



PLANNING & PARKS DEPARTMENT

Andrew T. Struck, Director

<https://ozaukeecounty.gov/540/Planning-Parks>

MEETING AGENDA
COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING BOARD
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2025 AT 10:00 A.M.*
***(OR 10 MINUTES FOLLOWING CONCLUSION OF THE COUNTY BOARD MEETING, WHICHEVER IS LATER)**
OZAUKEE COUNTY ADMINISTRATON CENTER, ROOM A-200
(121 West Main Street, Port Washington, WI 53074)
Agenda Packet: <https://ozaukeecounty.gov/2107/Comprehensive-Plan-Board>

Bruce Ross, Chairperson
Thomas Richart, Vice-Chairperson
Rob Holyoke, Scott Rishel, and Timothy Maguire
Dan Vogel (Alternate)

1. Call to Order

A regular meeting of the Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB) was held at the Ozaukee County Administration Center in Room A-200. Chairperson Ross called the meeting to order at 10:15 AM.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
B. Ross	Chairperson, Supervisor, District 19	Present	10:07 AM
T. Maguire	Supervisor, District 15	Present	10:07 AM
R. Holyoke	Supervisor, District 22	Present	10:05 AM
T. Richart	Vice-Chairperson, Supervisor, District 12	Present	10:12 AM
D. Vogel	Alternate – Supervisor, District 10	Absent	-

Staff present: Andrew Struck, Director – Planning and Parks Department; Brittany Whyte, Conservation Biologist (Planning) – Planning and Parks Department

Others present: Robbie Robinson, Senior Planner – Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC)

2. Assurance that the Meeting has been Properly Noticed / Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Struck provided assurance that the meeting was properly noticed.

3. Public Comments, Correspondence and Written Communications

Chairperson Ross asked if there were any public comments.

Mr. Struck stated that no written communication or correspondence was received.

There were no additional public comments at the meeting.

4. Approval of Minutes (July 16, 2025)

Motion made Supervisor Holyoke, seconded by Supervisor Maquire, that the July 16, 2025, minutes be approved as written. A voice vote was taken. Motion carried unanimously.

5. REVIEW, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION – A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050 (3rd Edition)

- a. Review, Discussion and POSSIBLE ACTION – CHAPTER 4, Public Involvement for A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050**
 - i. Meetings/Correspondence with Municipalities (Town of Port Washington, City of Mequon, etc.)**

Chairperson Ross introduced agenda item 5a.

Mr. Struck provided an update about recent communications that staff have had with some of the Ozaukee County municipalities. Formal communication from the Town of Port Washington is included on page 11 of the agenda packet, saying that the Town of Port Washington is not interested in participating in the Farmland Preservation Plan (FPP). The thoughts expressed in the letter are similar to those from the last time Mr. Struck had discussed with the Town of Port Washington for the previous FPP. They decided not to designate any farmland preservation areas. Mr. Struck had a discussion with the City of Mequon; they have also declined to participate. Their main concern was needing to change their zoning. They have an existing eligible zoning district, but it's not currently used or mapped (A-1). They are not looking at conducting any rezoning. Currently all the agricultural land in the City of Mequon is represented by an overlay zoning district; therefore, this would not meet the state requirements unless rezoned.

Chairperson Ross asked what would be required of the City of Mequon in order to participate in the FPP.

Mr. Struck stated that their current zoning has an eligible zoning code, but no parcels are currently designated. They would need to include (through a rezoning) eligible parcels in the eligible zoning district (A-1) and it could not be a farmland overlay district. Furthermore, the City of Mequon staff said that no residents/landowners have come to them with an inquiry to participate in the FPP. It was a conversation between City of Mequon planning staff and the City of Mequon Mayor. They decided that if changes to zoning were required (update to the zoning map), they would not participate.

Supervisor Holyoke asked if the Town of Belgium will be the only participant for this FPP edition.

Mr. Struck stated that he has tried to contact elected officials and consulting staff at the Town of Saukville but hasn't heard anything back and assumes that they are not interested in participating. Also, there is now apparently a group in the Town of Belgium discussing about whether the Town of Belgium should participate or not participate in the FPP. They have had some zoning issue concerns, and some residents think the State requirements for zoning may be too restrictive. The Town of Belgium leadership is still on-board with the plan and designating FPAs, but they are continuing to discuss. The Town of Belgium is already included in the existing FPP, so this would be a continuation of their participation in the new FPP.

Chairperson Ross asked if Ozaukee County would still need to update the FPP if none of the municipalities decide to participate.

