

The Joint Comprehensive Plan Committee was called to order by Village President Kapaun at 7:04 pm.

Present: Stephanie Lamia, Patty Johnson, Katy Kapaun, Michelle Aho, Grace Hoyer, Geno Hanson and Tim Johnson

Absent: Warren Tracy, Steve Melby, Henry Nechville

Guest: Peter Tharp

Review and discuss Implementation element:

We are a little behind on where we want to be. Took a couple of months off to deal with DOT issues. Working draft is September 20th or so which means that this will not be perfect but will be an internal working draft. The hope would be for the committee to review the plan (month to review) and then meet on our own to review and give feedback. Once this is done and incorporated, the next step is the open house (like visioning session) to present the process of this plan, etc. Opportunity for the public hopefully before deer hunting and Thanksgiving. Plan won't be adopted in December but after the first of the year do the public hearing, etc. This can be held at the Warren Town Hall.

Implementation element:

- Programs and implementations as part of this plan. How will each of the elements be integrated and communicated. How do we measure our progress? What can be used to help with this measurement. Update it once every ten years but also an annual review.
- Plan Support: education, volunteerism, website element to help the community in general. – Social media aspect is the go-to for communication. What can we do to become the source of information. Posting from the Village to the Community site. Volunteerism – playing a role in what is happening in the community. Maybe remnants of the sesquicentennial can carry over to this. Maybe add this to the website for the volunteer site.

Strategy implementation:

Actions/projects/programs – example comprehensive outdoor recreation plan. This means taking action to plan, etc. There will be some joint strategies for both communities to work on but also some specific tasks for each municipality. Land use is different in the town than the village. Timelines for the strategies. Recommend and look for feedback on these. Short-term (five years), long-term and the tracking of this progress (action plan trackers). Not all on the local unit of government to do this. These will be a separate booklet of action items.

Is the intent that the Joint Comp Plan continue to meet? Kapaun thinks that this should happen but not sure if this is an annual or bi-annual meeting or only when an issue comes up. Right now, there are a couple of inquiries that are looking for land use and hopefully we can meet to make the changes that are needed. Could this be part of the plan to meet annually? Future growth areas that we have discussed that will need to be reviewed. Review action plan

progress. Try to keep the plan on the forefront of everyone's mind. May meet more often if something big is happening. How is the Joint Comp Plan organized? Should there be bi-laws or are we ok with how we are? This is only a recommending committee and that is why this would not need by-laws. This committee could change with a new appointment that is done annually. Kapaun is not sure how we would handle an impasse? Are we going to move forward as is or part ways. Does this require by-laws or a memorandum of understanding? How do you dissolve if this doesn't work anymore. If the town wants to amend future land use in the town, do they need to bring it before the village for approval or is it just the Village sending to the Town? There was agreement that this must go both ways. What does the amendment process look like: minor changes to maps or texts. Updated every 10 years or more frequently. Adoption process for plan amendments and plan adoption are the same (follow statute). T. Johnson thinks that this should be done with your short- and long-term goals. Most common is the future land use map, text regarding future land use map and policy regarding this. Kapaun asked what if we make a substantial change from the original plan – economics of updating the plan but we would have to do a formal amendment. Amendment document that is adopted by resolution and must go through the formal process, 30-day public hearing, adoption by each plan commission and governing board. The 10-year plan update the statute does not define what an update must be, but the big items are data, and this will change every 10 years (census numbers), boundary has changed so maps must be updated.

