

**Public Hearing Minutes**  
**Farmington Town Board**  
**Monday, April 13, 2026, at 9:00am**  
**E913 Prairie View Lane**  
[www.farmingtonwaup.gov](http://www.farmingtonwaup.gov)

**Call to Order:** The hearing was called to order at 9:02am. Chair Kevin Will presided. The opening statement was given. Notices were properly published and posted.

**Public Hearing Statement:** This hearing is open to the public. Proper notice has been posted and given to the press, in accordance with Wisconsin Statutes, so the citizens may be aware of the time, place, and agenda of this hearing.

**Roll Call:** Kevin Will, Chair; Craig Nelson, Supervisor I; Phil Durrant, Supervisor II; Anjela Hamm, Clerk.

**Approve Agenda:** A motion by Craig Nelson, seconded Phil Durrant, to approve the agenda. Motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

**Purpose:** The purpose of this meeting is for the Town Board to hear public input on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment for the property located at parcels #05-21-33 and #05-20-44 by removing both parcels from the Farmland Preservation Area.

**Public Input:**

- **Lissa Field (E490 Frost Valley Rd):** Lissa expressed opposition to the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment. She stated that both properties are appropriately classified as Farmland Preservation and should remain designated as such.
- **Virginia Knippel (E499 Frost Valley Rd):** Virginia stated “ditto” in agreement with Lissa Fields’ comments, expressing opposition to the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.
- **Martin Mykisen (N3523 County Rd QQ):** Martin requested additional clarification from the Town Board regarding whether the property would be reclassified following removal from Farmland Preservation. The Clerk clarified that it would not be reclassified; instead, both properties would be removed from Farmland Preservation and would retain Agricultural Retention zoning.

- **Bruce Bushweiler (N3551 Frost Valley Rd):** Bruce identified himself as the former Director of the County’s Land and Water Conservation Department, where he administered the Farmland Preservation Program; and provided some background information on that. He expressed concern regarding potential conflicts between intensive agricultural operations and residential development, noting that modern farming often involves 24-hour activity, large machinery, and the use of agricultural chemicals, and that those who choose to live in such areas understand and accept these conditions. He further emphasized that significant effort went into the development of the Comprehensive Plan, which already allows for limited, responsible development on Farmland Preservation parcels. Bruce urged the Board to deny the request in order to maintain the integrity of the plan.
  
- **Renee Mykisen (N3523 County Rd QQ):** Renee stated “ditto” in agreement with Bruce Bushweiler’s comments, expressing opposition to the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.
  
- **Eric Jacobson (733 Midway Rd – Menasha):** Eric, the landowner of the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment, provided clarification on the purpose of his request. He explained that his intent is limited to constructing a shed on the corner of Erickson and County Q and, potentially, selling a small 5–6 acre part of the parcel located on that corner. He emphasized that he has no intention for subdivision development, noting that he previously donated 10 acres to the Town for the current Town Hall site and declined a subdivision opportunity 12 years ago. He also described his current agricultural operation as an organic cattle farm with approximately 100 head and stated that he does not use pesticides on his fields. When questioned about documentation referencing “potential future residential development,” Eric stated that the notation appeared to be a misunderstanding or misinterpretation at the county level.
  
- **Eric Knutson (E490 Frost Valley Rd):** Eric pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan application contained handwritten references to potential residential development. He expressed opposition to the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, stating that such development could result in a higher-density population that is not consistent with the surrounding area. He emphasized that the rural atmosphere is what makes Farmington a special place to live.
  
- **Lorrence Gabbert (E971 Erickson Rd):** Lorrence questioned if there was a way for the applicant to build what he needs but restrict a residential development in the

future from happening. The Town Board clarified that that question may be better addressed at the County level, for Planning and Zoning.

- **Brad Ceranske (E720 Frost Valley Rd):** Brad provided comments indicating that it would not be impossible for the applicant to construct the proposed shed while still maintaining Farmland Preservation requirements. He also noted that as population increases, property taxes may be expected to rise, along with a greater demand for Town services, in relation to the potential future residential development referenced in the application.
- **Carl Johnson (E521 Frost Valley Rd):** Carl stated “ditto” in agreement with Brad Ceranske’s comments, expressing opposition to the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.
- **Valerie Ceranske (E664 State Rd 54):** Valerie asked the Chairman if he could read the resident letters received by mail/email.
- **Dennis Handschke (N3586 Frost Valley Rd):** Dennis questioned why all 40 acres has to be removed from Farmland Preservation, when the applicant only wants a pole shed built on a small part of one of the parcels. He also expressed concern that this could open up possibilities for future apartment or housing development in the quiet neighborhood.
- **Eric Jacobson (733 Midway Rd – Menasha):** Eric wanted to clarify one more time that his intentions are not residential development for the parcels if approved to be removed from Farmland Preservation.
- The Chairman read into the record, summaries of the four written statements received from Virginia Knippel, Lissa Field, Janet Hall, and Bruce Ceranske.
  - o **Virigina Knipple (E499 Frost Valley Rd):** Virginia’s letter expressed significant concerns regarding the long-term character of the area, including impacts on lakes and wildlife, outdoor recreation, and the overall rural atmosphere. She noted that development in this area could set a precedent leading to irreversible changes to the landscape. She further emphasized that preserving farmland is essential to the local economy.

- **Lissa Field (E490 Frost Valley Rd):** Lissa’s letter stated that the Township of Farmington is defined by its agricultural identity. She noted that the parcels in question are rural in character and expressed opposition to the proposed amendment. She also stated that removing the parcels from Farmland Preservation would not be consistent with the preferred land use outlined in the Comprehensive Plan and emphasized the importance of maintaining dense residential development outside of rural areas.
  - **Janet Hall (E499 Frost Valley Rd):** Janet’s letter expressed opposition to the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. She further explained that people are attracted to the area because it is quiet, rural, and offers a wide range of outdoor activities, and that these activities provide greater economic benefit to the County than any potential re-designation would. She also referenced properties she owns, noting that, like many of her neighbors, she has placed her land in a conservation easement and the Managed Forest Law (MFL) program because she values farmland and timberland.
  - **Bruce Ceranske (E664 State Rd 54):** Bruce’s letter expressed concerns that property values could rise if the amendment is approved, and that hunting land adjacent to residential homes could be impacted if the area is developed. Urged the Town Board not to approve the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. He further stated that the applicant does not reside in the area, while he and neighboring residents will have to live with the decision permanently as local residents.
- Several attendees asked procedural questions regarding notification requirements and the statutes governing public notice. The Clerk explained that the Public Hearing notice was published on March 12, providing the required 30-day advance notice, and that the County requires notification to property owners within 300 feet of the affected parcels; those owners were mailed notice of the public hearing. The Clerk noted that she was not certain of the specific state statute governing the notification requirement and would need to consult with County Planning and Zoning for clarification.

**Adjournment:** A motion by Craig Nelson, seconded by Phil Durrant, to adjourn the meeting at 9:42am. Motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

**Submitted by, Anjela Hamm – Town Clerk**