



www.shutterstock.com - 83736145

**VILLAGE OF WEBSTER**

# PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, August 3, 2022 @ 5:00 p.m.

Webster Community Center

7421 Main Street West, Webster, WI

- 
- I. CALL TO ORDER** – Village President, Jeff Roberts called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.
- II. PRESENT** – Village President, Jeff Roberts; Village Trustee, Charlie Weis; Village Surveyor, Mark Krause; Village Citizen Members, Gaylen Brown; Gaelyn Sears and Greg Widiker; Village Clerk-Treasurer, Debra Doriott-Kuhnly. Others present: Village Trustees, Tim Maloney; Meenon Town Supervisors, Chris Sybers and Randy Strese; Property Owner, Ken Erickson. Meenon Town Chairman, Tom O'Brien and Becky O'Brien arrived at 5:55 p.m. Absent: Village Public Works Director, Jay Heyer.
- III. PUBLIC NOTICE OF AGENDA, DELETIONS/CORRECTIONS** – Motion made Trustee, Weis to approve the agenda as presented; seconded by Member, Sears. **Motion carried 6-0.**
- IV. PLAN UNIT DEVELOPMENT NORTH OF YELLOW RIVER** – Village President, Roberts gave the floor to Village Surveyor, Mark Krause. Mark handed out the Concept (Development) Plan Maps for Ken Erickson's property North of the Yellow River and South of County Road A. He pointed out the Village portion and Meenon's and stated the importance of both municipalities working together. The Village's zoning is R1 and allows for 100-foot lots and the village portion is about a quarter mile east and west and 600 feet of river frontage; that is mostly wetland, close to the bridge. Mark and Ken will talk to the Meenon Town Board at their next meeting and they also plan to attend the Village Board meeting on August 10<sup>th</sup>. The property in the Town of Meenon will need to be presented to the County for rezoning. Mark believes the development will fit within the current Village zoning. The concept plan includes all the parcels being at least an acre and a half; yet mixed sizes, and most of the frontages are 200-feet wide. This would meet the County's R2 district. There are a couple acreage parcels to the North (in Meenon) and open fields, etc. A road would come in off Highway 35, on the West side and one from County Road A, on the North side. There are questions on how much traffic will be accepted on Highway 35; don't want to build turn lanes. Although not shown on the concept map, Mark said there are five or six lots, in the middle, that don't have river access and some tougher access to the river (riverbank and wetlands). He and Ken talked about putting in two spots with a walking trail, canoe rack and a bench, so there wouldn't be a lot of docks going in. The potential locations would be by lot six and lot seven. Roberts asked Mark to state what lots are in the village. These are: part of lot twelve, most of lots eleven, ten, nine and eight, the frontage on lot seven and just the south tip of land on sixteen, fifteen and fourteen (just the frontage and not the high ground.) On the map, draw a line from the two section corners; south of the line is in the village. (west side is the south side of the bridge and the east side is where lot 6 starts) Member, Widiker asked if this is something that would require approval from Burnett County Land Use and Information Committee. Mark said yes that is who they will present the plan to and the public meeting would be in front of them. Widiker then asked if this would be called a Planned Unit Development (PUD). Mark said yes as it doesn't fit a 'one size category' for zoning. The property is currently zoned A2 (in Meenon) and R1 (in Village). Widiker then read from the County Code for PUD and said it appears, to him, that it doesn't meet that requirement. Widiker asked if a Planned Residential Development (PRD) was considered for this property and it

seems to be better suited. There is strong language that really focuses on protecting open spaces, shorelines, pollution and erosion control, and preserving ground cover. Widiker acknowledged the uniqueness of this property. Mark clarified differences in PUD and PRD and their plan is going with a PUD because of the features of this property. And there would be covenants written to protect resources, wetlands, and the river, of being good stewardship versus simply R2 zoning. Widiker then asked about cutting down trees. Member, Brown asked if DNR has guidelines. Mark explained 30% of their front open for a viewing corridor, or dock or boat house. He then quoted the rules for cutting outside of the viewing corridor and setbacks. There are also rules for not filling in wetlands and erosion. Widiker thanked Mark for the map and then shared that it feels the plan is for a lot of lots along the river and doesn't seem to fit the language of the intended purpose of a PUD in terms of controlling pollution, preserving the river, protecting shorelands. He stated he is a voice for folks that appreciate the river and river activities and not seeing houses. Widiker stated he also has concerns about potential for multi-family units and commercial development allowed in PUD. Mark said there could be language built into the plan where potential commercial or multi-family could or could not be allowed. Driveways and drainage ditches were also discussed. Widiker confirmed all the lots would have private septic. Mark said if the committee agreed to proceed, the next steps would be to share the concept plan with the County Land Use Committee at their next meeting on 9/5, the full Village Board Meeting next Wednesday and to the Meenon Town Board on 8/15. Weis and Maloney brought up ordinance regarding hooking up to water and sewer in the Village or a variance is needed. Roberts read part of an ordinance where it speaks to if water and sewer is not available (would think the river would mean not available and or cost prohibited). Brown confirmed that looking at single family not multi-family. Mark again spoke of the benefits of PUD district vs other districts. There would need to be a jurisdictionally agreement on taxation on split lots between the municipalities. Roberts recapped that there would be no need to change zoning in the Village portion. Widiker asked about RV\campers – there are ordinances restricting the amount of time they can be placed for the County/Townships and the Village. Mark said this could also be included in the covenants. Widiker reiterated his stance that sixteen houses on the edge of the Yellow River doesn't seem to protect the river, shorelines and natural resources; he has deep concerns about the river botton and he is not ok with it. Way too dense. Sears expressed that can't stop progress yet agrees the need to protect the resources, river, work with erosion and pollution control. She asked Ken his projected timeline to develop this property. Ken said he doesn't know how long it will take and there are rules and guidelines that must be followed for protecting the resources. Sybers said the plan meets Meenon's comprehensive plan and all their requirements. As discussed previously, he said the plan can have more restrictions (to protect the resources for years to come), via covenants, versus blanket A2 and or R1 zoning. Roberts said he thinks it is a viable plan with added covenants. Mark said he works with zoning all the time and stated a good plan is better than a good rule (in most cases), stressed the importance of flexibility and working together with good discussions. He said not discounting what Widiker is saying but all the places with high banks on the South Side of the River have buildings. Mark also wanted to point out that this is a huge piece of property and acknowledged seeing the concept plan could look scary, but it is a big piece of land and won't be developed overnight. Meenon Chairman, O'Brien asked why this property isn't being presented as a PRD (O'Brien arrived later in the meeting and missed the earlier conversation on this topic), Mark explained. Motion made by Member, Brown to move forward with the next steps for preliminary concept plan; seconded by Member, Sears. Voice vote taken. Widiker-yea; Sears-yea; Brown-yea; Weis-yea; Roberts-yea; Krause-abstained. **Motion carried 4-1 with 1 abstain.**

V. **ADJOURNMENT.** Motion was made by Member, Widiker to adjourn at 6:20 p.m., seconded by Member, Brown. **Motion carried 6-0.**

Respectfully submitted,

*Debra Doriott-Kuhnly*

Debra Doriott-Kuhnly, Clerk-Treasurer

August 3, 2022

\*\*\*These minutes are subject to approval at next month's Regular Meeting.