

**Town of Bristol Special Plan Commission Meeting  
and Public Hearing on Land Use Plan for the Town of Bristol  
Bristol Town Hall 19801 83<sup>rd</sup> Street, Bristol, WI 53104  
Tuesday, August 29, 2006  
7:00 p.m.  
Minutes**

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairman John Boldt at 7:00 pm. Commissioners Ruth Atwood, Joan Peterson, Larry Kelley, Bob LeFebve and Shirley Davidson were present. Scott Davis was absent. Also present, Planner Pat Meehan, Town Attorney Sue Sager, Administrator Randy Kerkman, Plan Commission Secretary Amy Klemko and 38 constituents.
  
2. Planner Pat Meehan gave an overview of the Land Use Plan that was adopted in 1992. and the new plan. He stated that the town has held 4 or 5 public hearings and numerous work sessions to come up with a new plan that was good for the town.  
The plan consists of 7 Chapters of text and maps.  
Chapter 1 – Introduction: Why and how we are doing this.  
Chapter 2 – Population and Employment Analyses and Projections:  
Chapter 3 – Natural Resources: Protection Standards.  
Chapter 4 – Existing Land Use and Projected Year 2035 Land Use Needs.  
Chapter 5 – Land Use Objectives, Principles and Standards.  
Chapter 6 – The Land Use Plan: Map, Phasing Map, Text and Verbiage.  
Chapter 7 – Plan Implementation: Land Use Zoning Districts, Design Guidelines, and Land Division Ordinance.

There are 3 phases to the plan: 2005-2015 – Phase I  
2015-2025 – Phase II  
2025-2035 – Phase III

This is to be done based on a five-year incremental growth within each phase per Wisconsin State Statues 62.23 & 66.1001.

The actual population for 2000 was at 4538 and the projected 2035 population is 7301, with 2.55 people per household.

In 2000 there was 86.2% agricultural land use. There will be an increase in employment and a population of 7300, and will need a minimum of 1206 dwelling units.

In 2005, agricultural use was at 66.7% with 33.3% urban lands.

In 1992 the Land Use Districts approach was used and the new plan calls for Village Hamlet, Village Center and Business Park land use districts in addition to those land use districts previously used.

Pat Meehan asked that the following adjustments to the plan requested by the Kenosha County Department of Planning and Development Memorandum dated August 28, 2006 be added to the minutes:

As described on page 7-2 and 7-5 the County does not agree on the issue of pre-zoning land.

The County has had a long standing policy not to zone land based on speculation, but rather based upon a submitted and complete application request for a rezoning justifying the need to change such zoning classification. The County respectfully suggests that this language be removed from the text.

On page 7-4 and 7-5 the plan indicates a number of areas of the Kenosha County General Zoning and Shoreland/Floodplain Zoning Ordinance that should be amended. The County respectfully suggest that this be reworded to state that Kenosha County is currently in the process of addressing text amendments and planning on future text amendments that will enhance certain areas of this plan. In regards to the areas listed in the Land Use Plan Kenosha County commented as follows:

- Creation of a B-6 Business Park District – The County is currently working on this District.
- Creation of a B-7 Village Center District – This is a district that County planning staff agree should be looked at in the future.
- Suburban Cluster Subdivisions – This is a topic that County planning staff agree should be looked at in the future.
- Business Park Design Guidelines – the County is currently working on these.
- Residential Design Guidelines – This is a topic that the County planning staff is willing to discuss in the future.
- Net Floor Area Ratios – This is topic that the County planning staff does not feel needs to be addressed since although the County is becoming more urban in place of agriculture it is doing so at a suburban/rural density.
- Use of Standard Industrial Classification – This is a topic that the County planning staff is willing to discuss in the future.
- Landscaping Standards – This is a topic that the County planning staff agree should be looked at in the near future.
- Sign Ordinance – The County is currently researching regulations to more effectively regulate signage.
- Off-street Parking – The County is currently researching regulations to more effectively regulate off-street parking.
- Increasing the Minimum Dwelling Unit Sizes – At this time this is a topic that the County planning staff agree is more effectively controlled by subdivision covenants reviewed and approved as part of the platting process.
- Page 3-6, C-2 Updated Resource Conservancy Districts Enhancements – This is a topic that the County planning staff agree should be looked at in the near future.

Pat Meehan also asked that the following adjustments to the plan requested by the Kenosha County Department of Planning and Development Memorandum dated August 29, 2006 be added to the minutes:

An additional item of comment is in regards to the expansion of the mobile home park to the northwest of Rainbow Manor. The County respectfully disagrees with this expansion being part of the Land Use Plan. The services that are needed for this type of community, which caters to the elderly, should not be expanded in an area where they are at their furthest point, especially fire and rescue. This type of expansion should only be done on sewer. Sewer service expansion approval of the existing

system is questionable.

