

NEW BERLIN PLAN COMMISSION JOINT MEETING WITH THE GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN SUBCOMMITTEE

September 20, 1999

Minutes

The joint meeting of the Plan Commission and Growth & Development Management Plan Subcommittee was called to order by Mayor Gatzke at 6:00 P.M.

Plan Commissioners in attendance were Mayor Gatzke, Mr. Barnes, Mr. Christel, Alderman Kaminski, Mr. Chase. Also present was Steven K. Hoese, Director of Planning, Greg Kessler, Associate Planner and Jeff Fortin, Planning Technician. Mr. Felda and Mr. O'Neil were excused. All Growth & Development Management Plan Subcommittee members were present except those who were excused.

Mayor Gatzke was asked to comment on the structure of the Growth & Development Management Plan Subcommittee. The GDMP Subcommittee is not a body that is expected to take formal action and operate under parliamentary rule in respect to items being placed on an agenda. Rather, it is a group whose activities are facilitated by our consultants and whose input, while very, very important, is directed to offering information related to personal experience and belief and, therefore, any item that a member of the GDMP Subcommittee would wish to offer an opinion on is available through the facilitators. Given that, I believe the structure of this committee is such that a Chairman is not required. Mr. Hoese coordinates the activities of the group as a whole.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Introduction of the Consultants/Plan Commission Secretary and Project Coordinator

Mr. Hoese introduced Greg Dale and Chris Duerksen, Consultants for the Project. They are responsible for designing a development management plan for our community. Mr. Hoese emphasized that we are not re-doing the Master Plan but rather designing a development code that will bring the present Master Plan and Zoning Code together.

Mr. Hoese introduced Greg Kessler, Associate Planner who is the new employee for Project Coordinator.

Mr. Hoese explained his duties as Plan Commission Secretary were to make sure that all procedures for this run according to our rules and regulations.

Mayor Gatzke discussed procedure to get things on an agenda . His directive was to prepare a position paper for Plan Commission or Common Council.

Mr. Herb Eggie pointed out that the letter received from the Planning Department congratulating us for becoming volunteers of the task force (GDMP Subcommittee) said just one thing about the function of this committee and that is we were to review the work of the consultants. There were no outlines, no rules, no regulations as to what we were to discuss or how far we could discuss it. I brought this letter before the Plan Commission the other night with the sole purpose of getting some sort of information as to how this task force could function. What are the rules, what are the regulations, what are the parameters within which we are to operate? The question was not then the goodness or the badness or the pros or the cons of a moratorium. All we wanted were some guidelines by which to operate. The only guideline we had was, You are to review what the consultants do. Review and then what? Nothing was said. Then what?! Nothing!

Mayor Gatzke expressed his appreciation for Mr. Eggie's frustration at the process at this point. I can only add that we are appreciative of the volunteer efforts of everybody who sits on this committee. The work that you are doing here will add significantly toward the product that is produced by our consultants. That is why they are asking, that's why they have had you here and the input of this committee is to give feedback to the consultants as to whether or not what they are doing is in line with what the citizens want. So with that we will turn it over to the consultants.

2. Review of Development Policies

Mr. Dale explained that the development policies, after review, refinement, and approval will serve as the guiding principles for the Growth Management Plan and Development Code. We need to continue the process that has been underway. We have gone through four or five major steps. As we go through this, the best way to think about what we are trying to accomplish here tonight is to establish a framework for action. The purpose of these policies, which is a culmination of a process we have been following, is to make the link between the policy and reality. We have already gone through the process of identifying planning issues, prioritizing the issues, land demand and capacity analysis and looking at how planning issues vary from location to location. The significance of which is that it lies the ground work for the regulatory issues and the development code issues which is the purpose of what we are trying to do.

Mr. Dale explained he would lead a discussion on each of the concept or geographic areas keeping in mind guiding principles. Overheads were presented for each area. The first geographic area is Urban Neighborhoods. Targeted issues in this category are listed as: largely built, no substantial change in uses contemplated, long term maintenance, infill/redevelopment compatibility standard, amenities, access to commercial areas, code enforcement/monitoring, infrastructure maintenance, linear greenway system.

