

## Appendix B

### Public Participation Plan and Results

# **1 Public Participation Plan for the development of the Town of Delta Comprehensive Plan**

---

## **Introduction**

The Town of Delta will develop a comprehensive plan as defined in section 66.1001 of the Wisconsin Statutes to guide community actions and to promote more informed decision-making regarding land use and related issues. Section 66.1001(4)(a) of the Wisconsin Statutes specifies that local governments preparing a comprehensive plan must adopt written procedures that are:

*“Designed to foster public participation, including open discussion, communication programs, information services and public meetings for which advance notice has been provided, in every stage of the preparation of a comprehensive plan.”*

These written procedures must also:

*“Provide for wide distribution of proposed, alternative, and amended elements of a comprehensive plan, and shall provide an opportunity for written comments on the plan to be submitted by members of the public to the governing body and for the governing body to respond to such written comments.”*

The following Public Participation Plan has been developed by the Town of Delta to foster public participation throughout the comprehensive planning process consistent with the spirit and intent of section 66.1001(4)(a) of the Wisconsin Statutes.

## **Methods of Public Participation**

The Town of Delta will foster public participation through the efforts described below. These efforts will include sharing of plan related information, hosting public outreach activities, and following a plan adoption process that is open and responsive to the citizens of the Town of Delta.

- ◆ Information Sharing and Availability
- Posting of all Plan Commission and Town Board meetings, public informational meetings, and public hearings at the following sites:
  - Town Hall
  - Town Recycling Center
  - The “Delta” Sign

- Publishing the appropriate notices and news releases regarding public informational meetings and public hearings to the official newspaper.
- Plan Commission meetings will be held throughout the planning process. The technical process of drafting the plan will take place in this setting, and all meetings are open to the public. At least seven meetings of the Plan Commission devoted to the development of the Comprehensive Plan are anticipated.
- Project update reports are given to the Town Board at their monthly meetings by the Plan Commission. These meetings are open to the public and are a good source of up-to-date information on the process.
- Keeping materials and documents at the Delta Town Hall and the Iron River Public Library for review by local residents. Contact the Town Clerk for access to the Town Hall to review current working documents and drafts. Official review drafts of the comprehensive plan will also be available at the library as they are completed for distribution.
- Bayfield County will be kept apprised of the planning effort in the Town of Delta. Town planning information shared with the County may be posted on their web site ([www.bayfieldcounty.org](http://www.bayfieldcounty.org)) and available through the "Land Use Planning" link. Minutes and agendas of plan development related meetings will be sent to the Bayfield County Zoning Department.
- Plan distribution will take place with the Plan Commission "recommended" and "final" drafts. Neighboring towns, Bayfield County, the Drummond Area School District and all other required parties will receive copies of the plan as required by the Comprehensive Planning law.
- ◆ Public Outreach Activities
  - A public opinion survey will be mailed to each property owner in the town. The survey will contain questions relative to the required planning elements. The results will be analyzed and used to help guide the plan formulation process.
  - Public informational meeting #1 will be held and is tentatively scheduled for April of 2003. This public meeting will present the background data and maps that have been gathered including the survey results. Growth trends and critical issues that the Town will face over the next 20 to 25 years will be presented. The attendees will also be able to review the vision statement, goals and objectives drafted by the Plan Commission.
  - Public informational meeting #2 will be held and is tentatively scheduled for September of 2003. This meeting will present the draft preferred land use map in addition to draft policies and recommendations for each of the required planning elements. The attendees will be invited to comment on each of these items. The comments received at this meeting will play a significant role in shaping the future recommendations of the Town of Delta Comprehensive Plan.

- A public hearing will be held before the Town Board regarding the Comprehensive Plan. The Plan Commissions' "recommended" draft will be presented, and the public will be invited to comment. Comments received will be taken into consideration by the Town Board as they consider adoption of the plan.
  - Direct mailed meeting invitations will be used to inform Town residents of the public informational meetings and the final public hearing.
  - Written comments will be accepted at any public informational meetings as well as the formal public hearing. The Town of Delta will respond in writing to written comments submitted at the public hearing as specified under section 66.1001(4).
- ◆ Other Potential Activities
- A planning process newsletter could be created to update local residents.
  - A display of draft planning materials could be posted at the town recycling center for viewing by local residents.
  - News releases explaining upcoming public input opportunities could be drafted for printing by local newspapers.
  - Regular office hours could be held at the town hall at critical times in order to give interested individuals opportunities to review draft planning materials.
  - Intergovernmental workshops could be held that include the neighboring communities.
  - Focus group meetings could be held to gain public input on specific planning elements or strategic issues such as future growth, water quality or intergovernmental cooperation.