Pat Meehan also corrected errors in the unincorporated areas of Bristol.

- All Community Business District Designations in unincorporated “village” of Bristol area to be VHB Village Hamlet Business District.
- Don Biehn’s property should be changed from Village Hamlet to NB Neighborhood Business District.
- Change VHB Village/Hamlet Business District Designations located on the south side of STH 50 at its intersection with CTH MB to NB Neighborhood Business District.
- Change all Kenosha County owned property located north of STH 50 between USH 45 on the west and CTH D on the east to the I-1 Institutional District.
- Designate specific Public High School site on map and in text of the plan.
- Bristol Woods County Park extends from Hwy C to Hwy Q. This was incorrectly designated on the map.

At 7:30 Chairman John Boldt opened the floor to public comments, stating that there would be a 3-minute limit and only one time per person up at the podium.

- George Seater of Seater Construction representing Ed Paramski would like to see 80 acres on Hwy 45 & Hwy V currently zoned A-1 rezoned to A-2.
- Al Namath wants to see A-2 zoning (10 acre homesites). He owns property on HWY JS & 45 zoned R-1, no animals, 1<sup>st</sup> phase – currently has no kids, 2<sup>nd</sup> phase \$600,000 –\$900,000 homes, all brick fronts and 3 car attached garages.
- Doug Potter gave information regarding Central High School and its capacity, which is projected to be at 1500 students by 2014. The task force is doing everything they can to look at adding on, but the property is land locked so a new site is a possibility for an addition.
- Carolyn Owens questioned SEWRPC proposal of 1209 dwelling units which is less than 2439 units in the Town Plan by 2035.

Pat Meehan indicated large lots are difficult to split into smaller tracts for planning purpose.

Carolyn Owens asked how many homes are proposed for all the developments on the table right now. Randy Kerkman stated approximately 1100 are proposed at this time.

She also questioned the Institutional Land Use District which could be a jail, church, school etc.

She feels the area chosen for a high school is not a good area and would be better located west of Hwy 83.

- Kay Sharp feels we should be promoting low density development. Start, promote and stick with low density developments, R-1, R-2 are great, R-3 and above are too high a density. Carefully develop a plan as tax payers don’t want to pay for these developments.
- Lori Anderson stated that she would like to see a more readable copy of the text and maps, something that everyone will be able to understand. She doesn’t want the Town to be pushed into a revised plan and would like the impact fees

protected. Farmers must be able to sell, but we still need to keep our rural areas. She also asked for one more public hearing on the plan.

- Jill Anderson asked if or when the law on impact fees changed would the land use plan also change? She would like to see the plan in language everyone could understand. She asked what's to keep the open space and describe what the buildings going to look like.  
She feels the whole plan is too encompassing and she doesn't think it is a good plan for our Town.  
Pat Meehan stated that the open space is all indicated in white on the plan map and that the design guidelines are to be considered in the future.
- Margaret McCabe is concerned with the land designated for the school and feels it should be removed until the school task force picks a site.

3. Chairman John Boldt closed the public comments at 7:56 p.m.

4. Plan commission Comments:

Bob LeFebve feels it is prudent to have a site set aside for a future school.

Shirley Davidson is concerned with the memorandums from the County and the comments spoken tonight. She wants it clear that we are not pre-zoning property.

Pat Meehan stated that we don't control zoning the County does.

Joan Peterson is concerned about the land designated for a school and what will happen to it if they don't use it. She asked if we take it out could you put school site only and have a separate designation for this. She also asked for a show of hands on how many wanted more information and how many do not want more information.

Chairman Boldt stated that the Plan Commission has spent a lot of time and has been diligent on the plan. He doesn't like to see a show of hands for something like this.

Sue Sager stated that the Commission should annually review the plan and/or in 5 year increments. If the school doesn't want the site then they should see what it could be used for.

She would rather see a separate designation for school land other than the Institutional District which is too broad a spectrum.

Ruth Atwood asked that more information be put in the next newsletter and that R-2 and R-3 be looked at again.

The Plan Commission will be discussing the Land Use Plan at the September 19, 2006 meeting. They also planned a walking tour with the developer of the Great Northern property on Friday, September 8 at 4:00 p.m.

5. A motion was made by Larry Kelley and was seconded by Shirley Davidson to adjourn the meeting at 8:25 p.m. The motion was carried unanimously.

Minutes submitted by

Amy Klemko, Plan Commission Secretary