Review and discuss WisDOT updates

- No feedback needed just updates. In July 2024 we had a meeting with DOT. Purpose to meet as a Town, Village and DOT and WCRP. Transportation items specifically high-speed rail and 65 corridors.
- HSPR (High Speed Passenger Rail) – there are two studies going on right now on existing rail line. Service from Milwaukee to Twin Cities and Eau Claire to Twin Cities on this line. Two phases for each study. Phase one is a fact gathering (going on now or starting soon) to be completed by end of 2025. Phase two is more planning and heavy public involvement. During phase two it is important to be engaged in this process. Estimating 10 trips per day between both studies going on. They are saying four to five years for Eau Claire to Twin Cities and six trips a day between Milwaukee and Twin Cities. We asked the DOT about the implications for road closing and Vine Street and Division, and they did not expect either crossing to be closed but likely the town crossings will be impacted. Need to take this into consideration when looking at future growth. Hanson pointed out that this will be funded partially by the County (10%).
- Highway 65 – In the mid 2000's access control was put in place to minimize traffic impacts that they were seeing. 2008 worked with Village and Town for possible relocation of official corridor (reserving space for future need – not buying or building it but intent that there will be a future road which is mapped). Accommodate four lanes but will start as a two-lane highway and grow from there. Main challenge is the intersection at Highway 65 and 70th Avenue and the proximity to I94 and the intersection is part of this. In 2021 the boards took action to remove this by-pass to get rid of this map. The 2008 map also planned a local road which does not work any longer because of the way Kwik Trip was developed so a

revision needs to be made because it cannot function the way it was planned. WISDOT is willing to modify if it works. The alternative is the bypass but open to consideration to making the changes but not paying for the changes. DOT may look to move the interchange East, but they won't allow two interchanges so one would need to be closed. Badke is looking for options on how to proceed. Do we plan the future land use without the bypass or incorporate the bypass as originally planned into the future land use map then the action item would be to modify the alignment and address issues in the future. Recommendation would be to proceed with how it was mapped and incorporate this into the map and explore with DOT on modifications. T. Johnson asked what the estimate traffic flow to create this bypass to happen? The traffic volumes that they have but there is not a magic threshold to make this happen based on congestion. One thought is to move the driveway of Flying J to change their access point more to the West. Maybe worth having a talk with River Falls to see what lead up to the bypass being added in their community. Kapaun understands their point in trying to manage this plan and ultimately saves money by not having to purchase the properties. Aside from the congestion is the prioritization of funding of projects at the state level. Extension of Wilkens Way to the North and reconfiguring the entrance to Flying J and getting 107th open for traffic and working with the DOT/DNR to help with this process. Should the roundabouts be traffic lights to help with the flow of the traffic? Must be prudent and talking to the DOT and looking at our options. Do the declarations ever expire? The deed restriction would never expire but must be rescinded. Why is 130th Avenue not an option? Two lanes would be paid for by the development not the DOT for the initial two-lane. T. Johnson asked if we should be making plans from 130th Street from the freeway all the way to New Richmond making this a four-way highway. The challenge there is the DOT is not allowing a second access point. Which option would do we want to see going forward? Land use is working off option two right now but how do we want to proceed. T. Johnson would like to see option #1 but have plan B in case something comes up. What would plan B be? 130th being a straight road? This map is not a DOT map (no authority to officially map state highway corridors. Adopted by Village and Warren working with the DOT. DOT is not mapping this but looking for a plan if something comes up. Since we have both abandoned our map would we have to recommend that we put this back in place. Cannot readopt because it doesn't work. Maybe we officially map Wilkens Way being extended so show our traffic route. The idea of having it mapped is so that we cannot use the land. Can we include direction around it instead of mapping it. Need a sense of where this corridor might be so that we know what will go around it for land use. Can take the jug handles off – obligated to put something in place but don't like it. Can we say that it will shift down 70th and curves into 130th? Semi only lane would be a good solution. Would 70th Avenue have enough room to expand to four lanes. **If option 1** – officially map the backage roads to show what we are thinking for the future while exploring options. We are willing to proceed without the Highway 65 bypass but with working with DOT to explore modification to the Highway 65 alignment and adopt an official map for future local roads to help alleviate the traffic issues.

Review and discuss Land Use element

Village and Town work together on this. Land use demands and forecast out land use demand for every category. New development should be master planned with the desire for connected neighborhoods in the village. Place and site new large industrial warehouses strategically near others. This is what they think they have heard the residents wanting but is there something missing. With Rolling Meadows if we want to keep them closer to three units per acres so 1/3 acre each. 10,000 square feet. Believes that some of this is market driven. Having smaller households which means smaller lots not larger lots. From the public visioning workshop – town having one large subdivision and low growth in the town of Warren which is intentional.