### **Procedures for Adopting The Town of Delta Comprehensive Plan**

The Town of Delta shall comply with all of the procedures for adopting a comprehensive plan under section 66.1001 (4) of the Wisconsin Statutes.

The Town of Delta Plan Commission will recommend by a majority vote, adoption of a Resolution to Adopt the Comprehensive Plan. The resolution and majority vote will take place at a regularly scheduled and publicly noticed meeting of the Plan Commission. The vote shall be recorded in the official minutes of the Plan Commission. The resolution shall refer to maps and other descriptive materials that relate to one or more elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

In accordance with State Statute 66.1001(4), *Procedures for Adopting Comprehensive Plans*, one copy of the plan recommended for adoption by the Plan Commission will be sent to the following:

1. Every governmental body that is located in whole or in part within the boundaries of the local governmental unit.
2. Every local governmental unit that is adjacent to the local governmental unit which is the subject of the plan.
3. The Wisconsin Land Council and/or Department of Administration
4. The public library that serves the area in which the local governmental unit is located.

Copies of the plan will also be made available for public review at Delta Town Hall. Contact the Town Clerk to gain access to the Town Hall. Citizens will have a minimum, two-week opportunity to review and provide written comments on the Comprehensive Plan. After the Plan Commission has received all written comments, it shall respond in writing to the comments received as specified in State Statute 66.1001(4)(a).

After adoption of a resolution by the Plan Commission, the Town Board will adopt the Comprehensive Plan by ordinance. A majority vote is necessary for adoption. The Town Board will hold at least one public hearing at which the ordinance relating to the Comprehensive Plan will be discussed. The hearing will be preceded by a class 1 notice under ch. 985 that is published at least 30 days before the hearing is held. The class 1 notice shall contain at least the following information:

- ◆ The date, time, and place of the hearing.
- ◆ A summary, which may include a map, of the proposed Comprehensive Plan.
- ◆ The name of an individual employed by the Town Board who may provide additional information regarding the proposed ordinance.
- ◆ Information relating to where and when the proposed comprehensive plan may be inspected before the hearing, and how a copy of the plan may be obtained.

## Town of Delta Public Participation Objectives

---

### Purpose

The Town of Delta Plan Commission set objectives for public participation for the purpose of establishing measurable benchmarks for public involvement in the plan development process. Achieving these objectives will help assure the plan commission and town board that adequate opportunities for public involvement will take place before the plan is considered for adoption. Failure to achieve any of these objectives should be addressed in some manner before considering the plan for adoption.

### Objectives

#### 1. Points of Contact

The Town of Delta Plan Commission will strive to achieve at least 1200 points of contact throughout the planning process. This means that the plan commission hopes that citizens of the town (other than town board and plan commission members) will interact with the planning process at least 1200 times. A range of activities could count toward this objective including: receiving meeting notices, attending meetings, completing surveys or submitting comments.

<u>Potential points of contact</u>	<u>Objective</u>
Mailed public opinion survey	213 (50% return)
Mailed public open house invitations	850 (2 invitations mailed to every household)
Informational meeting attendance	100 (2 public informational meetings)
Plan commission meeting attendance	20 (citizen attendance of regular meetings)
Public hearing attendance	17 (low number indicating that the vast majority of concerns were answered in public informational meetings)
Total:	1200

#### 2. Variety of Methods

The Town of Delta Plan Commission will strive to utilize at least 13 different methods of public outreach. Twelve were identified as mandatory in the public participation plan, and 6 were listed as potential activities. This means that the plan commission will elect at least one of the potential activities to use during the plan development process.

#### 3. Purpose of Methods

The Town of Delta Plan Commission will strive to utilize public outreach methods that cover all levels of involvement from public awareness to public interaction.