Mr. Struck stated that the plan wouldn't need to be certified by DATCP (for the State FP Program), in theory, but there's still a lot of valuable inventory and information as well as other non-State program priorities in the FPP. So, not all is lost, even if the Town of Belgium decides not to participate. Staff and SEWRPC will plan to forge ahead and have the plan adopted by County Board. The plan will also provide supporting planning for other State and Federal programs and grant funding (not necessarily through DATCP). If no municipalities participate, Ozaukee County will continue to use other areas of the plan that are not part of the State Farmland Preservation program; however, Ozaukee County will likely need to wait 10 years before

updating the plan again for participating municipalities.

Chairperson Ross mentioned that there's the state component of the FPP, but CPB members must also consider what Ozaukee County wants to do for farmland preservation.

Mr. Struck noted that he thinks Ozaukee County is currently at a tipping point for land use for farmland preservation, so any efforts (e.g. conservation easements) may have a positive impact.

Chairperson Ross mentioned that he sees officials and residents wanting different things.

Mr. Struck stated that the ideas in the Town of Port Washington's letter seem to be what he has heard from other municipalities as well.

Mr. Robinson noted that SEWRPC's planner has been working with the Town of Belgium. Charlie Parks, the Zoning Administrator for the Town of Belgium, reached out to SEWRPC's planner and heard that some of the people who were in-favor of participating in the FPP previously are not sure anymore. They see the zoning restrictions for their farmland as a hindrance and are feeling pressure from development in the south.

Mr. Struck mentioned that he also thinks landowners are noticing the payments received by other landowners from selling their land to the data center.

Mr. Robinson mentioned that the SEWRPC planner and Thomas Winker, the Town of Belgium Chairman, are discussing the Town of Belgium's zoning further.

Mr. Struck stated that he still hasn't heard from the Town of Saukville, but it is getting to the point where it wouldn't be possible for them to participate in the plan with the given adoption timeline.

Chairperson Ross noted that land use patterns continue to evolve in order to increase flexibility for landowners, but this idea contrasts to what the community wants as a whole.

Mr. Struck stated that it's not all landowners; there are landowners who are very interested in farmland preservation, but they are perceived as a minority.

b. Review, Discussion and POSSIBLE ACTION – CHAPTER 5, Farmland Preservation Areas (FPAs) for A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050

Chairperson Ross introduced section 5b.

Mr. Struck stated that Chapter 5 is included in the agenda packet starting on page 15. The Chapter includes the farmland preservation area for the Town of Belgium only. The criteria used in this version of the FPP are largely the same as in the last FPP and based on the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) assessment. It was decided not to re-do the LESA analysis at the outset given time and staffing constraints and also that minor modifications/updates to new corporate boundaries would make it compatible and relevant. Mr. Struck believes that it still holds up very well as one of the criteria. As a reminder the LESA analysis was based on methodologies from NRCS and staff spent a lot of time developing it for the last FPP. DATCP also felt that it was a good assessment.

Mr. Struck pointed out that, before item E. Zoning, on page 19 of the agenda packet, there have actually been two amendments to the Multijurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County and the 2013 amendment was the latest. This was noted by staff and SEWRPC will add it to the paragraph. As noted earlier, *A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050 (3rd Edition)* and *A Park and Open Space Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050 (4th Edition)* (POSP) will become amendments to *A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035*. Lower on page 19 of the agenda packet, the City of Mequon's current zoning districts are shown.

Chairperson Ross asked if the City of Mequon's A-1 and/or A-2 zoning would be eligible.

Mr. Struck noted that yes, probably the A-1 and A-2 zoning districts would be eligible; however, no properties are currently designated as such on the zoning map and rather all agricultural use is treated as a combine zoning district (with housing) or overlay ag zoning district. Also, just as a note, the C-1 and C-2 zoning districts are not eligible alone, but rather only as a large parcel that has an eligible agricultural zoning. There are eligible zoning districts in many of the towns in Ozaukee County (as noted in Chapter 5), but most of the towns don't use those zoning districts (on the zoning map) or don't want to certify them with DATCP. The Town of Port Washington has an A-1 district and does have parcels already designated as such, but they are not interested in certifying that zoning and those areas with DATCP.

Mr. Struck stated that Chapter 5 references the County Shoreland and Floodplain zoning ordinance and noted that these are now two separate ordinances (they were separated as part of a recent update), so this will be updated in the final draft. Chapter 5 includes a designated farmland preservation area for the Town of Belgium that covers most of the township (approximately 16,500 eligible acres). Table 5.2 on page 32 of the agenda packet shows percentages of currently designated farmland preservation areas in Ozaukee County.

