

Plan Commission Study Group Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, March 11, 2010 - 11:00 a.m.  
Paul J. Bertschinger Community Center  
7860 Hwy 42, Egg Harbor, Wisconsin

Members Present: Kim Jensen-Chair, Chris Anderson, Gail Hill, Richard Wegner, Karen Peterson, Bill Cammack –by phone, Kevin Vonck-UWGB Planning Consultant

Members Absent: Orren “Brad” Bradley-excused

Also Present: Mike Fitzgerald, Christine Tierney (departed 12:25), Kaaren Northrop, Dave Callsen

1. Call Meeting to Order

Chair-Jensen called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of the Agenda

Peterson moved to approve the agenda as is presented. Hill seconded. Motion carried.

4. Approval of Plan Commission Study Group Meeting Minutes for February 18, 2010.

Peterson moved to approve the Plan Commission Study Group Meeting Minutes for February 18, 2010. Wegner seconded. Motion carried.

5. Open Session (limited to 10 minutes)

Anderson commented on the feedback and good discussion on the recommendations made by the Plan Commission Study Group. Plan Commission was happy to see the hard work that was done. At the Village Board level there was discussion and good feedback on the recommendations. It did not pass at the Village Board meeting and will go to a Public Hearing on April 12, 2010. Anderson would like to come back to the Village Board with the intention of the recommendations and the issue of the “grandfathering” (pre-1981). He handed a letter containing the intention of the PC Study Group, including information to be given to the Village Board for review with the addition of “grandfathering”. It was suggested that “grandfathering” needs to be clearly written, specified and applied to the recommended ordinance changes. It was consensus that this be attached as an amendment to be reviewed by the Village Board, to move forward in the process of the changes to the parking. The grandfathering concerns were discussed by the PC Study Group in great length. Section (a) is to be amended to read that it be figured by the predominant business use in that specific area to calculate the impact on parking. It was suggested it be changed/amended for the Village Board level for recommendations, since it was already passed by Plan Commission. Anderson stated that the Village Board was very pleased with the work that had been done on the ordinance.

6. Sign and Zoning Ordinances

a) Review/Discussion

**Parking Recommendations:**

Wegner moved that the Plan Commission Study Group send the written letter agreed upon as an attachment to the Parking recommendations to the Village Board, Peterson seconded. Peterson amended the motion’s recommendation to include the corrections under part (a) stating if there is double use, then you must use the predominant use for that specific area to calculate the impact on parking, and the correction under (h), to omit the word perpetuity. Wegner seconded. Motion carried.

In section (d) the Plan Commission Study Group by consensus stated that less is not appropriate now that they have given options on how to comply with the variance in the parking ordinance.

**Sign Ordinance:**

Vonck presented the suggested possible changes in the Sign Ordinance 155. Vonck stated there is no R2 district in the Village, but the ordinance currently reads as such. In residential and commercial areas there is a certain aesthetic appearance that you strive for in each area. The discussion led to permanent and temporary signs. It was suggested that time limits on signs must be equal regardless of content (political vs. sale, etc.). The intent is to try to capture the permanent sign idea under temporary, but with an allowance of change 1-2 times a day. Also it was suggested to consider signs that are attached and free-standing. It was suggested that the group review exempt signs (height/width), what will need a permit, and what signs will be prohibited.

*The PC Study will look at:*

Residence & Commercial→

Permanent & Temporary→

Attached & Free-standing signs→

Exempt signs/Permit signs/Prohibited signs

Vonck stated that his intent is to discuss sign dimensions, etc. and then handout what documents he has today based on standards to review for discussion before the next meeting. He indicated the importance of clarity in purpose and intent in the sign ordinance. Vonck reviewed the ordinance and suggested ideas for changes in an overhead presentation.

Vonck stated that there are no current calculations in the sign ordinance to determine sign size allowance. The discussions included, multi-faced signs: 2 faces (45 degrees-one side) and 3-sided/4-sided (add sides and 50% of total sides equals square footage allowed), Design requirements (wind pressure), signs on vacant properties, sign size and type in relation, sign per structure. Sign size was discussed in length -the minimum versus the maximum size allowed in one sign. Pie is your square footage; currently it is 50 square feet. Discussed was the possibility of splitting your pie up between several signs. The number of signs per business/building allowed was discussed in great length. The PC Study Group conferred on the square footage of the footprint of the building and made the decision to use this to determine the total square footage of the signage used. A minimum of 50 square feet and maximum of 150 square feet of signage allowed was discussed. Vonck will try to have the information as discussed today sent out soon to all the Study Group members for review before the next meeting.

Vonck's presentation for PC Study Group, **Chapter 155: Sign Regulations for discussion and Comment Only** is attached as was presented.

b) Recommendations to Plan Commission

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 18, 2010 at 11:00 a.m.

8. Adjourn

Jensen moved to adjourn the meeting at 2:03 p.m., Cammack seconded. Motion carried.

Recorded by,

Kelly A. Popp, Deputy Clerk/Administrative Assistant.