett, 3630 Leonard Point Road: reminded the Planning Commission that the Town of Algoma was always a rural community and that this area has seen development that isn't consistent with that past. He went on to express his concerns regarding new developments and that they would bring access issues at STH-21 and that density of the Town roads is of major concern.

Eric Rintamaki, 3309 Nelson Road: believes that R-3 zoning designations are a gateway for higher density apartments. He also expressed concerns regarding OASD capacity with future development, speeding issues along existing roadways. Lastly, he stated his concerns over more storage facility developments and the desire to keep the area rural in nature.

Paul Schmidt, 1951 Scarlet Oak Trail: recommended that no future development be permitted until the Town of Algoma fixes the existing road infrastructure. He stated that our Town roads are falling apart and that this should be of paramount concern.

Thomas Leske, 1857 Scarlet Oak Trail: stated “no to development” and that traffic concerns along Town roadways needs to be addressed prior to future development. He agreed with the previous resident and that intersections and roads come first. Lastly he stated “Who is responsible for telling family, no more kids (are allowed) at Oakwood Elementary?”

Mr. Krumenauer clarified OASD perspective and stated that the district did not foresee any capacity issues at Oakwood Elementary or the district at this time. He went on to state that the district has various methods to increase capacity at many of their schools.

Cordell Ernst, 1220 Welsh Haven Drive: stated his concern regarding overflow traffic onto adjacent residential roads.

Jeff Somers, 155 Milton Circle: asked the Town of Algoma if additional research was done regarding existing road capacity and how it fits with future development. He also asked if sewer and water studies were completed.

Craig Sickler, 1575 Leonard Point Road: stated his opposition to the development and said that the Town should plan the future of the Town, not the developer.

The Item was returned to the Planning Commission for Discussion.

Mr. Thompson stated that though the comprehensive plan does not state what low density residential is, it is his understanding that the intent was for it to be single-family. He continued by stating that low density in his opinion is R-2. Given these concerns and the questions yet to be answered by Developer and Town, he would recommend a tabling motion.

Mr. Thompson made a motion to table Item 4 until the November, 2018 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martin.

Motion carried 4-0

Item 4 is tabled for one month in order to allow the Developer and Town time to answer questions raised.

**5. Discussion and possible action re: Preliminary Plat Approval – Lakevista Estates.**

Mr. Krumenauer explained the item and detailed the individual aspects of the development proposal. This residential development includes three distinct sections for discussion. Section one is a single-family development consisting of standard residential lots with a large stormwater feature in the middle. The second portion consists of twindo or duplex developments along the proposed Veanna Boulevard. The last portion consists of single-family lots with a PDD alternative allowing greater lots quantities with smaller lot sizes. Mr. Krumenauer went on to explain that the intent of this proposal is to cater to all level of housing options. The item review also included discussion that was brought up in Item 4 and included the background of the development process, and the historical allowances within the Town of Algoma Comprehensive Plan and other planning documents.

Ms. Clark opened the item up for technical questions.

Ms. Clark asked for some clarifications on stormwater/sump pump concerns as well as clarified her concerns on the proposed pedestrian accommodations as designed.

Mr. Krumenauer stated that many of those concerns are consistent with staff thoughts and can be further clarified during the site plan review process.

Mr. Thompson asked for some additional clarifications on potential mini-storm development for sump pumps. He also asked whether or not drain tile was located in the fields. Lastly, Mr. Thompson asked for some clarification from the developer/design firm on stormwater mitigation.

Jack Richardson, Martenson & Eisele, Inc. (development design firm): explained the stormwater design process and that the pre plat approval process requires proof of feasibility with final design and review required prior to final plat. He also stated that the basins as currently proposed are designed to handle large rain events as well as regular day to day “nuisance” water.

Mr. Thompson asked if mini storm will be an issue.

Mr. Richardson stated that those options can be explored and that the system may need to be tweaked appropriately if required.

Eric Hoffmann, Lakeview Estates, LLC: Went on to explain that a full drain tile study has not been completed but general practice includes identification and abandonment during the infrastructure/basement construction.

Ms. Clark asked if bedrock depth and soil characteristics were reviewed.

Mr. Hoffmann stated that the bedrock was not discovered above 14 feet in any of the test holes. He explained that the rock located deeper in the test pits was difficult to dig, but not bedrock.

Ms. Clark reminded the developers of the shallow bedrock in other locations and that it daylights in several neighborhoods to the west.