Chairperson Ross asked if the Town of Belgium chooses to participate in the FPP would they be tied down for 10 years.

Mr. Struck stated that the Town of Belgium could be included in the plan while they make their own decision about their zoning. A similar situation happened with the Town of Fredonia when the last FPP was created. The Town of Fredonia was eligible in the FPP but did not proceed with certifying their zoning ordinance and areas/parcels with DATCP.

Chairperson Ross asked if a municipality could decide to backout of the FPP in a few years.

Mr. Struck said probably, by changing their comprehensive plan and also the zoning, but landowners in that municipality would have to pay back any tax credits they had received for the entire period, though there would be no land use penalty fee assessed on the municipality. Mr. Struck noted that the County could include a municipality in the plan (based on our criteria applied to their current land use and zoning), and they could later decide not to follow through on a zoning certification for the FPP with DATCP. Of course, we would have to have eligible parcels (based on our criteria) to include them in the plan now (e.g. Town of Belgium). In the agenda packet, on pages 12-14, there are maps created by SEWRPC for three of the towns who had the greatest potential to participate in the FPP, which showed eligibility for a potential farmland preservation area based on LESA scores and existing agricultural land (but not necessarily zoning). As noted on these maps, Ozaukee County does still have significant existing agricultural land use.

Mr. Robinson stated that Map 5.3 on page 37 of the agenda packet includes the new City of Port Washington proposed annexation area.

Mr. Struck noted that there was a large meeting recently about the City of Port Washington annexation. A public hearing was held for every parcel that the City of Port Washington intends to annex. Right now, the annexation is about 1,700 acres, but there will probably be a few hundred more acres.

Supervisor Holyoke asked if the annexation area goes all the way north to edge of Town of Belgium.

Mr. Struck said yes, the proposed annexation area borders the town line.

Chairman Ross asked if CPB would like to make a motion to conditionally approve Chapter 5 of the FPP.

Supervisor Richart made a motion to conditionally approve Chapter 5, Farmland Preservation Areas (FPAs) for A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050. Seconded by Supervisor Maguire. A voice vote was taken. Motion carried unanimously.

c. Review, Discussion and POSSIBLE ACTION – CHAPTER 7, Implementation for A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050.

i. Program Prioritization (from Chapter 6 Programs) – Revised Results from CPB Member Responses and Ranking Methodology

Chairperson Ross introduced agenda item 5ci.

Mr. Struck stated that staff created revised program ranking tables based on the comments from CPB members at the last meeting. There are 3 tables included in the agenda packet on pages 39-49. The first table on pages 39-49 (Table 1) shows the overall program rankings. The program rank shown in the “Overall Rank” column. The columns to the right of that were requested by Chairperson Ross at the last CPB meeting. Mr. Struck went through the program list and filled out check marks (responsibilities) for each program and column based on his knowledge; CPB is welcome to suggest any edits. The program descriptions are detailed, so many programs dictate which department/committee would be responsible. A few of the programs may need more “responsibility” columns added, such as the Highway Department, Ozaukee Economic Development, or Ozaukee County Tourism Council, though there are only a few programs like this, so Mr. Struck didn’t add those columns at this time. Mr. Struck stated that he thinks the responsibility headers do largely address how the programs would be addressed both by a Department and oversight Committee. There is one edit that Mr. Struck would like to make that isn’t shown in the version of the table in the packet: for program number 103, the CPB column should be checked because it’s related to identifying areas of land use on the Comprehensive Plan land use mapping.

Chairperson Ross thanked Mr. Struck for his work on the table and stated that he thinks Table 1 looks good. He would also like to make some minor edits to the column names.

Mr. Struck stated that staff will edit the column headers.

Mr. Struck gave an example of a program that might be ranked low under the current CPB rankings but is on the overall list and because of other countywide priorities may be implemented sooner than later. Mr. Struck mentioned program number 99, “Develop a Countywide housing plan in conjunction with local municipalities and other nonprofit organizations and Partners”, stating that there has been some discussion about potentially approving some budget funding to accomplish this with municipalities. This program was ranked 105th place under the current FPP/CPB rankings. Mr. Struck noted this as an example of having the full list of priorities and programs since sometime outside priorities (in this case Ozaukee Economic Development and local municipalities) may weigh into County budget priorities. This particular item may show up as a budget request from Ozaukee Economic Development (based on their strategic planning). Program number 112, regarding funding for Ozaukee County Tourism Council, was ranked 111th place, but this is another example of a program that is being funded by the County (in part), so that is why having the full program priority listing is important as sometimes other priorities factor into to County budget considerations.

