

Plan Commission
Meeting Agenda June 23, 2020
6:30 pm
Teleconference



Please join my meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.
<https://zoom.us/j/94988750431?pwd=K3kxNE1RaGFzT1FnZG1JUGt0Y0h1UT09>

Meeting ID: 949 8875 0431
Password: 395138
Dial in by using +1 (312) 626-6799 US

1. Call to order.
2. Approval of May 19, 2020 meeting minutes.
3. Discussion of proposed Comprehensive Plan Update Schedule.
4. Discussion and recommendation of Comprehensive Plan Public Participation Plan.
5. Future agenda items.
6. Adjournment.

Dated at Shorewood, Wisconsin, this 19th day of June, 2020

Village of Shorewood
Sara Bruckman, Village Clerk, CMC, WCMC

Should you have any questions or comments regarding any item on this agenda, please contact Bart Griepentrog, Planning Director, Planning & Development Department, at (414) 847-2640.
Upon reasonable notice, efforts will be made to accommodate the needs of disabled individuals.

It is possible that members of and possibly a quorum of members of other governmental bodies of the municipality may be in attendance at the above stated meeting to gather information; no action will be taken by any governmental body at the above stated meeting other than the governmental body specifically referred to above in this notice.



Plan Commission Meeting Minutes

May 19, 2020

3930 N. Murray Ave. Village of Shorewood, WI 53211

DRAFT

1. Call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 6:46 p.m.

President Allison Rozek	No
Trustee Kathy Stokebrand (Acting Chair)	Aye
Leah Blankenship	No
Eric Couto	Aye
Tim Hansmann	No
Therese Klein	Aye
Barbara Kiely Miller	Aye
Sangeeta Patel	Aye
Daniel Wycklendt (arrived after item 3)	Aye

2. Approval of February 25, 2020 meeting minutes.

Mr. Couto moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Ms. Kiely Miller. Vote 4-0 to approve; Trustee Stokebrand abstained as she was not a part of the meeting in February.

3. Discussion and recommendation of consultant selection for Comprehensive Plan Update

Building Inspector Burris introduced the item per the memo that was provided to the Plan Commission.

The RFP was published and responses were received in March/April. Interviews and reviews were delayed about a month due to COVID restrictions and happened on May 14th. The interview panel participants were Mr. Griepentrog, Trustee Stokebrand, President Rozek and Village Manager Ewald. Village Manager Ewald and President Rozek were unable to attend as other commitments arose due to the Supreme Court decision regarding the statewide stay at home order occurring that day.

Mr. Griepentrog and Trustee Stokebrand conducted the interviews and completed score sheets based on criteria within the RFP and an added category for the interview quality. Both independently scored the interviews and came up with the same results.

Ms. Kiely Miller wanted to hear their results first before discussion.

Mr. Griepentrog said the proposals were received from JSD Professional Services, Inc. and Vandewalle & Associates, Inc. Each were scored on the following; quality and content of the proposal, experience and technical competence, familiarity of the consultant with the types of issues encountered on a project like this, an understanding of their approach to our project, the interview, the project timeline and cost. With that JSD Professional Services scored an 86 (out of 100) and Vandewalle & Associates scored a 92.75 with Vandewalle being the selection based on the score sheet.

Mr. Griepentrog said Vandewalle scored higher because of their experience in this area (geographically they have done comprehensive planning work in the North Shore) and a wide base of Wisconsin comprehensive planning experience, they clearly

specified the project tasks and person responsible for them and they have a small team that would do most of the work with us. Mr. Griepentrog reminded the Commissioners that village staff would do two-thirds of the chapters and the consultant would do the last third. Vandewalle has done plans like this in the past which included working with staff.

JSD had not provided similar experience and Vandewalle also understood the concept of a second generation comp plan knowing that many communities in Wisconsin did this ten years ago and that there was more of a desire to reconfirm and reestablish some things. Vandewalle also discussed an ability to acknowledge controversial projects and its impact on the community.

Mr. Griepentrog said there was nothing wrong with JSD in particular but added they had lost their project leader (left for a new job) between the time of submitting their proposal and the interview. They did not have a lot of Wisconsin comprehensive planning experience but had more master planning experience. They had two landscape architects on their team which the village could've found a way to use them but their expertise is more with physical planning activity than comprehensive planning activity.