Mr. Hoffmann went on to explain the overall intent of the development including concepts, and the importance of providing housing for all ages. Additionally, he stated that the intent of the duplex/twindo portion is to provide a buffer from Jones Park and other less desirable uses such as quarries, public areas and other developments.

Randy Schmiedel, Lakeview Estates LLC: described the PDD portion of the development as an opportunity to cater to residents that want to age within the community. He explained that the development will appeal to 55+ residents that want to limit maintenance but stay in the Town of Algoma. He also stated that the proposed pedestrian accommodations will not terminate at Leonard Point Lane and are not necessarily intended for all community members. They are designed as a perk for the PDD and a safe place to explore for the home owners.

Ms. Clark asked if the PDD portion will have an age limit.

Mr. Schmiedel stated that is not likely as the market will dictate need.

Mr. Thompson asked who the owner of outlots 1 and 2 will be.

Mr. Hoffmann stated final ownership is yet to be determined, but could be either a neighborhood association or the Town of Algoma.

Mr. Krumenauer stated that the Town's primary concern is long-term maintenance of the basins. He stated that could be completed regardless of owner as long as strong legal paperwork is understood by all parties. An example is a Memorandum of Understanding for maintenance.

Mr. Thompson asked if parkland is allotted.

Mr. Hoffmann stated that the PDD area has communal greenspace but the parkland fee/development process is not yet finalized and will require Town approval.

Mr. Schmiedel talked about various remedies to speeding in the development. He discussed the curved design of Veanna Boulevard and that other methods can be explored.

Seeing no additional technical questions, Ms. Clark opened the discussion up to anyone in the audience.

Mina Kuss, 1759 Lake Breeze Road: suggested a few procedural improvements that the Town of Algoma could do to make the tabling/access process more efficient.

Caleb Ihrig, 3550 Bambi Lane: stated a few concerns that he had regarding lighting of the subdivision and proposed trails. He recommended to additional lighting. He stated his concerns regarding long term stormwater management and asked how the Town will correct the current issues. Lastly, he asked whether or not the basins as proposed will have security fencing.

Mr. Hoffmann stated that no pedestrian lighting is proposed at this time and that the stormwater management areas as designed will have a net positive gain to the community. He also stated that security fencing around basins is not always the best option as it doesn't always stop a person from accessing the area but will always impede public safety from getting to a person in duress.

Thomas Machak, 1873 Scarlet Oak Trail: asked the developer if there was a need for this development.

Mr. Schmeidel answered affirmatively and that there was strong interest.

Robert Reigh, 3308 Leonard Point Lane: stated his preference that the field continues to stay as its current use. He also stated his concerns regarding existing storm issues and whether or not the development would add to the issues.

Dick Hanusa, 3368 Leonard Point Lane: asked if the density of the PDD area is consistent with Code.

Mr. Krumenauer responded affirmatively.

Mr. Hanusa then asked for some additional clarification on the proposed Outlot 1 discharge location and whether any wetlands were discovered.

Pam Persick, 1822 Leonard Point Road: expressed her concerns regarding long-term maintenance of the proposed stormwater basins. She stated that from experience, the process is very costly and time intensive. She also asked how the developers will keep people off of private property when walking along the proposed pedestrian trail.

John Reiland, 3356 Leonard Point Lane: asked the Town of Algoma to look at the cost of development versus the benefits. It was also asked whether or not any fiscal impact was reviewed prior to the development proposal. Lastly Mr. Reiland asked a clarification question regarding the location of the basin and how water will be expected to flow up hill to the outlot.

Mike Haave, 3258 Leonard Point Lane: Stated the location of a known farm drain tile in the area approximately 1.5 lots east of his own. He also expressed his concerns regarding the proposed lot lines adjacent to Leonard Point Lane.

Garret Alford, 1799 Lake Breeze Road: asked where other location of Planned Developments were in the Town. He also asked for the developers to explain the process and intent of a PDD.

Paul Schmidt, 1951 Scarlet Oak Trail: wished to state the proposed PPD development area is inconsistent with the youthful trends of the Town. He also wished to know the goal of the proposed basins and what the cost to maintain is for the Town of Algoma. He went on to ask how long it would take for the development to break even.

Connie McDonald, 3218 Leonard Point Lane: said that this development will destroy the rural feeling of the Town. She went on to ask who would be responsible for the stormwater management areas and what the impact of wetlands will be towards the development. Ms. McDonald also had concerns of the discharge locations for pedestrian accommodations and that she also feels that the “developers should not market the property as partial lake views, they do not have lake views, we do”. Lastly she stated her desire for the development to stay a rural farm field.