Mr. Duerksen said we need to focus on changing the development codes to put into place implementation mechanisms to get things done. The next step in the process is to identify specific things that we need to change in the code under the development policy. One very important area is exploring additional pedestrian connections between subdivisions and commercial shopping and civic areas. The other issue of great importance is to create compatibility standards for new construction and redevelopment. We have seen the need for improvement in landscaping standards and operational compatibility standards.

The question was asked what the expectation is for people to walk to a store in this age of time, in this climate, in this time of civilization? There are such large blocks of subdivisions and can a transition be made between them and the commercial areas? Will it still be so far that people will not walk? Mr. Duerksen said the rule of thumb, is about six blocks for maximum walking distance before a car would be used. Mr. Dale said the ability for children to move about on a little bit larger scale is often desirable. Its more than just access to commercial areas, it's a sense of community issue.

The question was asked, assuming we identify a subdivision within six blocks of where we assume people would want to go, do we take the property from landowners and can we afford to buy it? Mr. Duerksen said what we are talking about is an incremental retro possibility. It can be done as a developers expense for new subdivisions. It was brought up that the Alternative Transportation Committee has a plan that is looking at linking neighborhoods to schools, parks, etc. The comment was also made that for this to work, improvement must be made in the commercial areas, housing codes, and zoning code violations taken care of. Discussion continued on what are essential services of neighborhoods to which it would be best to link sidewalks to. The comment was made, I live in one of the older neighborhoods on the northeast corridor and I can't see, for instance our block being three or four homes, that they would come through and put sidewalks in. A lot of people walk now for exercise in that area but they don't

walk up to the Sunnyslope or Greenfield Avenue areas. They wouldn't walk up there to shop because the main streets don't have sidewalks. Maybe as they redo things, a sidewalk would go there but I'm not so sure that a lot of people as a whole would be happy with putting in sidewalks. Mr. Duerksen said that is a good point and for this thing to work obviously there needs to be a good commercial area.

The question was asked about the two policies mentioned earlier, namely the one about monitoring housing conditions as far as code enforcement. Mr. Duerksen asked what kind of things is the City doing now? Mr. Hoese said under the development policies on Page 5 indicated Zoning Code Enforcement which are nuisance violations under the Zoning Code. The community has looked at but rejected a Housing Code. Mr. Duerksen said we are trying to raise the possibility of things that could possibly happen in the future.

Discussion continued on the sidewalk issue with someone saying with a lot of people having both husband and wife working, I would challenge that the people are going to walk six blocks to go to the grocery store or dry cleaners and walk back with those types of items. I would absolutely be in favor of having a means to getting the kids to the park or schools, but I think most of those issues deal with public transportation. There are not enough hours a day with kids going to soccer, etc. I think this needs to be taken down a couple steps to see really what is needed or wanted in some of these neighborhoods. I think to say someone is going to walk six blocks to go to a commercial development is a tough thing for me to believe. Mayor Gatzke asked what are the essential services for a neighborhood? You talk about a neighborhood being somewhere that everybody in a certain geographic area will walk. Mr. Duerksen said I can agree that nobody is going to walk six blocks to pick up their dry cleaning but will they walk six blocks to buy a gallon of milk or a newspaper or go to a coffee shop or a concert in the park. Will the kids ride their bikes twelve blocks to visit a friend. A true utilitarian shopping trip will be done by car. We probably don't know that because we don't have the opportunity to find out. Encouraging the development of commercial areas within walking distance and help to facilitate linking housing to already developed commercial areas will be helpful.

Can you take bike trails and pedestrian trails and acquire them by code? Mr. Duerksen answered yes with a plan that you would follow.

Mr. Hoese also wanted to bring up that the concept of clustering isn't only in the rural part of the city, but it also a concept that can be used in the urban side to preserve greenspace.

The second geographic area is National Avenue Corridor (East). Targeted issues in this category are listed as: character set, incremental improvements, compatibility standards – site design; building location; scale; materials; landscaping; access; signage, City Center overlay, streetscape improvements continued, civic function, gateway, commercial notes, multi-family and senior housing. Mr. Dirkson said similar to the urban neighborhood, the character is basically the need for compatibility. There is a need to consider a City Center Overlay Zone to create flexible, yet specialized development standards for the City Center area. The Eastern most end is one of the gateways into the City. Strip mall appearance should be avoided. Multi family and senior housing can break up continuous commercial. Issues of what are acceptable businesses regarding uses, landscaping codes, parking, and cooperation between small and large, old and new businesses need to be addressed.

