

VILLAGE OF EGG HARBOR PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES
TUESDAY MAY 25, 2021 – 12:00 P.M.

Cambria Mueller, Chair
Kathy Navis, Commissioner
Emily Pitchford, Commissioner
Jon Kolb, Commissioner

Paula Cashin, Commissioner
Lou Nyberg, Commissioner
Vacancy

Agenda:

1. Call Meeting to Order
 - a. **Chair Cambria Mueller called the meeting to order at 12:01pm.**
 - b. Commission members present: Cambria Mueller, Kathy Navis, Emily Pitchford, Jon Kolb, Paula Cashin, Lou Nyberg, Chris Roedl
 - c. Staff present: Tom Strong, Megan Sawyer
 - d. Audience members: Joe Smith, David Pollman, Robert Pollman, John Heller, Mary Jo Kolb, Bobby Baschleben, Bea Baschleben, Denny Phillips, Caleb Despina, Carol Balje, Jim Kalny, John Pinkert, John Bocchino, Kaaren Northrop, Lisa Van Laanen, Bill White, Tyler Pluff, Mary Rielly, Signature Pieces, Alyssa Rasmusson, Goeff Hansen, Karen Peterson, Carol Straubel, Jim Pionkoski, Mike Higgins, Brian Fecteau, Jim Vander Heiden
2. Approve Agenda
 - a. **Kathy Navis moved to approve the agenda. Second by Emily Pitchford.**
 - b. **Motion unanimously carried.**
3. Pledge of Allegiance
4. Approval of April 27, 2021 Regular Meeting and May 11, 2021 Public Hearing Minutes
 - a. Changes: Public hearing – On the first page, insert ‘to’ hear all the testimony.
 - b. **Cambria Mueller moved to approve the April 27, 2021 and May 11, 2021 minutes with the one change. Seconded by Kathy Navis.**
 - c. **Motion unanimously carried. Chris Roedl Abstained.**
5. Open Session
 - a. *Mary Jo Kolb explained on why she feels it is wrong to ask Jon Kolb to recuse himself from the Shipwrecked application. I asked him to contribute to the fund. The donation was for general ordinance enforcement, not to prevent the Shipwrecked expansion. I felt that One Barrel and a home which has not had zoning enforced despite many complaints. I always use my phone while he uses his laptop. It is easier to donate on the laptop so that is why his name showed up. The go fund me page was to ensure that ordinances are upheld.*
 - b. *Cambria Mueller pointed out that Jon Kolb and Chris Roedl will be recusing themselves from agenda item 8. I see both sides of the story but this is the cleanest way to move forward. I understand it is not an easy decision for Jon and Chris.*
 - c. *Bobby Baschleben requested the plan commission table this project until the parking ordinances and fees are revisited. It was clear to me from the last meeting that there was a conflict of interest when that vote was taken. I ask any board member that owns a business that might be impacted by the parking ordinance updates remove themselves from that vote to avoid a conflict of interest.*
 - d. *Mary Reilly asked the commission to manage development in the Village. We need to be thoughtful about how we are expanding in the Village. I hope that you consider your vote today. Please do not double down on the One Barrel experience by allowing the same thing at Shipwrecked. I hope that you seriously consider the implications of allowing this to go*

