

1 A regular monthly meeting of the Newbold Plan Commission was held on Thursday,
2 October 1, 2009, beginning at 4:30 PM at the Newbold Town Hall.

3
4 **Members in attendance:** Chmn. Bob Metropulos, Mike Sueflohn, Bob Estabrook, John Granger
5 Richard Guidinger, and Ed Hammer

6 **Members absent:** Dan Chronister Sr.

7 **Audience:** None
8

9 **Call the meeting to Order:** Chmn. Metropulos called the meeting to order at 4:30 PM. The Agenda
10 for this meeting was properly noticed by posting on September 29, 2009, a copy on each of the
11 three (3) Town bulletin boards. For informational purposes, the Agenda was also posted on the
12 Town website.
13

14 **1.0 Approve minutes for September 3, 2009 Regular Monthly Meeting**

15
16 **1.1** Ed Hammer moved to approve, with corrections, the minutes of the September 3, 2009
17 meeting; Dick Guidinger seconded the motion; motion passed by unanimous voice vote.
18

19 **2.0 Continued discussion on Chapter 13 Land Division Ordinance revisions for** 20 **recommendation to the Town Board:**

21 **Discussion :**

22 **a) Revised Draft --** Mr. Granger informed the Members that distribution of the revised draft of
23 the Land Division Ordinance, showing omissions as “strike-over text” and additions as
24 “underlined text”, to all Town Officers and P.C. Members has been accomplished.
25

26 **b) Density of development standards for Multiple Family Dwelling Units located on on-**
27 **water parcels –** The County mandated on-water lot sizes and riparian frontage widths
28 (RFWs) for each zoning district are much smaller than specified in Newbold’s Land Division
29 Ordinance. Hence, the County use of an area “multiplier factor” of 50- or 67% for each
30 additional dwelling unit may not be reasonable for on-water multiple family developments
31 located in Newbold; i.e., developments of on-water lots/parcels located in Newbold in Multiple
32 Family, Residential and Farming, Recreational and/or Business zoning districts.

33 Mr. Granger gave each of the Members a copy of a datasheet he had prepared; *“Increase*
34 *in Lot Size and RFW Requirements for Multiple Dwelling Units on Waterbody Lots”*. This
35 datasheet illustrates the Initial Unit Area and RFW requirements for Lot Size/RFW for each
36 Newbold Waterbody Classification (Most-, Intermediate- or Least- Protected) and potential
37 increases in Lot Size/RFW based on various multiplier percentages from 25% up to and
38 including 75% for increasing the number of units from one (1) to five (5).

39 The datasheet also illustrates the Initial Unit Area and RFW requirements for Lot Size/RFW
40 for each Oneida Co. Waterbody Classification (Class “I” and Class “II”) and potential
41 increases in the Lot Size/RFW based on multiplier percentages (50% and 67%) as shown in
42 Appendix “A” of the Shoreland Protection Ordinance for increasing the number of units from
43 one (1) to five (5).

44 The purpose of preparing the datasheet was to illustrate the impact of applying various
45 percentage multipliers on Lot Size/RFW and the resulting number of potential multiple family
46 dwelling units in a development.

47 Considerable discussion took place regarding pros/cons of:

48 a) using a “multiplier factor” to determine Lot Size/RFW for an additional multiple family
49 dwelling unit, or;

50 b) simply stating that any additional multiple family dwelling unit must have the same Lot
51 Size/RFW requirement as required for a single unit.

52 No agreement was achieved – discussion will continue at a subsequent meeting.
53

54 **c) Definitions for a County or a Town Plat as required by Chap. 236 --** Mr. Granger reported
55 that he is still searching to find a suitable definition for a “Town Plat”. Although the revised
56 County Subdivision Ordinance requires a County or a Town Plat for a Major Land Division,
57 the revised County Ordinance does not contain a definition nor does Chapter 236 Wis.
58 Statutes contain a definition. He will keep researching.
59

60 **d) Discussion regarding how to regulate density of development for a Condominium Plat**
61 **involving the division of undeveloped lands as opposed to a Condominium Plat**
62 **describing the conversion of an existing parcel with existing structures – No**
63 **discussion –**
64

65 **Action** -- no formal actions were taken.
66

67 **3.0 Administrative matters for review, discussion and/or action by Commission Members**
68 **concerning general Plan Commission activities, Town Board discussions/actions, County**
69 **Planning and Zoning Dept. activities, project updates, correspondence, set next meeting**
70 **date and future agenda items:**
71

72 **3.1 Chairpersons report – none**
73

74 **3.2 Correspondence, if any – None**
75

76 **3.3 Suggested Future Agenda items –** Continued discussion regarding review/update of the
77 Land Division Ordinance focusing on developing density standards for on- and off-water
78 developments and pros/cons of the concept for “Conservation Developments”
79

80 **3.4 Next meeting date --**The next meeting of the Plan Commission will be a regular monthly
81 meeting on November 5, 2009 at the Town Hall.
82

83 **4.0 Public comment/communication period as per Wis. Stats. 19.83(2) and 19.84(2):**

84 **None –** no audience members were present.
85

86 **5.0 Adjournment:** Mike Suefloh moved to adjourn the meeting; motion seconded by Bob
87 Estabrook; motion passed without negative vote. Chmn. Metropulos adjourned the meeting at 6:40
88 P.M.
89

90 *John P. Granger, Secretary*