The comment was made that there might be a possibility to encourage cooperation among neighbors up and down National Avenue where there is a tremendous amount of smaller independent owners of properties and maybe with some revolving grants or something there might be a means of cooperating with your neighbor vs. each achieving individual goals. There are some long established companies that have been there that may or may not remain but there might be some means to make the development of larger parcels a little easier. Mr. Duerksen

said one way that property owners can cooperate with each other is to share an access or the ability to cross from one property to another. This could involve consolidating on a larger scale.

The PUD Overlay was discussed saying that it can be made what we want it to be. Standards can be created with specific setbacks or additional landscaping or any number of things that may apply to this overlay that would not apply in other commercial zones. We will have to see what comes out of the plan itself and adopt it from there. The topic of landscape was addressed with the problem of it dying after its put in. We need some sort of maintenance program demanding following up on landscaping. We should also be able to specify types of trees, etc included in landscaping plans as well as size. The aspect of being liable for instructing people to do certain things was brought up. The parking landscaping, curbing and islands must be linked to ability for snow removal. Here we might also get involved with catch basins to get rid of all this water. This could also involve a significant cost.

We are not going to make the Bluemound Road mistake. We should remember that just because you live on a major arterial does not make it automatically zoned for commercial. We don't want to line all our arterials with commercial. Over time some of the business areas can be transitioned to residential or maybe a medical type use. That is a controversial issue with legal conforming businesses made into non-conforming uses.

One of the early findings of the commercial center study was the lack of office space and the problem that this creates as far as a healthy mix in our commercial center. We need to look at for example, a dental office or realtor taking a prime spot for a store front away from a retail store operator.

The possibility of moving parking from the front to the back of the buildings was discussed. It was agreed that over time we can get at least some of the parking to be on the side or back. This will cut down on landscaping since the more parking in front, the more landscaping is needed. The building will also be more visible from the front and it cuts down on the sea of asphalt. There may be some resistance to this because owners may feel they need cube entries to the building and there may be a security issue so there are some trade-offs. It seems easy to do but it may be difficult.

It was said that the front and back entrance works better when you have something scenic or interesting such as they are doing in Waukesha with the Riverwalk and also downtown Milwaukee. If you have something interesting for the people to walk along, it will work.

The third geographic area is Industrial Parks. Targeted issues in this category are listed as: job centers, gradually upgrade, accessory retail and services, screening, circulation improvements, monitor long-term economic viability, Calhoun interchange, public transportation access. Discussion included permitting small-scale retail, restaurant, and personal and business services uses when designed to serve primarily businesses in the area; and encouraging the screening of outdoor storage areas. The idea of using rail service to the Industrial Parks to minimize trucking should be investigated and perhaps encouraged. Improved connections to regional transportation will be explored in order to provide businesses with better access to workers. Sidewalks are needed inside the parks for people to get from the drop-off point of public transportation to the point of destiny in the Industrial Park. There was concern with public transportation in residential areas. Changes in manufacturing markets should be looked into so we know what is in demand. A business owner said looking at what people most perceive as an industrial park they would be shocked by the technology in our industrial park. Business Park would be a more appropriate name rather than Industrial Park. We are not just an industrial park. We have a tremendous amount of good flexible size buildings which insures continuation. Combining the two parks on each side of Cleveland Avenue from a marketing point was also suggested.

It is very critical to maintain the difference between existing and new. In Westridge and some of the newer facilities a lot of the things we are talking about have been addressed. In the existing industrial park areas it is very tough to say we can upgrade architecture because in most cases it would require redoing the whole façade. You will hear that it is nice to have an office looking building but that is not where they make their money. I think there needs to be a real distinction between the old with certain limitations and the new with more opportunities possible.

The fourth geographic area is Westridge and Moorland Road. Targeted issues in this category are listed as: build out, hospitality uses, extend south transition to the northeast – low density office, neighborhood retail, sewer service boundary changes, multi-family as a transition, traffic management. Mr. Dale said that this is an area that has been well planned. The investments are showing all the signs of being successful. The possibility of hospitality uses meaning restaurants, hotels, etc. extending to the area to the South along Moorland Road was suggested. Expansion area to the Northeast and Northwest we are suggesting be a transition area meaning lower density office and neighborhood retail to reduce impact on surrounding residential areas. Sewer service areas would have to be modified to accommodate this. We are also talking about long term traffic management in the area. Ability to make road improvements to handle the traffic is needed.