- Commercial to the West, industrial to the East. Highway 65 corridor mainly commercial with frontage/backage roads and important to officially map. Not enough land currently in the Village for the residential growth but with the bypass being removed this will free up more land but what do we want to see go around this. Natural dividing line would be Wagner drive. Commercial to light industrial as you move towards 70th Avenue. Extend Wagner to 130th somewhere but does not have to be a straight road. Future growth areas within the town could be extending downtown to the west. Talked about highway 65 corridor to commercial – 94/65 commercial to the West & SW and potential expansion of industrial park to the E (business park). Keeping growth West of 65 in the Town keep the East separate. Yellow around the storage units means residential. Might be a good area except for the train tracks or keeping it undeveloped or keeping this pink for proposed future envisions? Leave this as prime area but maybe commercial? Add Triebold areas as future light industrial. Growth of the park thru Twin Lakes but there is no thought on this. Currently working with Central Rec to possibly expand this area for another ball field and soccer area. Challenge is the parking in this area. Park Board has been put back together for the Town.

Rest of the Town of Warren is mainly zoned R1 and R2 and limited commercial zoning. Farmland preservation zoning is not implemented. With no zoning there are no tax credit opportunities. Rohl property will be the exemption to this property. Might not be rezoned but will be preserved as farmland. County zoning allows this by land use permit if over 500 animals. Does this limit the uses like solar? St. Croix county does have solar standards. Town is fine the way they are. Klapp preservation land to connect to land on 80th Avenue for preservation. 2014 draft future land use map for the township but was this adopted? There was no future land given to the town only planned for the Village. Shows a lot of mixed residential on the western half. Town likes the current conservation subdivision ordinance and likes current land division. Keep development limited in the town. Do you want to maintain the existing land use in the town except for the future growth area? If it complies with the ordinances, are you open to individual houses to be added and yes, not opposed to future subdivision on the East side of Highway 65. Don't want to clutter up the town roads with future development – traffic impact review. Will this be a policy/ordinance or future land use map item? Rural living thoughts/approach? Dark yellow for existing major subdivisions what does yellow vs brown mean? Dark yellow or light yellow or all the same color. Make this a mix of ag, home business etc.? One future land use map that will show all of Warren and Village.

2002 land use policies:

Discussed the 2002 Land Use Policies. Future development should occur in areas adjacent to and comparable with existing development is yes. Development should be prohibited in floodplains and wetlands, should not disrupt natural drainageways, etc. is yes. Preservation of Ag Land is a yes and Provisions of services within the urban growth boundary should be staged to provide for compact urban growth was agreed to.

Phasing in of development:

The landowners develop a master plan for bigger picture items. Future studies – require formal studies to show the impact. Land uses to address in the updated plan are solar: county zoning smaller solar collectors (roof, garage) is a conditional use but larger is PSC (more than 100 mw) not county. Draft policy to adopt a licensing type ordinance for solar project less than 100 mw to encourage joint development agreement and ordinance address the bullet points listed in the presentation and include this into the comp plan. Should this include wind also? More worried about the larger ones coming in. If they are the utility so maybe these are safer than private companies. Solar has not had much resistance. Assurance is they abandoned the site and clean it up? If they don't follow the agreement. Wind has the same mw cutoff. Is this a concern for the Township? Will look at what the Town of Forrest has done regarding this.

Next steps

1. WCWRPC will update future land use map and send to the clerks (just the map) and request feedback.
2. Then incorporate in a draft working plan to be sent by mid-September. One month to review and meet to discuss without WCRP and report feedback back to Susan to prepare for an open house. Open house will be at the town hall. Plan committee meeting after the open house to address remaining items. (do not group as a group unless you post for meeting).

Motion to adjourn at 10:08 pm by Aho, seconded by Johnson. Motion carried.

Megan Dull, Village Clerk