Chairperson Ross noted that he thinks an argument could be made that if a municipality wants support for a housing study, then the municipality needs to support the residents who want more farmland and farmland preservation.

Mr. Struck stated, to summarize, Table 1 includes the weighted rankings for all the programs and will be included in the appendices. The next table on pages 46-47 (Table 2) also includes weighting, but just the top 31 percent of programs are shown. Table 2 is comparable to what was displayed in the last FPP, where the top 30 percent of programs were shown. This table would be included in Chapter 7 of the FPP. The last table on pages 48-49 (Table 3) shows the programs as scored by CPB this year, without the weightings and would also be included in Chapter 7. Multiple tables could be included in Chapter 7, if desired.

Mrs. Whyte provided a summary of the differences between the programs listed in Table 2 and Table 3. Table 2 shows the top 35 programs with weighting included in the scores. This table has 14 programs that are also on Table 3, and 17 programs that are not on Table 3. All 35 programs on this list happen to

be from the “Agricultural” goal groups, due to the weighting, in addition to the scoring. Table 3 shows the programs that received total combined scores of 14 and higher from CPB members this year. Table 3 contains 24 programs that are not on Table 2; all of which happen to be in the “Other Related Recommendations” goal groups.

Chairperson Ross noted that the overlap of programs that are in both Table 2 and Table 3 could be shown as the top priority programs in the FPP.

Vice-Chairperson Richart mentioned that he thinks it is important not to lose the information in Table 3; Table 3 addresses transportation and other topics.

Supervisor Maguire asked how these programs will impact Ozaukee County when they are finalized.

Mr. Struck stated that these programs will form a basis for implementation based on priorities and other factors as noted earlier. So, many of these programs are implemented to some degree now and would continue. Programs such as implementation of the Land and Water Management Plan by working directly with agricultural landowners and farmers.

Chairperson Ross stated that Table 1 gives the departments some specificity about who is supposed to be picking up the responsibility for each program.

Vice-Chairperson Richart stated that, when looking at the municipality column, there seems to be less municipality involvement in the goals that are not related to farmland.

Mr. Struck noted that some of the programs are not traditional program areas for the municipalities. Ozaukee County and UWEX (or other partners like NRCS) has had the responsibility for farmland preservation education and outreach.

Vice-Chairperson Richart mentioned that he thinks some programs, like some related to water quality, should be transferred over to municipalities for their involvement.

Chairperson Ross stated that he thinks Ozaukee County should use whatever leverage power it has to help municipalities preserve farmland. If that’s important to the County Board, funding should be used to make it happen. That would be an executive-type summary observation. There are tools, but action requires a consistent approach. Chairperson Ross stated that he thinks that is an opportunity for the County Board. The FPP should not just be a document that is set aside.

Mr. Struck mentioned that all of the program tables will end up either in Chapter 7 or in appendices of the FPP.

Chairperson Ross stated that he thinks the list of programs that overlap between Table 2 and Table 3 should be included directly in Chapter 7 in a table that also shows the responsibilities columns from Table 1.

Mr. Struck stated that staff and SEWRPC can add that new table to Chapter 7 and include the more complete listing in the appendices.

Vice-Chairperson Richart asked if CPB members will be content if the programs that overlap between Table 2 and Table 3 are largely programs that scored 14 on Table 3. Vice-Chairperson Richart stated that he is not certain if this is what he wants to be displayed, though he understands that having a list of only 14 priority programs is easier to look at than 31 programs.

Mr. Struck stated that documents will be prepared and members can review at the next CPB meeting.

Supervisor Maguire noted that if realities change, program lists can evolve.

Mr. Struck said yes, that's why he suggests listing all 112 programs, so that the lower-scored programs can still be addressed (and used with outside funding agencies). Reality and funding may drive some programs to discussion.

Mr. Struck stated that no formal motion for agenda item 5ci is needed at this time and the revised Chapter 7 will be discussed at the next meeting.

ii. Draft of Appendix – Agricultural, Natural and Cultural Resource Programs Available in Ozaukee County

Chairperson Ross introduced agenda item 5cii.

Mr. Struck stated that staff are still working through the *Agricultural, Natural and Cultural Resource Programs Available in Ozaukee County* appendix, which can be found on pages 50-67 of the agenda packet. When this appendix was written for the last FPP, it was somewhat comprehensive at the time. Ozaukee County has now used many more programs and there are a lot of things that could be added to the appendix. Mr. Struck expects that the version in the agenda packet will largely be retained. More details will be added in some areas, and some areas will be consolidated (such as all private funding sources). The version in the packet is around 90% complete. This appendix helps to get tasks implemented. Ms. Vogeler from the Ozaukee County Land and Water Management made some updates that are displayed on the version in the agenda packet also.