Comments on the traffic issue were rather than doing it piece by piece like in a community where you do a stormwater management plan for the area and then you come along with individual parcels making sure you are in line with the plan, you would look at it on a larger scale with an overall plan so the City gets the results it wants. Mr. Dale said a traffic management plan is planned for the area which includes looking at all the uses in the area, how much traffic it will generate, what the road needs are but then as the development unfolds, it will require individual traffic impact study so that the traffic management plan is monitored. Much of this may be already being done. Mr. Hoese said that the problem is that it is not in our development code. Unless we make this part of our procedures, it will be one time things.

Comments regarding architecture in Westridge were brought up. The standards of architecture in Westridge are stated as meeting or exceeding high standards which raises a question as to whether we now have any high standards of architecture in our code or any other provision? The development in the Westridge area seems to be moving in the right direction, but do we have any standards of architecture for application in other parts of the City as far as commercial, industrial, retail developments are concerned? Mr. Hoese said Mr. Duerksen made a review of the code on what we have and what we don't have. In 1992 when we updated our Zoning Code, the Master Plan as adopted talked about architectural standards so for the first time we added architecture as a code section in our Zoning Code. What you have seen lately is the manifestation of that. There has always been an architect on the Plan Commission for that purpose. So there are some of those elements in our codes but it is relatively new and needs refinement.

On the topic of regional mass transit, the comment was made that with the kind of residential development we have with homes being far away from commercial areas and schools, shouldn't we be talking about a local transit system, not just a bus that makes one sweep down Moorland Road. We need something that will connect some of these things. Taking the initiative to transporting industrial park employees from their pick up point was suggested. The Mayor mentioned that there is already a shuttle service created by the private market place in the industrial park. Mr. Hoese said we have also tried an experiment with an extension of Milwaukee County Transit Lines, we have talked about elderly lines with the County for some of our Senior Centers, and the volunteer taxi cab service in New Berlin. We have a Blue Chip Grant to study the successes and failures and what is acceptable in a suburban setting.

The fifth geographic area is Sections 26 & 35. Targeted issues in this category are listed as: support agricultural but recognize change, upscale single-family, rural character preservation, protect stream valley, sewer extension, one dwelling unit per 2-acre gross density South of

Grange Ave., existing zoning density north of Grange Ave., lot clustering. Mr. Dale said this is sort of "in between" land and because of that it was made a special category.

The comment was made that we should leave the door open for industrial, retail, commercial, etc. Mr. Dale said given the characteristics of the area and the environmental sensitivity of it, we seemed to think it was more suitable to residential.

In terms of industrial commercial development at Racine Avenue and Hwy. 43, has there been any kind of discussion of accommodation by Muskego in terms of sewers?

Mayor Gatzke said we have a relationship with Muskego whereby we share sewer service area.

Mr. Hoese commented that when the City commissioned the study for the next employment center, which ended up to be Westridge, Sections 26 & 35 was one of the alternative sites studied and was rejected by both the Plan Commission and Common Council. The need for expanded industrial is one thing, but there are other factors to be considered such as location, access for trucks and employees, streets need to accommodate this kind of traffic for high density. Mr. Hoese said I would discourage the expansion of industrial based on these recent studies showing this was not the best place for expansion. I would support the agricultural elements that are there now and the natural features like the stream valley, and if it is to be converted to residential, be it low density.

Density was a topic of discussion. The idea of maximum density of one dwelling unit per two acres was questioned. The question was can there be less and Mr. Dale answered yes, there can be one dwelling unit per five acres or one dwelling unit per 10 acres. There might also be a minimum lot size concept but basically we are saying no more than one dwelling unit per two acres. You might cluster those and end up being a dwelling unit on an acre with 50% set aside for open space. The question was then asked what if any provisions are being made for the development of these two sections of the City commensurate with the development policies that are outlined here. Mayor Gatzke explained that because there are no sewers available to that area, we have treated them under the guidelines of those areas of the City that don't have access to sewers.