- forward.
- e. *Carol Straubel expressed her concern about this project as it alters the character of the Village. This creates a traffic hazard at the corner of G and 42. The 92 additional seating covers only a quarter of the available land. There is no guarantee that this wouldn't be 500 people on a busy summer day. Allowing one business in the center of the Village to become the largest restaurant in the county will dramatically change the Village forever. I don't see how the needs of one business should outweigh the needs of the citizens who have spoken against this. I believe it is unfair to those businesses who have been required to provide parking for years. Shipwrecked customers will use the parking provided by other businesses. This business is being subsidized by the actions of the Village. Creating these divisions between the business owners doesn't create a healthy business environment.*
 - f. *Brian Fecteau is a 20-year resident of Point Beach. I have been proud to see the development in the Village but the traffic trying to turn left at Hwy G and 42 is terrible. I see this expansion making the safety problem even worse. It is going to be a mess. I also believe it will take up the other parking lots and the volume will jeopardize the character of Egg Harbor.*
 - g. *Robert Pollman said that taking a left from G going north on Hwy 42 has been a problem for forty years. This has not been created by Shipwrecked. It should have a stoplight. We didn't create this parking problem. I can't think of anyone besides Main Street Market that has sufficient parking. We didn't create these problems any more than anyone else did.*
 - h. *Mary Jo Kolb stated that there has been a traffic issue and a parking problem for years. This expansion would add to that problem. The fact that there is already a problem doesn't mean we have to add to it. On April 28, the Pulse Facebook page, there were 90 comments on the project. Not one was in favor of this project. I'm asking the commissioners to remember they represent residents and other businesses in the Village.*
 - i. *Caleb Despina pointed out that Hatch Distillery has the proper parking. It is more than just Main Street Market. We seat just over 120 people and have 45 parking spaces. The parking spaces were full last summer. I think that shows just how important parking is to the planning for this proposal. This should be kicked down the road or denied.*
 - j. *Jon Pinkert is an Attorney that represents the applicant. I would like to address Mary Jo Kolb's comments. The ordinance clearly specifies what the applicant can do to meet the parking requirement. The FILOP is one of those options. I want to reiterate ours is a government of laws. While there may be comments against this project, I think it is clear you need to abide by the ordinances.*
 - k. *Jon Kolb if you look at Special Development District 152.026, point one asks if the proposed project is in the spirit and intent of the regulations and will produce improvements to justify the application. In the spirit and intent, when the plan commission set a \$200 fee in lieu of parking, that was not the spirit or intent for an 85-parking spot shortage. We are talking about a 400-seat restaurant with only seven onsite parking spots.*
 - l. *Joe Smith said no one questions the fact that 1 parking spot for every four seats is a reasonable requirement. I would ask that you look at their full ordinances, not just that one part. Sturgeon Bay for example has a downtown district that is exempt from that parking requirement. It is the same in Green Bay because they want it to be an urbanized downtown. The Trustees are spending money to urbanize Hwy G and Church Street as well. Ten years ago, the Village had empty store fronts. Do you want people in the downtown district to be walking past homes or shops and restaurants? That is what a downtown urbanized area is about. Cedarburg for example does include on street parking in their calculations. We are not seeking Special Development District relief, so anything related to that does not apply.*

6. Parking Requirement Comparisons

- a. *John Heller provided an overview of how the Village of Egg Harbor parking requirement calculations compare to other municipalities as presented on page 12 of the meeting packet. The conclusion was that there is a deficit of 90 parking spots. Megan did a study of the businesses in the area to estimate the number of required parking for each business, the number of actual spots that each has and the deficit and surplus each has. The problem is in the area of Hwy 42 and G. I would suggest that if we want to analyze the core parking from Orchard Street to Harbor School Road and from Church Street to Hwy 42. The example includes an 18,000 square foot restaurant. Egg Harbor is well under the required spots compared to other municipalities. For the fee amount, we are considering the cost of infrastructure, land, maintenance, and diminished value based on the distance from a business. These are things we still have to dig into. I'm asking if the Plan Commission needs to be more vigorous in determining what the parking requirements should be.*
- b. *Emily Pitchford asked if we are looking only at the requirement calculation or also the fee.*
- c. *The commission members asked John to provide the additional information to the commission prior to the next meeting.*
- d. *Jon Kolb recommended forming a four-person parking committee dedicated just to parking to work on the parking requirements and fee amount. We have talked about this for years at this point.*
- e. *Chris Roedl expressed the opinion that parking should remain with the Plan Commission, feeling that it would just delay additional action.*
- f. *Kathy Navis agrees with Chris Roedl. I also disagree that nothing has been done. The Plan Commission has acted, but there is more to be done.*
- g. *Lou Nyberg does need to start at square one again with a new committee.*
- h. *Cambria Mueller recommended that we keep parking on our agenda. We need to break it down into edible pieces. John has a lot of research on the subject. That might be the first step to breaking it down and moving it forward.*
- i. *Kathy Navis asked that the future agenda items is a specific part of parking for the next agenda starting with the requirement calculations.*
- j. *John Heller commented that we also need to look at FILOP for the next meeting.*
- k. *Cambria Mueller will work with John Heller and staff members to get information ready for the next meeting.*

7. Correspondence

- a. *Cambria Mueller opened the floor to comments regarding the public correspondence received by Village Staff.*
- b. *Tom Strong indicated that the opinions expressed in the correspondence have already taken place during open session.*
- c. *The Commission members agreed this has already been covered.*

8. Deliberation and possible action on the Conditional Use Permit application filed by Sojenhomer, LLC for an addition at 7791 STH 42 (Parcel # 118-0125302612N and 118-0125302612P).