Mr. Griepentrog and Trustee Stokebrand scored both the interviews and both came back with the recommendation of selecting Vandewalle & Associates, Inc.

Mr. Wycklendt joined the meeting at this time.

Ms. Kiely Miller asked if the person who left JSD was Amanda Arnold, their Senior Planner. Mr. Griepentrog stated yes. Ms. Kiely Miller noted she had only been with the company for a year and that that had been a concern of hers. She said one thing she did like about JSD was that a member of their team had experience with historical planning. One thing she did not like with the Vandewalle proposal was that it started off discussing redevelopment opportunities, infill and working with real estate people versus what the residents want. With the Village being so small this could be different than working with a larger municipality. Mr. Griepentrog said that during the interview Vandewalle discussed a controversial project in Lake Geneva and how they had a meeting to discuss it and get the feelings regarding the project. He felt this first meeting which tackled the topic head on so they could understand it. When the land use chapter gets worked on this could be valuable experience for them going forward. Ms. Kiely Miller said that it was ten years since the current plan was completed there has been a lot of redevelopment projects and lessons from them will need to be reviewed along with what was learned from the traffic and parking study done last year. Mr. Griepentrog said that redevelopment opportunities were not asked for but that it is a typical standard thing most municipalities ask for. She liked that the proposals addressed how to do online participation. Both teams did virtual interviews and both were up to speed on facilitating online meetings.

Ms. Kiely Miller said that Vandewalle has somebody on staff involved with GIS mapping and suggested the Village use their own consultant and they would just advise. She asked if this would increase the cost above the \$30,000 the Village Board approved. Mr. Griepentrog said that the Village already has a GIS consultant on contract but if for some reason there is a request for extensive maps beyond what is typical then cost could increase. This would be a special request not the typical.

Ms. Kiely Miller asked what the Plan Commission's role will be with the consultant. Mr. Griepentrog said monthly meetings at their regular time being the first level or review prior to any formal presentation. The Plan Commission will be involved in all the reviews before it is presented. The materials may not come from the consultant each time but from staff presenting it at meetings.

Trustee Stokebrand said she reached out to some references the Vandewalle gave and when reaching out to a reference from City of Greenfield she said they were very happy with the work Vandewalle did and that they exceeded their expectations. Another reference from the City of Brookfield spoke highly of them. She asked him specifically about land use, the intergovernmental component and the issues and opportunities and he reiterated that they worked very well especially with the intergovernmental component. He said the coordination with governmental groups helped move their update along smoothly.

Mr. Couto said he was ok making the recommendation and asked if it was needed to make a motion. Mr. Griepentrog said he would prefer a motion but it was not placed on the agenda as a consideration.

Ms. Klein asked if the costs were similar. Mr. Griepentrog said JSD's cost was \$27,500 and it was itemized based on staff and projects. Vandewalle's was \$30,000 not to exceed cost. Ms. Kiely Miller noted JSD's cost did not include presentation to the Board or committees so that could increase their costs.

Mr. Couto moved to recommend to the Village Board Vandewalle & Associates for the Shorewood Comprehensive Plan Update, seconded by Mr. Wycklendt. A roll call vote was taken: Mr. Couto – Aye, Ms. Patel – Aye, Ms. Klein – Aye, Ms. Kiely Miller – Aye, Trustee Stokebrand – Aye, and Mr. Wycklendt - Aye. Vote 6-0.

4. Review of 2019 Plan Commission Annual Report and Future Initiatives

Building Inspector Burris introduced the item per the memo that was provided to the Plan Commission. This is an annual report and initiative submission and it will be reviewed by the Village Board in June. What is important is the confirmation of initiatives. The three initiatives identified are to revise the off-street parking requirements, review the zoning map and update the special privilege policy and ordinance.

Ms. Kiely Miller reviewed the list the committee had previously and asked about historic properties and districts and moving forward with that. Mr. Griepentrog said that was designated as one of the Village Manager's initiatives and she will include the Plan Commission when necessary. She said revising the sign code was another. Mr. Griepentrog said it is already in his work plan and he is prioritizing it when he has time to work on it. He meets quarterly with the village manager to go over his work plan. She said other initiative had been to research and revise conditional permitted and prohibited uses. Mr. Griepentrog said he'd be happy to add that initiative if the Commission feels it should be. The initiative to research/revise zoning code relative to site design standards didn't go anywhere last discussion either. She didn't know if this would come up during the comprehensive plan. Mr. Griepentrog said this would be a pretty big discussion and was held off until after the comprehensive plan was completed.