Another question stated was how is the support of agricultural uses compatible with sewer extension. Mr. Dale said support of agricultural uses is a subtle distinction. Agricultural use is appropriate for that area but the policy of the City is also ultimately in the long term the development pressures will be such that agricultural uses cannot be expected to continue indefinitely. We have spent a lot of time on this issue.

Comments included that even though this area has no sewer available now, it has been planned with a larger infrastructure and will ultimately be served with sewer so we have to address the fact that sewers will be coming this way. When it happens is a matter of when bureaucracy lets the extension have it. I can not tell you conclusively whether or not a one dwelling unit per two acres is correct given the amount of environmental corridor. I would suspect that a better use given that the infrastructure is in at least from the sewer capacity standpoint maybe something higher than that. One of the other points I feel we need to make in this area is that transportation came up with the technology center discussion previously. One of the ways to get around the transportation issue would be to develop an employment base housing unit area. Being that this is a sewerred area it gives you the capability of addressing this issue. I don't think it's something we should look blindly at or lock into two units per acre. Certainly the environmental corridor can be a preserve, cluster developments could work out fine, or larger upper scale single family homes.

Mr. Dale agreed that we need to talk about incentives to encourage cluster development, perhaps density bonuses. The minimum density may need to be greater in return for preserving a higher amount of open space.

Alderman Schueble commented that areas with one to five or one to six worked very well. Contrary to saying it won't work, it already is working in some of the Siepmann Corp. development areas. Mr. Dale said that Siepmann Corp. told us that overall one to five or six would not work. Most of Jim Siepmann's development are less than three, mostly one or two acres. Overall density is a different issue.

Alderman Scheuble asked about the symposium tapes on water. The consultants said they had not viewed these tapes but information was gained from other sources. Mr. Scheuble added that nothing was mentioned about water and as far as planning for the future, I think we provided information that you didn't look into. The consultants answered that environmental preservation is included. Alderman Scheuble said that information provided by the experts has been ignored. The experts being SEWRPC, DNR, MMSD, etc. You didn't look at any of the information provided. The consultants said we did look at this extensively, but you provided enormous amounts of information, frankly a lot of which was not relevant. Focus New Berlin gave us a great deal of information of which we have reviewed. We appreciate all the information provided. Mayor Gatzke suggested that we eliminate the phrase that the experts have suggested . . . our consultants are also experts.

The sixth geographic area is West Side Open Space. Targeted issues in this area are listed as: regional model of rural development, support agricultural uses, low-density residential, no sewers, open space subdivisions, one dwelling per 3 acres gross, 1 acre lot, sliding scale – i.e. 1 unit per 5 acres to 1 unit per 3 acres based on open space, remove adjacency exception, com83 will not affect these policies, city participates in open space subdivisions, rural amenities/theme. Mr. Dale said there is pressure to the land holders for change in this area. The City should recognize that it is not realistic to think this land will continue to be primarily used for farming. Mr. Dale said they are recommending even lower density residential than suggested for Sections 26 and 35. The area is not intended to be served by sanitary sewer in the long range. Open Space Subdivisions are encouraged. We do look at this kind issue of density on a sliding scale, that is a growth density of anywhere from one to five dwelling units per acre to one to three dwelling units per acre depending upon the degree to which open space is provided. This needs to be worked out with the drafting of the regulations but that is the concept we are looking at. Mr. Duerksen said there is a whole host of things to use as incentives to be able to get the higher density of one unit per three acres. It could be required that the developer set aside more open space, or have groundwater mitigation measures adopted in open space subdivisions. There are ways to get some community benefit out of increase in density. The question was asked if it would be possible to put in the policy statement that some of the large marshes could be community purchased. The consultant answered that what is done in an open space subdivision is to give the community some ability to designate the areas that they want maintained as open space. For example, if there is an aquifer recharge or wetland area that they want maintained as open space. Mayor Gatzke said the City does not want to pick up a lot of remnant parcels because assuming the parcel also assumes the liability.

