

**WASHINGTON COUNTY**  
**MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING**  
**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**MINUTES OF JANUARY 18, 2008**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Radermacher at 8:15 a.m. at the Public Agency Center, Room 3224. Those present included:

**Members Present:**

Lawrence Hoffman..... County Board Supervisor  
James Schwartz ..... County Board Supervisor  
David Radermacher ..... County Board Supervisor  
Linda Walter..... Health Department Director  
Linda Olson ..... Director, Aging and Disability Resource Center  
Ken Pesch..... Highway Department

**Staff:**

Debora Sielski ..... Assistant Administrator for Planning  
Washington County Planning and Parks Department  
  
Joanne Wagner ..... Office Manager  
Washington County Planning and Parks Department

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS:**                      **Call Meeting to Order/Review Agenda**

Chairman Radermacher called the meeting to order. Quorum present.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS:**                      **Approval of November 27, 2007 minutes**  
**Motion by Pesch, seconded by Walter to approve the minutes of November 27, 2007**  
**as submitted with no additions or corrections. Motion carried.**

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS:**                      **Review and consider approval of Draft**  
**Chapter IX – Land Use Element**

SEWRPC did a Land Use inventory in 2006 which was more general than the one conducted in 2000. Sielski referred TAC to page 2A (see attached). Unfortunately, there are some discrepancies in comparing the existing land uses in 2006 to the existing 2000 land use inventory. These are noted on the table.

Sielski stated that one of the items required by the Comprehensive Planning Law is to identify Smart Growth areas.

Pesch questioned table IX-2 on page 3a. Is the year 2003-2007 a five-year span or a four-year span and are the values per acre? Sielski will ask SEWRPC to clarify these items.

Sielski summarized the Framework for Developing the County 2035 Land Use Plan Map section and referred TAC to Map IX-5 (see attached). The County did not go through a

planning process to develop a Land Use Plan; we have incorporated all of the local plans into that map. Radermacher commented about Richfield's suburban density for residential and voiced concern about this issue. Discussion ensued regarding the Land Use Plan.

Radermacher asked what our role was in regard to the village that is being created in Richfield. Again stated that he certainly is not in favor of the suburban density for residential without sewer and water. Sielski stated that the County must include Richfield's Comprehensive Plan. Sielski further explained the State Statute and that with all cities and villages, we must incorporate their plan into the County Comprehensive Plan within their municipal boundaries without change regardless of whether the County agrees with their plan or not. Even if we don't agree with what one of the cities or villages has in their Comprehensive Plan, we must include them, including the Village of Richfield. Radermacher voiced a concern about development in an area that does not have sewer and water provided. Further discussion ensued regarding the Village of Richfield and the provision of sewer and water. Sielski stated that there is nothing in the Statutes that states that a village must provide sewer and water. Radermacher voiced concerns stating that not only is this detrimental to the environmental area, but to the future taxpayers. Radermacher stated that when they vote on this plan, he will certainly make a statement and vote his objection to this type of thing. Sielski stated that talking to the Town of Richfield and the Wisconsin Department of Administration might be more effective.

Radermacher requested to add the following statement: After reviewing the Washington County Land Use Plan 2035, Map IX-5, in looking at the major impact that suburban residential density will have, he believes very strongly that the problem of future impact on sewer and water in Richfield is going to be fiscally imprudent and create a major hardship for the taxpayers in the Town of Richfield. Sielski respectfully cautioned the use of making a strong opinion about one municipality, which has not been done in any of the Chapters. Olson feels we should not necessarily single out Richfield, but make a strong statement about future planning for sewer needs and provide a caution to local governments in this plan. **Motion by Olson, seconded by Hoffman to add the statement that the local plan should consider the impact of future needs of sewer and water facilities. Motion carried unanimously.**

Pesch requested clarification of the table on page 11A. Sielski clarified the information in the table. Pesch was satisfied with the explanation.

**Schwartz arrived at 9:00 a.m.**

Pesch questioned the Kettle Moraine State Forest Land Use category. Sielski explained how SEWRPC categorizes these Land Uses.

No further discussion regarding Draft Chapter IX – Land Use Element.

