

**LANGLADE COUNTY
WATER AND LAND USE PLANNING COMMITTEE
RESOURCE CENTER, 837 CLERMONT STREET
ANTIGO, WI 54409**

Minutes of Meeting, Tuesday, July 26, 2016 at 3:00 P.M. in the Wolf River Room, Langlade County Resource Building, 837 Clermont Street, Antigo, WI 54409.

1. Meeting called to order at 3:00 P.M.
2. The Committee recited the Pledge of Allegiance.
3. Roll Call: Present: Ron Nye
Don Scupien
Julie Webb
Duff Leaver
Dick Schuh

Also Present: Duane O. Haakenson, Director
Tim Rusch, Surveyor
4. Approval of meeting minutes for June 28, 2016. Motion by, seconded by to approve the meeting minutes for June 28, 2016 as mailed. All voting aye. No nays. Motion Carried.
5. Public comment: None
6. 3:30 P.M. Public Hearing pertaining to Amend the Langlade County Zoning Ordinance Section 17.41 "Floodplain District, Provisions Pertaining to Flooding and Floodplains". See public hearing minutes.
7. Kielcheski CSM Waiver, Tim Rusch, agent: The property is part of an 80 acre parcel owned by Tony and Jane Kielcheski, in the Town of Wolf River, located well off of Hwy 55. The land has been owned by Kielcheski for a number of years and the access to it from the beginning has been an easement over an existing road that runs from Hwy 55 to the south end of this 80. Kielcheski's 80 acres currently has 2 cabins on it, one which he and his wife use in the northern part of the two 40's, and a cabin in the SE corner of the southern 40 that was built by his daughter and her husband. As part of their estate planning and other things, Tony wants to get that cabin owned by his daughter on to its own 7 acre lot. The reason for being here is that the County Ordinance requires to create a new parcel on an easement road that the easement should be 33 ft wide.
 - a. Haakenson: Land Division Ordinance requires for one lot 33 ft wide easement, for two lots or more it needs to be 66 ft wide. 33 ft is the minimum in this case. They want to apply for a waiver from that from the committee because it is existing and unspecified.

b. Rusch: They have an easement, however, the original document doesn't specify a width of that easement, which isn't unusual that some of the old easements didn't specify how wide they were. What Kielcheski is proposing to do is on the proposed new lot where the easement runs through there we will specify that is 66 ft wide so there is no future problems. They are asking for a waiver of that 33ft wide width requirement over the existing easement because it wasn't specified in the original documentation. The road itself is a reasonable road, you can see on the aerial photo that it shows up fairly well. The road varies from 12' to 14' of travel surface.

c. Leaver: What's the purpose of it having to be 33 ft wide? For the Fire Dept?

d. Haakenson: If it's two lots or more we went with the 66 ft because the likelihood of it transforming into multiple residences and getting a culdesac, safety issues. The other thing is when we were first developing plats with private roads it led to all those issues of who maintains the road, how do we find these places in emergencies because signs are posted at the end of the road, so they are not easily identified. So Land Division Ordinance went to those two requirements at that time to try to avoid all these plats being developed on private roads.

e. Rusch: I would add that it's very rare that there would be a cleared 33 ft area it's just that you allow that much space for the easement. County's have found that 33 ft is a good minimum number to actually build a road and be able to maintain it. We have done this a handful of times that I have been involved with. When you come across these the old record didn't have a width specified in it. If we do anything new we are very clear to specify what the easement width is. Some of these easements go back decades.

f. Nye: So the easement on the proposed CSM would be 33 ft?

g. Rusch: Anything new we would do would be in compliance with the county ordinance, and I would say 66 ft to prevent any future problems, but that doesn't change anything that would be done in the future with the rest of it.

h. **Motion** by Schuh, second by Leaver to approve the Kielcheski CSM waiver. By roll call vote, all voting aye, motion carried.