Public awareness: To make the public aware of the comprehensive planning process. (Direct mailed informational meeting invitations; Posting and noticing of meetings; Publicly accessible draft documents; Interaction with Bayfield County plan; Plan distribution)

Public education: To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives and/or solution. (Public informational meetings; Plan commission meetings with public comment; Town Board meetings with public comment)

Public input: To obtain public feedback on issues, alternatives and/or decisions. (Public opinion survey; Plan commission meetings with public comment; Town Board meetings with public comment; Public hearing)

Public interaction: To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns are consistently understood and considered. (Public informational meetings; Respond to written comments)

#### **4. Response Rate**

The Town of Delta Plan Commission will strive to respond to 100% of all public comments submitted to the Town Board or Plan Commission regarding development of the comprehensive plan. Verbal comments may be responded to verbally or in writing. Written comments will be responded to in writing.

# Town of Delta Comprehensive Plan Project Public Informational Meeting Results

May 29, 2003

## Introduction

A questionnaire was administered during the May 29<sup>th</sup> Public Informational Meeting at the Delta Town Hall. Each question was explained by the facilitator, and time for discussion was allowed. This helped provide clarification where needed and encouraged an in-depth look at each of the issues presented. Educational materials and displays were also presented with several of the discussion items.

The results of this activity should be viewed as one more piece of the total body of public participation. This format of public participation is advantageous in that the discussion leads to well thought out responses. However, only a small number of people are represented. Fewer people attended the public informational meeting than responded to the public opinion survey, for example. These results alone should not be used to guide development of the plan. They should be used to shape the plan where they are consistent with the results of other public participation. Many of the responses did indeed confirm and clarify the results of the public opinion survey and the work completed to date by the plan commission.

The total number of responses to each question ranged from 29 to 36. Most questions were responded to by at least 32 people. A summary of the responses is presented below and includes the facilitator's recommended action.

### Discussion Questions

1. The town should coordinate with the county and neighboring communities to plan for an aging population's housing needs.

*78 percent of respondents **agreed** with this statement. This should become a town housing policy.*

---

2. The town should promote flexibility in land use controls by exploring incentive based approaches and by allowing mitigation of potential negative impacts to produce win-win outcomes.

*47 percent of respondents **agreed** with this statement, while 28 percent were **unsure**, and 14 percent **disagreed**. The intent of this statement was unclear without specific examples. The concept should be clarified during the discussion of plan implementation and presented again at the next public informational meeting.*

---

3. The town should direct future high density development proposals to areas served by the existing road network.

*52 percent of respondents **agreed**, 20 percent were **unsure** and 28 percent **disagreed**. This needs further discussion, but it may become a potential transportation policy for the town.*

---

4. Future ~~high density~~ small lot\* development proposals that will require schools, emergency services and other community services should be clustered or concentrated rather than scattered.

*53 percent of respondents **disagreed** and 12 percent were **unsure**. This is consistent with the survey results that suggest the overall development pattern should be scattered. The town should not adopt this statement as a land use policy.*

*\* This change was made during the public informational meeting to clarify the question.*

---

5. The town should direct future residential growth to areas that minimize negative impacts to productive forests, farmland and environmentally sensitive areas.

*63 percent of respondents **agreed** with this statement. This confirms results of the public opinion survey. This should become an agricultural, natural and cultural resources policy. The plan commission may want to clarify what "negative impacts" and environmentally sensitive" mean.*

---

6. The town should allow flexibility in lot sizes, but limit maximum density in agriculture and forest preservation areas.

*44 percent of respondents **disagreed**, while 21 percent were **unsure** and 35 percent **agreed**. This response suggests that there should be more consideration given to this concept, but it does not appear to support that portion of the draft definition of the Agriculture Preservation or Resource Conservation preferred land use classifications.*

---

7. The town should encourage the establishment of a "town center" that incorporates existing public facilities and allows for a mix of business, residential and public land uses while strengthening a sense of town identity.

*72 percent of respondents **agreed** with this statement. This supports the town's draft land use goals and objectives and conceptual preferred land use map relative to the proposed town center.*

---

8. The town should require commercial and industrial uses to follow design guidelines that address aesthetic impacts including attractive building style and

materials, prevention of light trespass, landscaping, hidden parking, attractive signage, shared highway access points and functional pedestrian access.