Trustee Stokebrand asked if the review of the sign code refers to commercial. Mr. Griepentrog said yes. She said there is nothing wrong with adding the items to the list and having that list even if they are not acted on. Mr. Griepentrog said he understands that perspective but when this process began in 2018 many committees submitted a lot of items and it made the board's discussion of them quite difficult and nothing was selected. Last year's submission was shorter (up to three as opposed to nine) as a way to help the process.

Ms. Patel asked if it is clear that the topic of off-street parking requirements included businesses and when businesses are before them for conditional uses if they are accounting for parking properly. Mr. Griepentrog asked if the question was whether the parking requirement initiative was specific to commercial occupancies. Ms. Patel said

yes. She wanted to be clear this was an aspect of off-street parking and not just residential parking. Ms. Patel said each time a special exception is given for parking it is not clear if they are over budgeting when granting them (multiple parking exceptions for one specific area). Trustee Stokebrand said that in general the goal of the Village Board will be to simplify and streamline the code and include both residential and commercial. Mr. Griepentrog said this has been discussed a number of times and during the traffic study and it is written in an open format so anything residential and commercial can be included. He feels the code is too strict which is why special exceptions are required. Mr. Couto asked what the traffic and parking study came back with in regards to parking for commercial. The consultant didn't provide a recommendation on this and mentioned it is a local policy decision. It would be up to the commission and planner to review the code and parking requirements. Mr. Couto asked what you fall back on without any recommendations or guidelines when you have ran out of viable parking options in an area. Mr. Griepentrog said that the village would have to come up with their own recommendations and the problem with the current regulations is that they are based on commercial occupancy and the renovation of a space. Trustee Stokebrand asked if regulations take into account public parking structures. Mr. Griepentrog said the regulations do not. His biggest issue with the parking regulations is what triggers the review; renovation of a space. If someone doesn't renovate a space there is no discussion about parking but if you renovate into a different use that triggers a parking review. Mr. Couto said he agrees the half and half review makes no sense. Mr. Griepentrog said the only rewording he would suggest would be to change it to "revise commercial off-street parking requirements".

Ms. Klein asked if there was anything new to add possibly regarding in-home businesses and if the zoning needs to change to accommodate that. Ms. Kiely Miller asked if she was referring to one person who works out of their home (i.e. graphic designer) or one who runs a business where clients are coming into the home. Ms. Klein said all of those scenarios she is asking about. Mr. Griepentrog said there is a section of the code that references home-based businesses with limitations which could be reviewed and expanded if need be. He has no problem adding it to the list but would like to prioritize items.

Similarly, accessory dwelling units was a topic that came up during the housing study as a way to expand housing options. He said the CDA is the village's housing authority but the topic of accessory dwelling units is under the zoning code. It could be a shared initiative between the CDA and Plan Commission. Mr. Couto asked how it would be a shared effort. Mr. Griepentrog said that the CDA is responsible for the policies and priorities regarding housing as they are the Village's housing authority and if they wanted the Village to expand housing opportunities one way to do that would be through accessory dwelling units and that would be a change to the zoning code which is the Plan Commission that oversees those changes.

Mr. Griepentrog summarized that he would be adding the review of the conditional, permitted and prohibited uses, to research the zoning code for setback and form based requirements, review home-based business regulations and to expand housing opportunities within the zoning code. Ms. Kiely Miller said this all depends on staff workloads and said they can add items but some may not get addressed. Mr. Griepentrog said they can add additional initiatives but to prioritize them. He said he would recommend keeping the top three items on the list in the order they are presented and would add the other suggestions after that. Trustee Stokebrand said that home-based businesses would be a timely initiative but that the economy may need to shake out before to see if in six months if people are still not working in offices. Mr. Griepentrog