8. 1st Addition to Town of Rolling Cemetery, Tim Rusch, Agent:

Nye: For the record I am stepping away from this one since it has to do with the Town of Rolling.

a. Rusch: A couple months ago we did one for the Town of Antigo, Queen of Peace Cemetery Addition. The reason why we are in front of the board with this is state statute require that cemetery plats be approved by the county board. Quite some time ago the county board and zoning department determined the proper way to get something on the county board agenda regarding cemetery plats was to come through this committee. What we are looking at today is in the Town of Rolling. The public road is Bear Lake Rd on the south end. The existing cemetery is referred to as the Elmhurst Cemetery, or the official name is the Town of Rolling Cemetery, which was laid out in the late 1800's.

I've been working with the town because they wanted to make sure they were comfortable with the existing layout. Over the decades things got out of order and they wanted to make sure where the boundary lines were. At the same time they wanted to create a new area, which in fact there are already gravesites in the new area. We are proposing 43 new lots in the NW corner of the property. One large one committed to a family, the remainder of them are 10x16 which is ample for 4 burial sites in a lot. The process is that this is a Preliminary Plat and if you concur this can get forwarded to the county board for their approval. The Town of Rolling has already ok'd this, so it just goes through the process after getting signed and recorded and the town can go forward and develop this. The town owns the surrounding land to the west and the north. There is plenty of room for future expansion. These additional 43 lots are likely to last for decades. They average 2-3 burials a year in this cemetery.

b. **Motion** by Leaver, second by Schuh to approve the 1st Addition to the Rolling Cemetery. By roll call vote, all voting aye. Motion Carried.

9. Update request to remove name from GIS: Tlusty: Tlusty reviewed this request with Corporation Counsel and Robin asked about the purpose of displaying the property owner's name on the GIS (on-line). If one of the purposes of this information system is to be able to identify who owns the property, then by allowing the redaction or removal of property owner's name (as listed on public records, such as the tax roll), this would defeat a purpose or function of this information system. This system was established for the convenience for people that need that type of information, and it allows people to do research at home or at their office without having to visit county offices. Tlusty noted that we have only this current request in all the years we have had the GIS. If we have a number of requests over the next months or years we could think of developing a policy. It is the position of the Corporation Counsel that the County didn't need to develop a policy at this time. Corporation Counsel noted that if individuals do not want to have their names listed in property ownership records that are maintained by the County and available to the public, then individuals could consider other methods to conceal their identity, such as listing the property ownership as a fictitious name, corporation, LLC, partnership, etc. By following this process, the GIS system would not then display the name of an individual but rather the new name listed as the "owner" of the property. Tlusty planned to advise the requestor to consider following that process, if he did not want his individual name displayed.

Nye: So after discussion, what I am hearing from the committee is to not develop a policy at this point.

10. GIS position: Haakenson: I have worked with R.J. and he has set up interviews for our new full time position. We have 3 interviewees. By policy I need two motions into the record. By policy it's the department head, HR and the oversight committee Chairman. I also would like Dave Tlusty involved because he will be working the closest with this person, and also Andy Faust from Regional Planning who has the technical expertise part of the equation.

a. **Motion** by Webb, seconded by Leaver that Dave Tlusty and Andy Faust be included in the interviews for the GIS position. All voting aye, motion carried.

- b. Haakenson: The other issue RJ said I should talk to you about is right now the policy allows us to go up to step 5 because of experience and qualifications he would like permission to negotiate salary up to step 10. So if we feel one of the candidates has enough experience and is qualified
 - c. **Motion** by Schuh, seconded by Scupien to give Duane permission to negotiate the position above step 5 to 10. All voting aye. Motion carried.
11. Budget: Haakenson: This is a preliminary budget for you to look over. I will come back to you in August for approval. If you look at the numbers our dept made budget by just under a few dollars, for 2017 and 2018.
12. Update on zoning, sanitary, real property listing, land division, and surveying activities:
- a. Enforcement Update: Haakenson: It's been real busy, we will be sending out citations on the delinquent pumping. These are people who have ignored us from last year.
 - b. Activity Update. I have not heard back from the DNR on the Shoreland Ordinance. I will be contacting her, otherwise we won't make the October 1st deadline.
13. Motion by Schuh, seconded by Scupien to adjourn meeting at 4:30 P.M. All voting aye. No nays. Motion Carried.

Julie Webb
Secretary

Duane O. Haakenson
Director Land Records & Regulations

Cc: WLUPC
County Clerk
Parties Involved