- a. *Chair Cambria Mueller asked Tom Strong to provide an overview of the key points the Commission members need to deliberate on.*
- b. *Tom Strong provided a review of the key points for the commission to deliberate on, Parking, Pedestrian and Motorist safety, and review against the comprehensive plan.*
- c. *Joe Smith asked if the Commissioners will be considering the public communication since I did not have the opportunity to ask questions of those submitters.*
- d. *Cambria Mueller indicated it will be based on the public testimony. The Comprehensive*

plan does allow the Commission to also consider public input as it relates to the Comprehensive Plan.

- e. *Jim Kalny provided an overview of the Statutory Burden of substantial evidence that needs to be met based on Wisconsin Act 67. Prior to Act 67 in 2017, public opinion alone could be used as justification for denying a Conditional Use Application. The legislature redefined the definition of substantial evidence. The main position that took was that if an applicant meets or agrees to meet requirements imposed by the Village, the Village shall grant the conditional use permit. Any condition imposed must be based on the purpose of the ordinance and based on substantial evidence, defined as facts and information other than personal preferences or speculation, pertaining to the requirements. Opinions can still be considered, but it can't be the basis for your decision. The requirements and conditions must be reasonable and measurable. The Applicant must demonstrate that the application that all requirements and conditions shall be satisfied. The Villages decision to approve or deny must be based on substantial evidence. 152.030 specifies the ways the number of required spots that can be provided to meet the requirements. The Plan Commission may require additional spaces based on the scope of the project. The regulation also says the Plan Commission may accept any combination of parking that meets the intent of the ordinance. The ordinance puts on this Commission the burden of determining if this combination meets the intent of the ordinance. Section 152.002 states the purpose of your zoning code as "The purpose of this chapter is to promote the health, safety, morals, prosperity, aesthetics and general welfare of the community." 152.003 states "It is the intent of this chapter to relate to the built environment as viewed from a public right-of-way. It is also the intent of this chapter to compliment the intent of the Comprehensive Master Plan; in particular: the vision statement; transportation recommendations; downtown development directives; harbor and waterfront recommendations; existing and potential land use conflicts; preferred land use plan; land use policies; and recommended implementation strategies." Information related to any of those elements is relevant to the intent of the Ordinance. 152.028 states "The intent of the Commercial District, C-1 is to provide for the location of professional offices, retail stores and multi-family dwellings. The Commercial district has a less significant lot size and minimal setbacks. It maintains the Village's small town feel by fostering development that has a traditional small town, appearance in which its housing, shops, workspaces, parks and civic facilities co-exist in relative harmony." Another evidence of intent is the factors you are to consider for the Conditional Use review. The testimony of those who created the ordinance would speak to the intent of the ordinance. The concept of quaint is included in the Comprehensive Plan. The Plan Commission has to determine if there is substantial evidence to find the developer will comply with all the regulations. That compels you to determine if the combination of methods to meet the parking requirements meets the intent of the ordinance. You will also need to determine if the project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. This needs to be based on facts and substantial evidence, not no personal opinion or speculation. Substantial evidence has to directly pertain to the requirements of the condition reasonable persons would accept as a conclusion. Simple opinion plus substantial evidence can be taken into consideration. Conditions and findings need to be related to the ordinance, based on substantial evidence, reasonable and measurable to the extent practical. When making your decision, describe the substantial evidence that leads to the decision. Do your best to use measurable evidence to do that.*
- f. *Lou Nyberg commented on Act 67. As we go along, we should review our findings with him to confirm that we have our facts to back up our decision. This opens the door for some compromise in the future. A legal battle would be expensive and unpleasant.*
- g. *Cambria Mueller: If we stick with the public testimony to start the deliberation. For the*