*66 percent of respondents **agreed** with this statement. This supports the town's draft goals and objectives and should become an economic development policy.*

---

9. The town should work cooperatively with Bayfield County to achieve the town's desired future pattern of land use.

*81 percent of respondents **agreed** with this statement and should be reflected in the town's implementation strategy. This appears to strongly refute some of the written comments received in the public opinion survey.*

---

10. The town should consider implementation tools that can be administered by the plan commission with minimal enforcement required.

*83 percent of respondents **agreed** with this statement. This should be a theme in the town's implementation strategy and potentially supports the establishment of town ordinances such as mobile home standards, commercial building design review, and subdivision controls. This is consistent with public opinion survey.*

---

### *Draft Preferred Land Use Map*

Respondents reviewed the following descriptions of the preferred land use classifications and their locations on the conceptual preferred land use map.

#### **Town Center (Multi-colored)**

76 percent **agreed** with the definition, and 61 percent **agreed** with the location. This classification should be carried forward to the next draft of the preferred land use map.

Comments: Should encompass more area. The historical town center would be OK as well.

#### **Shoreland Community (Yellow)**

67 percent **agreed** with the definition, and 76 percent **agreed** with the location. This classification should be carried forward to the next draft of the preferred land use map.

Comments: More land should be included in this classification.

#### **Rural Transition (Orange)**

69 percent **agreed** with the definition, and 62 percent **agreed** with the location. This classification should be carried forward to the next draft of the preferred land use map.

Comments: Preserve agricultural land? Too much directing.

### **Agriculture Preservation (Brown)**

*53 percent **disagreed** with the definition, and opinions on the location were almost evenly split. This area should be classified rural transition, or perhaps it can remain as agriculture preservation if some other method of preserving agriculture is identified.*

Comments: Let the farmers decide what is best for their land.

### **Resource Conservation (Green)**

66 percent **agreed** with the definition, and 72 percent **agreed** with the location. This classification should be carried forward to the next draft of the preferred land use map.

Comments: We need more development.

### *Surface Water Quality Issues*

Surface water quality issues were a focus of the public informational meeting. This activity was intended to provide a broad survey of potential issues that could serve as a starting point for more detailed study at a later date. The results represent the opinions of a few individuals and are not statistically representative of the town as a whole. This information may be useful to the town, to lake associations, or the Department of Natural Resources. Respondents were asked to identify a waterway with which they were most familiar or to consider waterways in the town in general. They were then asked to rate the top 5 issues facing those bodies of water.

For those that chose Town of Delta waterways in general, the top 3 issues were (5 responses):

1. Lack of fish or wildlife.
2. Loss of shoreline vegetation.
3. Balancing use of waterways between quiet uses and powered uses.

For those that identified specific water bodies, the top issues were:

Bass Lake (1 response)

1. Balancing use of waterways between quiet uses and powered uses.
2. Permanent ice houses.
3. Erosion of banks.

Basswood Lake (2 responses)

1. Balancing use of waterways between quiet uses and powered uses.
2. Failing septic systems.
3. Controlling aquatic plants or “weeds.”

Bellevue Lake (2 responses)

1. Balancing use of waterways between quiet uses and powered uses.
2. Failing septic systems.
3. Loss of shoreline vegetation.

Camp One Lake (1 response)

1. No issues. This lake is perfect.
2. Adequacy of public access.
3. Appearance and character of development.

Delta Lake (2 responses)

1. Balancing use of waterways between quiet uses and powered uses.
2. Rate of new shoreline development.
3. Lack of fish or wildlife.

Eagle and Flynn Lakes (1 response)

1. Balancing use of waterways between quiet uses and powered uses.
2. Lack of enforcement of no wake zones.
3. Loss of shoreline vegetation.

Hart Lake (1 response)

1. No issues. This lake is perfect.
2. Lack of fish or wildlife.

Line and Black Bear Lakes (1 response)

1. No issues. This lake is perfect.

Phantom Lake (1 response)

1. Controlling construction site erosion.
2. Rate of new shoreline development.

Pike Lake Chain (9 responses)

1. Failing septic systems
2. Invasion of exotic species
3. No issues. This lake is perfect.

White River (3 responses)

1. No issues. This river is perfect.
2. Lack of fish or wildlife.
3. Appearance and character of development.

## **Town of Delta Comprehensive Plan Project Public Informational Meeting Results**

August 28, 2003

### **Introduction**

The second of 2 planned public informational meetings was held at the Delta Town Hall on August 28. As was the procedure for the first public informational meeting, all property owners in the Town of Delta were mailed an

invitation to the meeting. Included with this mailing was a "Frequently Asked Questions" document that addressed many of the questions that Plan Commission members had been hearing in the community since the first public informational meeting.