A question was asked about statewide Com83 rules having a possible external influence and what the consultants perceive this might be. The consultant answered that if the rules go forward the effect will be to make it easier to develop on smaller lots with the mound site systems. The City will come under increasing pressure to allow that to occur. We have tried to be clear by saying that the density proposed for an area is not driven by septic system rules. The density is not a function of what size septic system is needed. Just because the State changes the rules and says you can jam more lots in an area, the City does not have to go along with it. If the new Com 83 regulations come in and allow septic on smaller lots, the subdivision extension policy allows one and a half acres. That is an open invitation to do a lot of one and a half acre

subdivisions. We are recommending that those be taken out of the zoning code sooner rather than later. The comment was made that the Com 83 is now being debated at the State legislative level and they very well might be included in the bi-annual budget and that budget may be passed in another month or so. We are right at the doorstep of a onslaught of potential Com83 effect. The consultant said that Com83 can say you can do it on one acre but the zoning says one unit per five acres so you will not be able to do it. The Achilles heel is the subdivision extension. We are not getting a lot of them now, but we may in the future. Mayor Gatzke said that some form of modification to Com83 will pass.

More discussion on Com83 and Smart Growth and those policies. Someone wondered if the consultants are aware that there is now a discussion on the Smart Growth that will make it impossible for the City to use the Com83 unless they conform to the standards of land use set up in the Smart Growth ordinances. That is now being discussed by the Senate and the Assembly and it is very important that we consider that Smart Growth relates to Com83 and that you can't have Com83 without abiding by the land use policies set up by the legislature. There is no opposition to Smart Growth so it will surely pass. It is very important that we understand that those policies will effect how we decide land use. The Mayor added that we have already qualified to the provisions of Smart Growth. Mr. Hoese also included that staff is writing a position paper on behalf of that. It was agreed that we really don't know what Smart Growth will entail until it is passed. The consultant said he is familiar with the Smart Growth initiative from around the country and what we are doing in our plan meets virtually all of the parameters of Smart Growth.

The seventh geographic area is I-43/Racine Avenue. Targeted issues in this area are listed as: future job center, sewer service-Muskego, pause for planning, transition to Prospect Hill. Mr. Dale indicated that this area is suggested as an opportunity for a third job center. It would have to be provided with sewer service as it does not have it now. A focused plan for this area would be needed. There was a question regarding abandoning the quarry or converting that area into an industrial site.

Mayor Gatzke said there are two quarries. The City has made an offer to purchase the one on the North side of I-43 with the long term of creating a community park. The quarry to the South of that property is still an active quarry. We have seen various proposals over the years and one being industrial development. At this point in time, we have discouraged any type of development in that area because there is no utility service.

The extension of Johnson Road plan in regard to the wetlands was discussed.

Someone brought up that Mayor Gatzke along with an alderman and five high school students testified against the extension of Johnson Road when it came up at the county board 20/20 Plan because they were aware of the danger to the wetland by any extension. Even an overhead extension would have salt on it in the winter time which would go into the wetland year after year. There has been strong opposition to that 20/20 Plan. Mayor Gatzke said the statement in the west side open space has a long term possible extension of Johnson Road. You will not see this road extended for some time.

The comments continued that there was hope that the extension of Johnson Road is not suggested in the final version of the development management plan.

Mr. Dale wanted to clarify that there is really two issues, the partial completion of Johnson Road as part of the Lincoln Avenue area as opposed to the region-wide system that would involve the extension of Johnson Road. We are not suggesting that Johnson Road be extended all the way but when we get to the Lincoln Avenue area that if it is looked at long range, one lane of Johnson would need to be extended to get access to the interstate.

The eighth geographic area is National Avenue Corridor (West). Targeted issues in this area are listed as rural and scenic corridor, rural commercial nodes at: Calhoun, Beloit Rd and Martin Rd., Prospect Hill; Calhoun gateway, Prospect Hill historic preservation, intersection improvements consistent with policies. Mr. Dale said uses would be limited to rural commercial and historic nature. Intersection improvements need to be monitored.

There was question as to how the rural theme restrictions would be applied. Mr. Duerksen said it would typically be done with a rural overlay district. These requirements would be overlaid on top of the existing zoning regulations. For example, certain types of commercial uses would be limited.

The size of the parcel immediately West of Calhoun was discussed. The size is comparable to the whole Commercial Center. Encouraging a rural theme on something of that magnitude will be a challenge. There is a good deal of conservancy there also. Compatible rural uses would be required.