- record, Jon Kolb and Chris Roedl are recusing themselves from this deliberation.*
- h. Jon Kolb asked if recusal is for both deliberation and for voting?*
 - i. Jim Kalny: Yes, this includes both.*
 - j. Cambria Mueller referenced Caleb Despains testimony to start off the deliberation, identifying the Comprehensive Plan points on quaintness and balanced growth. There have been an influx of food and dining establishments in the Village. Page 37 of the Comprehensive Plan highlights the communities desire about the direction of development. Page 27, Paul Brophy's testimony that 75% of the residents who responded wanted to maintain the quaintness of the Village. Lisa Van Laanen testified that the intent of the FILOP was never intended to allow a shortage of this many parking spaces as we consider the options for meeting the parking requirement. Bonnie Wolfe testified that if this goes through, this would be the largest restaurant in the County. That touches on the balanced growth. Does that fit in the Village? Jon Kolb testified that the fee was originally set at \$200 and the intent of that ordinance. Joe Smith asked about the correspondence that was referenced, my opinion is that there are multiple spots in the Comprehensive Plan that speaks to the community's voice. I do think the correspondence should be considered as it relates to the Comprehensive Plan. Our residents, businesses and provided the input for the Comprehensive Plan. Quaint and balanced growth means different things to different people. Our jobs as the commissioners is to come up with a consensus about what that intent was, to help guide us through decisions like this. Cambria opened the floor to the commission members.*
 - k. Emily Pitchford: It is fine to say the Comprehensive Plan represents a quaint village to many but there is more to it. It has to be reasonable and sustainable growth. The intent of FILOP was for 8-10 parking spaces for those who don't have that parking. This has to be a safe development for traffic and people. It has to look at what the options are for parking.*
 - l. Paula Cashin agreed with Emily in regard to safety. It is my understanding that Wisconsin statues give Plan Commissions the authority to make decisions based on the health, safety, and general welfare of the community. We need to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of our visitors and residents. My concern is that if we approve this application, we will have an increased number of Shipwrecked customers crossing Hwy 42. That is a safety issue.*
 - m. Lou Nyberg has been a long time Point Beach resident. We have a Village that sits south of other municipalities that attract tourists. We have thousands of cars going through the village every weekend day. The only thing you can hope for to turn left is that someone will cross the street so you can turn left from G on to Hwy 42. The congestion isn't only related to Shipwrecked. We are not going to solve that problem by trying to adjust one situation. We have to look at the bigger picture. We are going to have traffic through our Village. We and others have invited this through development. I would like to hear suggestions about how we address this on summer and holiday weekends. We heard a lot of testimony about congestion and safety. This is a problem and will continue to be a problem.*
 - n. Paula Cashin stated that currently we need to address the Shipwrecked application.*
 - o. Cambria Mueller agreed with Lou Nyberg that this is a bigger problem. If we allow 92 additional seats without parking, that will make the existing problem even worse. We are already at a breaking point. This project as presented makes safety an even greater concern. I don't know that I can agree to approve letting them make the problem worse.*
 - p. Kathy Navis suggested that a stoplight at the corner of Hwy G and 42 would help to deal with the pedestrian safety issue.*
 - q. Paula Cashin expressed a concern about setting a president using the \$50 FILOP fee per space. Shipwrecked never had enough parking. Now they want to expand seating and reduce parking.*
 - r. Lou Nyberg suggested there is room for compromise. Impervious surface was the primary*

- issue, which is resolved with this application. Perhaps Shipwrecked could reduce the number of seats, add some more spaces even if it means taking away green space.*
- s. *Kathy Navis agrees with that comment. The parking requirements says that the Plan Commission may accept any combination of the above methods that meets the intent of the ordinance. I don't think that seven parking spaces on that property is near sufficient when there is a section of green space available. What about making a larger parking area using pervious materials? The building already is not quaint in my opinion. I do think the addition they are planning softens what is already there. I have a huge problem with them reducing parking spots from twelve to seven. I would like to see them come back with a reasonable amount of parking spots on that lot with pervious materials.*
 - t. *Cambria Mueller asked the commission members what number of physical parking spots would be acceptable. Even if they have 30 spots, they would still be short around 67 spots. I agree with Lou that there is room to compromise but I'm not sure how many spots that equates to.*
 - u. *Lou Nyberg mentioned that they are already 50 spots short prior to this project. We aren't going to be satisfied being 97 spots short. I don't think they can do the project without some spots being covered by FILOP. I think this also sets a precedent that anyone else who applies to expand in the future will be held to the same requirement. I think the project will be soften by the addition. Outdoor seating is something that everyone is doing. As a commission, we are encouraging business growth, but we need to do the best we can on parking. I think we should be open minded, looking for a compromise.*
 - v. *Cambria Mueller commented that the applicant would never put the addition on if they have to come into compliance with green space requirements. They don't have to add on. They could make it all parking and bring their parking up to the currently required number of spots.*
 - w. *Paula Cashin agrees that they should make the new lot a parking lot with appropriate screening. They have never had enough parking there. I can't agree with this project.*
 - x. *Lou Nyberg commented that the Village used to allow on street parking within 500 feet. We made that ordinance. I think 92 seats is too many. I think there is room for compromise on that. I'm not taking sides. I'm just weighing the facts. I believe we can compromise and set a precedent.*
 - y. *Paula Cashin reiterated that they have never had enough parking. This is an opportunity to put in more parking.*
 - z. *Kathy Navis states that the idea of making that new lot a park lot is a horrible idea. My neighbor has no parking spaces. We don't want a downtown that is full of massive parking lots.*
 - aa. *Paula Cashin agreed that we don't want a high number of parking lots downtown but those that are there can be landscaped to provide screening.*
 - bb. *Cambria Mueller commented that they have purchased that lot with the intent to add on to the business. I don't feel we are putting an undue burden on someone who wants to expand their business. I think expanding the business is great business is great, but the location is horrible. I put myself in the shoes of a visitor who is looking at where to go and where to park. I get hung up on the fact that they are already well short of the required parking spots. They are asking to add on to the number of seats and take away parking. It is appreciated that they addressed the green space but made the parking deficit worse. What is a reasonable number of parking spots we should ask for?*
 - cc. *Lou Nyberg compared Casey's deficit to this application. I think there is room for compromise here by asking the applicant to use the land they bought to provide additional parking. Shipwrecked has always been short on parking. The Village is also short on parking. I think we have to approach it with an open mind. I would like the facts to come*