Patrick Lafontaine, 3449 Sheppard Drive: expressed his concerns of how the development will affect area traffic patterns.

Thomas Leske, 1857 Scarlet Oak Trail: reiterated the importance of when the Town will “break even”. He also stated it was wrong for the review team to be under the Developer’s “bank role”. He stated the development should be reviewed by outside professionals.

Mr. Krumenauer stated on the record that outside firms do review each proposal regardless of what the development is. He went on to state that the cost of review is paid through fees to the Town from the developer but not controlled by the developer.

Jeff Salchert, 3939 Leonard Point Road: expressed his concern over the traffic impacts along Leonard Point Road. He also notified the Town regarding the speeding along Leonard Point Road.

Peter Donner, 3330 Leonard Point Lane: expressed his thoughts that development for progress is fine when correct but extreme caution should be used. Mr. Donner also asked a few design questions relating to the proposed basins and various sump pump concerns regarding conveyance of water once discharged.

Charles Sheveland, 3612 Leonard Point Road: wants to make sure Town holds developer responsible for proper pond management and ensure that the basins are held to a high standard.

Jack Richardson, Martenson & Eisele, Inc: provided answers to many of the questions raised during public forum.

Mr. Richardson explained the PDD process and how it follows the spirit of the code. It is a tool designed to enhance the overarching zoning. He went on to discuss the various wetland components and the inclusion of WisDNR in the determination of wetland developments. In the development practice designs are generally done backwards from end of storm to top, lake to house, etc.

Mr. Hoffman, Lakeview Estates LLC: explained the desire to maintain the proposed basins to a higher standard. He wants to see a nice backyard basin. The proposed trail enhancement will be seen as a private amenity for the PDD area and that plantings will be supported to soften features.

Mr. Richardson stated that the proposed basin in the lower area is lower than the adjacent lots and will accept water before reaching the private lane to the north. The design firm went on to state that as much reasonable research will be given to locate existing farm drain tile. Additional storm mitigation features will include berms along the north end of the development to contain stormwater. Maintenance of drainage areas will be in place prior to development completion. All design basins will support the containment of stormwater.

Mr. Hoffmann stated that it is extremely difficult to define a break-even point for a development. He went on to state that the cost of development is a burden of the developer, but the final roads and infrastructure are not accepted by the Town or appropriate agency until approved.

Seeing no additional comments/questions, Ms. Clark brought the discussion back to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Hoy discussed the importance of sump pump control and asked whether or not the developer will account for these.

Mr. Richardson stated that the stormwater design is proof of feasibility and that final design can take those into account if required by site plan committee.

Mr. Thompson stated that for almost 20 years he has been reviewing and addressing planning commission items. He discussed the past practices of the Town and that road progress hasn't kept up with developments. This was a miss from his perspective and should be considered regarding future development but not necessarily a complete hindrance to future development. He went on to explain the development cost and maintenance cost process and how it is a privilege to develop not a right of the developer.

Kevin Mraz, Algoma Sanitary District: provided various notes regarding sewer and water development needs. He explained the process for future sewer and water needs as well as the existing capacity for developments such as this. He continued by stating the district has always anticipated these developments and that they are prepared for this eventuality.

Mr. Thompson made a motion for approval with the recommended conditions as well as:

- a. Sump pump management be provided to lots including lots 23 – 62.
- b. Mailboxes along Caden Court include a central location near the proposed Addie Parkway extension.
- c. Outlots one and two hold a permanent maintenance agreement where developer is responsible for maintenance.
- d. No parking permitted along Caden Court.

Seconded by Mr. Martin

Ms. Clark stated her concern for the restrictions on mailbox and parking locations. She asked if these were appropriate at this level.

Mr. Krumenauer stated that these conditions are noted as recommendations to the Town Board and can be further reviewed for consistency. He went to state that USPS will have discretion for mailbox locations and parking is a municipal code regulation and will need other approvals prior to action.

Mr. Martin discussed the importance of clear thinking and creating protections that ensure a strong Town of Algoma. He explained the importance of level headed thinking and how the overall needs of the community must be put into perspective, not just the immediate area.

Mr. Thompson talked about protections for the west and that these developments are both positive for the area and important to get right. He went on to state that the only method to protect from future development is to purchase the property yourself.

Ms. Clark thanked the community members for their participation.

Motion carried 4-0.

## **6. Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Martin and seconded by Ms. Hoy. The meeting was adjourned unanimously at 9:17 p.m.

Submitted by,  
Deborah L Stark, WCMC  
Clerk

Recording Secretary,  
Benjamin Krumenauer  
Administrator