said his suggested order for the remaining topics would be home-based businesses, accessory dwelling units/housing opportunities, conditional uses and zoning code review. Mr. Couto asked Mr. Griepentrog's opinion of the zoning code as it is written and how long it can keep being pushed off before it becomes an issue. Mr. Griepentrog said the chapter is woefully outdated but as a built out community it isn't utilized as much as one would think it is. He said it does need to get worked on though. Ms. Klein asked if it could be reviewed in sections. Mr. Griepentrog said he would separate it out between residential and commercial and felt the residential could be reviewed fairly quickly. The commercial section would take more time and he suggested a form-based code which would dictate the type of construction, storefront visibility and how buildings interact with the public realm. He feels this would be a huge benefit but would require a consultant with expertise to review that section. He suggested that this could be a proposal in the land use chapter of the comprehensive plan as a goal of the community to revise the zoning code because there would be more standing with documenting it in the comprehensive plan and then acting on it. Trustee Stokebrand asked if form-based code for commercial development/zoning be controversial. Mr. Griepentrog said the intent of form-based code is to remove the controversy and make things more specific. He said the City of Milwaukee has it in several commercial districts and it is a very useful tool that makes it clear what the community expects and wants. Ms. Patel said they have discussed in the past wanting more uniformity in the commercial district and form-based code could help with that.

Ms. Kiely Miller said reviewing the zoning map is her number one initiative and that Attorney Bayer has explained to them that with recent legislative changes if a project meets the code requirements it has to be approved even if as a commission they don't like it. If projects meet code they only have so much to stand on the say no and reviewing the zoning map would help. Mr. Griepentrog stated this discussion should take place during the update of the land use chapter in the comprehensive plan but is leaving it on the Plan Commission's initiatives in case the specificity of the discussion is not satisfactory during the update.

Mr. Couto wants the commission to be more proactive than reactive and to start digging into other items/topics.

Ms. Kiely Miller suggested adding the request for a planning intern to help with the work load. Mr. Griepentrog said this was an intention but with the current COVID situation (cost and concerns) it is not likely. He is having the discussion with the Village Manager.

Mr. Couto moved to accept the seven committee initiatives as discussed, seconded by Ms. Kiely Miller. A roll call vote was taken: Mr. Couto – Aye, Ms. Klein – Aye, Ms. Kiely Miller – Aye, Trustee Stokebrand – Aye, and Mr. Wycklendt – Aye. Vote 5-0.

5. Update on 2020 Census

Building Inspector Burris introduced the item per the memo that was provided to the Plan Commission. The Census Bureau has expanded the collection period that was to expire July 31st. The collection period now expires October 31st and is in part due to not being able to go door to door for follow up and get responses. The role of the Complete Count Committee has been therefore extended two months. There has been a weekly teleconference with Milwaukee County suburban communities to discuss response rates and those numbers were included in the meeting materials. With Shorewood's higher number of rental properties than many other communities the Village's response rate is good.

A first attempt to reach out to hard to count population (renters, seniors, young families) is to contact multi-family property owners asking them to post within common spaces a poster about the census encouraging their response. Having healthy numbers benefits the community in the long run so anything the committee can think of to encourage response is welcomed.

Trustee Stokebrand said we have no way to know who is responding or which demographic is not responding and asked if there was any feedback on that. Mr. Griepentrog said that in the materials response rates per Census Tracts. Tract 803 is the east side of the village mainly single family homeowners with the highest response. Tract 804 is the southwest quadrant that includes a large number of renters and has the lowest response rate. It is easy to identify that the missing responses are from multi-family buildings. The best way to get responses is to have the census workers go door to door but that will not occur to August. Trustee Stokebrand added that a lot could be UWM students and with that Mr. Griepentrog said when responding to the census you are supposed to use your primary residence as of April 1st. If an individual is a student and hasn't responded yet they could've moved recently to a different location and determining who lived at addresses as of April 1st could be difficult.

Ms. Kiely Miller asked if the poster that will be posted is the one in the materials with all the different phone numbers. Mr. Griepentrog said yes. She felt this would be useful because there is a number of Russian speaking residents in the village. She did state that she posted this flyer to multiple social media accounts to promote it.

Ms. Patel said that when she responded to the census there was a specific code required to do so. She asked if there are any instructions for finding your unique code if you no longer have it at the time you want to respond. Mr. Griepentrog said he was not sure how it all worked but that on the flyer/poster under 1. Respond Online it says "*if you do not have an invitation to respond, simply indicate that you do not have a Census ID and then enter the address for which you are responding*".

Mr. Griepentrog stated he has been working with the Senior Resource Center on this as well and that Elizabeth Price has posted the flyer/poster in multiple locations as well.