- out and understand what the law is. If we deny it, the basis needs to be factual.*
- dd. *Kathy Navis stated that they are meeting the ordinance with the exception of 115.028 g that states the Plan Commission may accept the combination of the fulfillment requirements. They have the right by law to develop this property. They aren't asking for Special Development relief. If this would go to court, I feel that we would lose. I don't think we ever intended for a property that had space to put in parking, to use the FILOP option instead of providing parking. The intention was that if you don't have the land for parking, you have the option to pay the fee in combination with the other options. I think seven spaces for this application is horribly inadequate. There is space there to put in parking. I don't know how many spots they can put in with pervious materials. It won't be 107 spaces, but they should put in some parking. It should be a combination that is fair.*
- ee. *Emily Pitchford agrees that the intent of the ordinance was not to allow a 95-spot deficit. It is not reasonable, practical or fair to other businesses in the Village.*
- ff. *Cambria Mueller asked Jim Kalny about if the commission would send the project back asking for more parking spaces, would they need to provide the applicant with a specific number of required spots that would be acceptable? If they come back with 20 spots, what happens if the commission can't agree that it is a sufficient amount of parking, how does that work?*
- gg. *Jim Kalny indicated the way the ordinance is written, you are directed to figure out the intent of the parking ordinance. We know that the intent was not to decrease the number of spots for a non-conforming property while expanding the seating. It sounds like you are all in agreement that it wasn't meant to be a substitute for parking. It is an issue that this isn't measurable. How much you are going to set is difficult to make a statement. The ordinance is setup to allow consideration based on special consideration on a case-by-case basis. How much more is the question. I hear you saying that the intent of the ordinance is that there would be additional physical spots. The intent of the ordinance was that there would be some parking spots, not as a replacement of physical parking facilities. There are other factors to consider such as the entrance for parking and how will they handle impervious surface.*
- hh. *Kathy Navis said we don't know just how many parking spots we can ask for because we don't know how many spots fit into that property using some pervious surface materials. We aren't going to design it for them. I think they get the idea that this is not near enough parking.*
- ii. *Lou Nyberg: I believe they should come back with an updated plan that increases parking with an indication that we will be open minded about impervious surface. I think there is also room to cut down outdoor seating.*
- jj. *Paula Cashin: They need to make the new property a parking lot with appropriate landscaping.*
- kk. *Kathy Navis: I recommend that we table the deliberation and ask for a new plan with substantially more parking that uses a permeable surface. I think they can also cut back on the number of seats to decrease the amount of parking needed. I would like to table it and ask them to come back with a new plan.*
- ll. *Emily Pitchford: I am in line with what Lou and Kathy have said. One more possibility to increase parking off site such as at Fat Louis. You can only add so much on this parcel. I'm willing to negotiate on impervious surface even if that means fewer outside seats. I don't want to rely on Church Street for parking.*
- mm. *Cambria Mueller indicated she is also stuck on the lack of actual parking. I agree with Lou's comments on compromising. I'm hearing they need more parking and there is room for compromise on impervious surface. We would also ask for landscaping around the additional parking.*

nn. Cambria Mueller moves to table this deliberation, with direction to Applicant to provide revised plans at a later date. Second by Kathy Navis.

oo. Motion carried 5-0. Jon Kolb and Chris Roedl Abstained.