**Motion by Olson, seconded by Pesch for preliminary approval of Chapter IX – Land Use Element. Motion carried unanimously.**

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS:**            **Review and consider approval of Chapter XII - Utilities and Community Facilities Element**

Sielski reviewed the list on the first page of the chapter that identifies everything that must be addressed based on the Comprehensive Planning Law.

Olson stated that regarding the fourth paragraph from the bottom on page 9, last sentence, Washington County will be going to Family Care as of April 1, 2008. It is not “planned” anymore. Sielski said this should say “went into effect” as the Comprehensive Plan is going to be approved as of April 15<sup>th</sup> this year.

Radermacher stated he had a question regarding the last program at the bottom of page 16, “Continue to implement Chapter 25, Sanitary Code, of the Washington County Code of Ordinances which includes regulation of private on-site wastewater treatment systems (POWTS)” Asked how that pertains to the Town of Richfield when they become a Village. Sielski stated she thought that it would no longer apply. Radermacher would like to see a statement added stating that this applies to unincorporated areas only.

Olson stated that on page 18, under the Health Care Issue, fifth bullet up from the bottom, take out the “Southeastern Wisconsin Family-Care program coalition” wording. This should be removed from the text. Say “Continue to support the Family Care Program”

Going back to page 16, Radermacher stated he has a comment regarding the last program on that page – “Continue to study the feasibility of establishing a program to collect and safely dispose of used tires.” Radermacher stated that currently, the issue of plastics is a major concern. Discussion ensued regarding what types of plastics constitutes hazardous waste. Radermacher requested the addition of “plastics” to the bottom program on page 16.

Schwartz stated that regarding the last program bullet at the top of page 19, - “study the development of an integrated County emergency call dispatch center”, this has been studied, is not going to happen.

Discussion ensued regarding police protection for the Village of Newburg in the Intergovernmental Cooperation Issue. This will change when the Village of Richfield is established. Olson suggested changing the wording rather than pointing out specific villages. Sielski suggested eliminating the “Village of Newburg and town residents” and say “continue to provide police protection as necessary in local governments as required by statutory requirements.”

**Motion by Olson, seconded by Schwartz to approve this draft chapter with the changes suggested. Motion carried.**

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS:                      Prioritization of Programs for Chapters VIII, X, XI, and XIII of the Comprehensive Plan**

Sielski referred TAC to the prioritization worksheets she had provided to them previously (see attached). In the Implementation Chapter, which is being developed right now, we need to determine a priority for all of these programs that we have in all of our chapters. She gave an overview of what the information entails in these sheets, and how this information will be compiled.

Sielski asked TAC to go through each of these programs and circle the number corresponding to the priority they feel appropriate for each program. She will be looking at the Comprehensive Plan on a yearly basis and looking at the status of the programs.

Sielski requested TAC members to complete these as soon as possible, as they are working on the Implementation Chapter right now. She reviewed the legend at the bottom of each page which indicates 1 being high priority and 5 being low priority for clarification of scoring.

Olson stated that she needed to make a clarification at this time. For the Housing Element, on page 4 – under the Goal of “Promote housing options that allow elderly and disabled persons to remain in their homes”, the second Program listed beneath that should be completely eliminated, as the Community Options Program no longer exists after April 1<sup>st</sup>.

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS:                      Future meeting dates and times:**

We will cancel the meeting originally scheduled for next week, January 24<sup>th</sup>. Sielski stated she will need the Committee to meet either the week of January 28<sup>th</sup> or February 4<sup>th</sup>. Sielski will touch base with Nancy Anderson at SEWRPC to find out when she is going to have the draft of the Implementation Chapter complete and ready to go out. We can then determine a date. Since we are trying to get this to the County Board by March, this Committee may need to meet twice in February. This will be all sorted out after she touches base with Nancy Anderson on the rest of the Chapters. Joanne will be calling everyone to determine availability at that time.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS:                      Public Comment**

No one present from the public. No comment.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS:      Adjournment**

Motion by Hoffman seconded by Olson to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 9:48 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Deb Sielski  
Assistant Administrator for Planning

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
David N. Radermacher, Chairperson

Date \_\_\_\_\_