Chairperson Ross asked if anything is needed for this agenda item from CPB at this time.

Mr. Struck stated that no motion is needed at this time. CPB members should let Mr. Struck know if they think anything is missing from the appendix. Another grouping for private grants will likely be added.

Chairperson Ross noted that a general comment about various private or non-profit funding sources could be added.

Mr. Struck stated that CPB will be able to see the final version before the final plan is adopted.

6. Other Business

Chairperson Ross asked if there was any other business to discuss today.

Mr. Struck stated that he recently re-reviewed state statutes regarding FPP adoption. When the POSP was adopted, it was adopted as a stand-alone plan by resolution. However, the FPP needs to be adopted as an amendment to the Multijurisdictional Comprehensive Plan (can also be adopted as a stand-alone plan) by both resolution and ordinance. Therefore, a 30-day public notice (and direct mailings to all surrounding municipalities, counties, WDOA, SEWRPC, etc.) must be provided (according to Wis State Stat 66.1001) for the required public hearing for review of the final draft Farmland Preservation Plan (FPP) for Ozaukee County: 2050. This can't be accomplished with a regular CPB meeting on September 17th. Mr. Struck asked if the group could meet one week later instead, on the 24th of September (assuming notice can be completed in the papers)

Mr. Struck stated that the FPP final draft is due to DATCP by October.

Mr. Robinson noted that the exact date in October depends on how many plans DATCP receives to review. SEWRPC has already sent some of Ozaukee County's draft FPP chapters to DATCP for their review. Mr. Robinson hasn't heard back yet on any comments for those submitted chapters.

Mr. Struck stated that a 30-day notice and public hearing is required, then CPB will hold a public hearing, before sending the FPP final draft to DATCP in October. The County Board doesn't need to adopt the FPP until after DATCP has reviewed it, and any of their comments are addressed. The final adopted plan (as an amendment to the Multijurisdictional Comprehensive Plan) needs to be completed by December 31, 2025. The public hearing will be in September and then it should go to County Board in November or December 2025 depending upon

public input and DATCP review.

Chairperson Ross asked if September 24th would work for all the CPB members. This date works for Chairperson Ross.

Supervisor Maguire and Supervisor Holyoke responded yes.

Chairperson Ross stated that CPB members should plan to meet on September 24th and noted that Supervisor Vogel will need to be in attendance to vote. Chairperson Ross asked if CPB will need a new alternate now that Supervisor Rishel is leaving his position.

Editor's note: a full 30-day legal notice in the official County newspaper for the public hearing could not be accomplished to hold the public hearing on September 24th, so staff emailed CPB members and noted that the next meeting date and the public hearing would be on October 1st instead (following the regular County Board meeting). So, the public hearing was noticed and scheduled for October 1st.

Mr. Struck said yes, a new alternate/CPB member will be needed. Mr. Struck assumes that Supervisor Vogel will be made a full CPB member, but that is up to the County Administrator and County Board Chairman.

Supervisor Maguire asked if the public hearing would be in the evening.

Mr. Struck said no, it will be at a CPB morning meeting time.

Supervisor Maquire asked how many people usually show up to this type of meeting.

Mr. Struck said not many people attend, usually.

Vice-Chairperson Richart mentioned that he looked at the news article from the Ozaukee Press on page 76 of the agenda packet, which says that the northern portion of the data center land may be developed in smaller phases, which he thought was interesting.

Mr. Struck stated that staff will get the public hearing notice submitted to the press and will have the full draft of the FPP document available in September for review by the public.

Mr. Robinson stated that Tim Jackson from DATCP is one of the main people who certifies FPPs. Mr. Jackson had said that October 1st would be the ideal date to have the FPP submitted to DATCP, but there's some leeway. County and SEWRPC staff will need time to make any necessary revisions to the FPP before final adoption and submittal.

There was no other business brought before the CPB.

7. Next Meeting Date(s) – TBD

Mr. Struck stated that the next meeting date will be September 24, 2025.

Editor's note: a full 30-day legal notice in the official County newspaper for the public hearing could not be accomplished to hold the public hearing on September 24th, so staff emailed CPB members and noted that the next meeting date and the public hearing would be on October 1st instead (following the regular County Board meeting). So, the public hearing was noticed and scheduled for October 1st.

8. Adjournment

Supervisor Holyoke made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Supervisor Maguire. All in favor. The meeting adjourned at 11:31 AM.