The intent of Racine Avenue being developed with income producing businesses and somehow connecting to the North with Johnson Road being a possibility. Again the Johnson Road extension was also discussed in regard to regional transportation and wetland pollution. There are ecologically developed ways to keep that road from polluting. We cannot make our studies so restrictive as to recommend Johnson Road never go through for example. Mr. Duerksen said that the consultants cannot make a recommendation on the Johnson Road extension in this area one way or the other. There is a substantial body of opinion in the community for it not to be built. Once it is built it, there would be a pollution impact as well as a overwhelming development pressure because there is now access.

Responsibilities for regional transportation were discussed. We will need to encourage traffic to buy, sell and work with the consultant agreeing that is a major decision the community will have to make. A major road going through will make it much more difficult to protect this western area of the city.

Concern was expressed with the hodge-podge look of National Avenue. Mr. Duerksen said if designed properly, certain stores could be very compatible with the rural character. The idea of a shop being in a pole barn is not compatible. Architecture caution is needed with a theme being followed.

The ninth geographic area is The Quarries. Targeted issues in this area are listed as: monitor, manage and mitigate, discourage incompatible expansion, final use plans, recognize economic roles. Mr. Dale said it is important that the City recognize that the quarries do have an economic role to play. The basic theme for the quarries is to continue to monitor the activities, look for incompatible expansion and the final use. Mayor Gatzke said there is some restoration plans within the quarry districts that include modification to a different use. We can't establish zoning rules which prohibit someone from completing their quarry in a manner that their restoration plan indicates that was drafted years ago. Concern was expressed in regard to the plans to convert the quarry into a park as to the accommodation for young people to get to the park. It was a thought that a bike path, or sidewalks on Barton or Glengarry would be difficult.

The tenth geographic area is Greenfield Avenue. Targeted issues in this area are listed as: existing corridor plan, development standards relative to streetscape/road improvements, phase out undesirable commercial uses, Greenfield/Moorland gateway – "Landmark" architecture. Mr. Dale indicated that the land use implications on the existing corridor plan should be followed, phasing out undesirable commercial uses. We are also suggesting that the intersection of Greenfield and Moorland be a gateway into the community. There is a potential of some landmark architecture in that area. Comments were made that at Greenfield and Moorland is an area where

two watersheds come together and a reminder that flooding problems occur here. The corner of Greenfield and Johnson on the North is commercial zoning for Brookfield with direct access to the freeway and it also has the availability of some sewer even on the New Berlin side. This intersection may require some special attention by us in the future.

The eleventh geographic area is West Lincoln Avenue. Targeted issues in this area are listed as: needs focused planning, think big and long-term, sewers, Johnson Road, "fourth" job center, environmental, open space. Mr. Dale said this is the most difficult planning area in the City. He went over some of the problems in this area and concluded that any solution in this area would have to be long term. In the long run it can be a low density, campus type environment business park. The comment was made that the development occurring along Greenfield Avenue will effect what happens along Lincoln Avenue between Johnson and Calhoun. The decision between holding tanks vs. sewers would need to be investigated. Substantial, additional planning is needed.

Landowners expressed desire to be involved through surveys, public hearings, etc.

Mr. Duerksen and Mr. Dale concluded this discussion on the review of the Development Policies.

3. Rural Landowners Survey

Mr. Hoese said that preliminary results are available from Mr. Dale regarding the Rural Landowners Survey. The answers will be in written form and what it all means will be further studied.

4. Status of City-Wide Survey

Mr. Hoese reported that the mailing label issue has been worked out for the City-Wide Survey and some work is still being done on the final questions.

5. Developer Code/Development Review Issues

Mr. Dirkson said that the focus of this project is really to go beyond the planning and talk about implementation. What we have done tonight is taken the comprehensive plan that we have now to the next level of details geographically throughout the City. In May we did a code diagnosis where we took the top ten issues that we wanted to change in the Zoning Code. Development review process is a big issue which has emerged. Taken all this information we have collected, we will come back and show you how the code will be reorganized and where regulations need to be changed to make the code work. We will then get your input on this detailed outline of the code and then we will start drafting near the end of the year.

6. Discussion of Next Steps

Motion by Mr. Barnes to forward to Common Council the memorandum of policies for their review and comment.

Seconded by Mr. Christel. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion by Alderman Kaminski to adjourn the Plan Commission meeting at 9:00 P.M. Seconded by Mr. Christel. Motion carried unanimously.