Mr. Couto asked if there will be any community wide mailings about this in the coming months. Mr. Griepentrog stated there is an article that will be in the upcoming Shorewood Today publication in June/July. It has been in manager memos and social media posts also.

6. Future agenda items.

Mr. Griepentrog stated the comprehensive plan updates will be coming back monthly. There are no other applications on hand at the moment.

7. Adjournment.

Mr. Couto moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:04 p.m., seconded by Ms. Klien. Vote to adjourn 6-0.

Recorded by,



Crystal Kopydlowski
Planning Department Administrative Clerk

**Village of Shorewood
Comprehensive Plan Update
Preliminary Project Schedule
June 16, 2020**

Target Date

Task 1.8	Ongoing Project Management	Ongoing
Task 1.2	Provide Content for Project Website and Social Media	Ongoing
Task 1.1	Finalize Public Participation Plan & Materials	16-Jun
	Review Existing Conditions and Previous Planning Efforts - Begin	18-Jun
Task 2.1	Kickoff Meeting with Village Staff	23-Jun
	Send stakeholder invitations	TBD
Task 1.1	Recommend Public Participation Plan - Plan Commission Meeting	23-Jun
Task 1.1	Adopt Public Participation Plan - Village Board Meeting	6-Jul
Task 2.2	Send Updated Data & Memo (for Issues & Opps Chapter)	13-Jul
Task 1.3	Public Open House (Provide Overview of Comprehensive Plan Update)	week of July 13
Task 1.4	Stakeholder Interviews	week of July 13
	Village-V&A meeting on Draft 1 and Maps	mid July
Task 3.5	Direct Changes to Required Maps	31-Jul
Task 3.1	Update Issues & Opportunities Chapter	31-Jul
Task 3.2	Update Land Use Chapter	31-Jul
Task 3.3	Update Intergovernmental Cooperation Chapter	31-Jul
	Village-V&A meeting on Village-led chapters & PC Prep	mid August
Task 3.4	Assist with Chapters Led by Village Staff	25-Aug
	additional changes to required maps	25-Aug
	Plan Commission Meeting (Present Draft Plan) - Village-led Chapters	25-Aug
	Village-V&A meeting on V&A-led chapters & PC Prep	early September
	finalize V&A chapters & send to Village	early September
	Village-V&A meeting on public engagement meeting	mid September
Task 1.6	Plan Commission Meeting (Present Draft Plan) - V&A-led Chapters	Special meeting- September
Task 1.5	Public Engagement Meeting	mid October
	Complete Draft of Plan for Plan Commission	29-Oct
Task 1.7	Plan Commission Meeting 2 (Present Final Plan and Recommendation of Plan)	24-Nov
	Required 30-Day Public Review Period	Nov. 25-Jan 3
Task 4.1	Village Board Presentation, Public Hearing , and Adoption	4-Jan
Task 4.2	Required Notifications	early January
Task 4.3	Production of Final Adopted Comprehensive Plan (15 color copies and 1 digital)	early January

RESOLUTION – 2020 - 20

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN
FOR THE UPDATE OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
VILLAGE OF SHOREWOOD, WISCONSIN

WHEREAS, the Village of Shorewood on January 18, 2011 adopted the Village of Shorewood Comprehensive Plan under the authority of and procedures established by §66.1001(4), Wisconsin Statutes; and

WHEREAS, that Comprehensive Plan document advises both the regular Plan Commission review of the Comprehensive Plan, as well as the ability to respond to unique circumstances which arise in relation to the Comprehensive Plan which are distinct from the regular plan review process, and to enable the Village’s consideration of potential amendments and updates where the Plan becomes irrelevant or contradictory to emerging policy or trends; and

WHEREAS, §66.1001(4)(a), Wisconsin Statutes, requires that the governing body of the local governmental unit adopt written procedures designed to foster public participation at every stage of the comprehensive plan preparation or update process, and that such written procedures shall provide for wide distribution of draft plan materials, an opportunity for the public to submit written comments on the plan materials, and a process for the governing body to respond to such comments; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Shorewood believes that meaningful public involvement in processes designed to consider and update its Comprehensive Plan is important to assure that the resulting Plan meets the wishes and expectations of the public; and

WHEREAS, the attached “Public Participation Plan: Village of Shorewood Comprehensive Plan Update” includes procedures to foster public participation, ensure distribution of draft plan materials, provide opportunities for written comments on such materials, and provide mechanisms to respond to such comments.; and