This public informational meeting had a more open format than the first one. There were no questionnaires. The presented material was followed by an open discussion period. Those attending could ask questions related to any aspect of the presented materials or the planning process as a whole. After the presentation and discussion period ended, attendees were encouraged to stay and review the available draft plan products including:

- ◆ Draft Preferred Land Use Classifications
- ◆ Draft Preferred Land Use Map
- ◆ Draft Plan Element Policies and Recommendations
- ◆ Draft Implementation Strategy and Programs
- ◆ May 29, 2003 Public Informational Meeting Results (including Surface Water Quality Issues results)

The results of this meeting should be viewed as one more piece of the total body of public participation. This format of public participation is advantageous in that an open ended discussion allows all items of interest to be raised. However, only a small number of people are represented. Fewer people attended the public informational meeting than responded to the public opinion survey, for example. These results alone should not be used to guide development of the plan. They should be used to shape the plan where they are consistent with the results of other public participation. Overall, the discussion showed support for the work completed to date by the Plan Commission. Concerns raised were primarily related to the town's relationship to the State of Wisconsin, Regional Plan Commissions, and the Comprehensive Planning Law (Wis. Stats. 66.1001).

## Results

The topics presented and discussed focused on the draft implementation strategy. This included draft policies, recommendations, an action plan, and all other programs needed to put the plan in motion after adoption. How the plan can be used by the Town Board was a central component of the presentation. Questions were solicited during both the presentation period and the open discussion period. However, very few suggestions for changes to the content of the plan were offered. The facilitator collected the questions and comments, and the Plan Commission responded to them in its next meeting. The public comments and Plan Commission responses are recorded below:

1. The policy "Road building should be discouraged..." should also state that it "Does not apply to private roads."

Plan Commission Response: This actually should apply to private roads. Certain private roads have the potential to become costly expansions of the town road network. Keeping in mind that this is a loose guideline that applies in the Agriculture and Resource Conservation areas, the Plan Commission suggests the following alternative change - Add "Roads that serve multiple improved properties may be constructed to town standards, and private access points shall conform to the Town of Delta Driveway Ordinance."

2. An implementation policy should be added that states "Bayfield County should be required to provide detailed written explanation when they do not uphold a town recommendation on a land use decision."

Plan Commission Response: This issue is important, but the suggested wording adds a negative tone to the plan. The Plan Commission suggests that the Intergovernmental Cooperation objectives are modified to include - "Work toward improving the completeness of Bayfield County's decision record regarding land use decisions that affect the Town of Delta." The county Zoning Department already provides a copy of the Zoning Committee's decision record to the town, but it lacks detail. A cooperative approach will likely go further toward improving communication with the county. It is hoped that the Town of Delta, by utilizing its conditional use/special use review criteria, will have even fewer instances of disagreement between the town recommendations and the county's decision. The town's reasoning for its decision will be even more clear to the county.

3. Designate an industrial area in the town.

Plan Commission Response: Thus far, the draft land use plan neither encourages nor prevents industrial development. Nor does the town anticipate significant industrial growth over the next 20 years. The Plan

Commission does not think there is a need to single out any areas for industrial development, but that the "Characteristics of Desired Economic Development" should be used as guidance on industrial development proposals. Any such development must go through the existing channels of zoning, and this guidance will be included in the plan document for use by the town board as needed.

4. There is already a mobile home park in the town, so preventing future mobile home parks may be complicated.

Plan Commission Response: This is a valid concern that should be addressed in the plan. The Plan Commission suggests that the description of the mobile home ordinance (within the Implementation Strategy) should include provisions for the grandfathering of existing mobile home parks.

5. A bicycle ordinance is needed in the town.

Plan Commission Response: What exactly needs to be regulated about riding bicycles? At this point, the Plan Commission does not recommend regulating bicycles.