WHEREAS, at a duly noticed public meeting held on June 23, 2020, the Village of Shorewood Plan Commission recommended that the Shorewood Village Board adopt the attached “Public Participation Strategy and Procedures for the Village of Shorewood Comprehensive Plan Update” as its public participation procedures for updating the Village’s Comprehensive Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Village Board of the Village of Shorewood hereby adopts the procedures included in the “Public Participation Plan: Village of Shorewood Comprehensive Plan Update” as its public participation procedures for periodic amendments to the Village’s Comprehensive Plan, meeting the requirements of §66.1001(4)(a), Wisconsin Statutes.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Village Board of the Village of Shorewood, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin, this 6th day of July, 2020.

Allison Rozek, Village President

Countersigned:

Sara Bruckman, CMC/WCMC, Village Clerk

DRAFT
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN
VILLAGE OF SHOREWOOD
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
JUNE 2020

Introduction

A key required component of Wisconsin's comprehensive planning legislation, Section 66.1001 of Wisconsin Statutes, is actively involving community stakeholders as the local comprehensive plan is being developed, updated, or amended. Public participation helps to ensure that the resulting comprehensive plan accurately reflects the vision, goals, and values of citizens of the community.

Section 66.1001(4)(a) of Wisconsin Statutes requires the Village of Shorewood to adopt, by resolution, written procedures designed to foster public participation at every stage in the preparation, update, or subsequent amendment of its comprehensive plan. The written procedures must provide for wide distribution of the comprehensive plan, an opportunity for the public to submit written comments on the plan, and provisions for local response to such comments.

This document meets this statutory requirement. It serves as the procedures that will be used to guide the required ten-year update to the Village's Comprehensive Plan, which was adopted on January 18, 2011.

Major Goals of Public Participation Strategy

- Provide opportunities for members of the public to participate in processes to consider and adopt an updated comprehensive plan.
- Adopt an updated plan that reflects the ideas, desires, and objectives of most residents and property owners.
- Meet both the letter and spirit of Wisconsin's comprehensive plan legislation.
- Utilize the Village's Plan Commission to guide the plan update process.
- Recognize that the goals expressed above must be balanced with the need to complete the comprehensive plan update within a reasonable timeframe.

Selected Public Participation Techniques

The Village will, at a minimum, use the following techniques to obtain public input during the plan update process:

- Hold one public open house to provide an overview of the planning process and collect input on the Comprehensive Plan update. This meeting will be conducted online, open to the public, and advertised in advance.
- Hold one public meeting to review the draft plan. This meeting will be conducted online, open to the public, and advertised in advance.

- Assure that all Plan Commission and Village Board meetings to consider and adopt the updated plan will be open to the public and noticed as required by State open meeting regulations.
- Hold focus groups with key stakeholders identified by the Village.
- Provide an opportunity at each public meeting held on the Comprehensive Plan update for public comment. The public comment period will be provided at either the beginning or end of each public meeting, or at one or more other parts of the meeting at the discretion of the Plan Commission or Village Board. This will allow the Commission or Council to concentrate on completing tasks without interruption, while still allowing the public an appropriate chance to observe and comment.
- Maintain a timely and informative website regarding the planning process, plan drafts, and upcoming public meetings. The website will be housed on the Village website and will include opportunities for public comment.
- Engage in digital public outreach through Village social media channels.
- Hold at least one formal public hearing on the proposed Comprehensive Plan update and the adopting ordinance prior to adoption. All members of the public will have an opportunity to present testimony and offer comments at the public hearing. The public hearing will be noticed and held per the requirements of Wisconsin Statutes, Section 66.1001.

Opportunities for Comments/Responses on Draft Comprehensive Plan

The Village will have copies of draft plan materials available at Village Hall and the Library during normal business hours. The Village will also provide copies of the final plan to adjacent and overlapping governments and non-metallic mineral interests as required by statute, and to members of the public as requested. The Village may charge for public copies an amount equal to the costs of time and materials to produce such copies.

Public comments will be solicited and responded to at every stage of the plan update process. Written comments on the comprehensive plan update may also be delivered, mailed, or emailed to the Village Clerk. The Village will respond to written comments via mail, email, telephone, meeting, and/or through consideration of appropriate changes to the draft comprehensive plan.