- pp. Megan Sawyer commented that the plan commission will see the plans again when they are submitted, asking if we will go to a public hearing again for the new plans.*
- qq. Jim Kalny in the past you have done a public hearing again, after the plan commission gets the updated plans.*
- rr. Kathy Navis requests that the Pollman's clean up the Christine's foundation site. It looks awful and dangerous. I would like to request that the foundation get filled in and cleaned up for this summer.*
- ss. Emily Pitchford: It is also unsafe.*
- tt. Jim Kalny: This is not an agenda item. Village staff can look into this.*
- uu. Megan Sawyer: To Jim's point, we will look at the Nuisance Ordinance which will come into play. Staff will look into that.*

9. Zoning Report

- a. Tom Strong provided an overview of Zoning Administration activities. Zoning requests and submissions are still not slowing down. Village View demolition is in progress but no zoning or building permits have been issued. We inspected Casey's addition. They are not enclosing it but are putting up two screening walls. The rest of the structure is open. There is a bar and service space there. They have had a liquor license to server there for years. We provided them a written notification that they need to stay under the 72 outdoor seat count from the 2019 Utility Committee count.*

10. Open Session

- a. Cambria Mueller highlighted all the public comments received on the Shipwrecked addition. It is easy to just say deny it but the deliberation is continuing. We are doing our due diligence, giving them the opportunity to provide updated plans. By the conversation continuing, it is by no means a done deal one way or another. I ask everyone to be patient and continue to send in your correspondence. I ask that you respect our diligence. Please know that we hear you and are working through it.*
- b. Tom Strong reminded the commission that the original plans had 22 on site parking spots and updated plans will need to use the entrance off of Hwy G.*
- c. Kathy Navis would like to address Tom's comment about Casey's. I recall approving a back patio. There was no bar in those plans. I don't feel it is appropriate that they don't have to have a parking review for that project. I would like a very specific presentation about how many indoor seats they have and how many outdoor seats they had and will have. I don't understand why they would not have to go through a parking review. I think the same of One Barrel. They are adding a patio and seats on the south side of the building which should also trigger a parking review.*
- d. Cambria Mueller said we will have this on a future agenda.*
- e. Joe Smith disagreed that Casey's represents a new use on that lot. The lot has been a restaurant since before zoning codes existed. The use is not changing so that doesn't trigger a conditional use permit review. The intensity is changing. When the intensity changes, it is on Village Staff to review it at that time. It doesn't need to come to the plan commission. It should be handled by staff. If they are adding seats, they then can come into compliance.*
- f. Tom Strong confirmed that as of 2019, Casey's had 72 outdoor seats based on the Utility Committee count. In regard to One Barrel, those discussions are already taking place. They will be coming back for a parking review. Matt Peterson and I had a good regular*

- discussion about their project.*
- g. Kaaren Northrop referenced the 2019 parking study. I have a copy of it and the data is now outdated. If you are planning to use that as a basis for future parking discussions, it will be necessary to update that study. Staff needs to verify those numbers.*
 - h. Tom Strong indicated that the numbers used are actually from a seat count for the utility committee specific to restaurants for REU calculations. I do agree that the 2019 parking spreadsheet needs to be updated.*
 - i. Bobby Baschleben invited commission members to drive down Hwy G. Cars have been parked on both sides and is currently impassable. I understand curbs will be painted yellow before it is opened this weekend. I don't know how two cars and a bike are going to fit down that stretch. I have pictures of it that I can send over. Please consider this when looking the parking lot that will only have an entrance off of Hwy G.*
 - j. Tom Strong provided an update that the walkthrough on Hwy G is this Thursday. It should be opened before this weekend. Stripers were lined up.*
 - k. Joe Smit confirmed the striping is completed.*
 - l. Jon Kolb asked if there will be signs 'no parking from here to corner'?*
 - m. Bobby Baschleben commented that it is not passable. If you don't have those signs it is going to be horrific all the way passed shipwrecked. It is much worse than it was before the project was done. I've lived here for 55 years. I am concerned about how is that going to be safer.*
 - n. Tom Strong indicated there are already no parking signs on one side of the street. We will look at the pictures and get back to Bobby.*
 - o. Kathy Navis commented on the Hwy 42 project that will have a left turn lane to Hwy G, to White Cliff and into Main Street Shops. There will be no parking in the downtown section. I think it is a big mistake. We are going to make the road that much wider with three lanes of traffic. If it isn't changed soon, it won't change. I think it is a big mistake and we will have a freeway in downtown Egg Harbor, in the name of speeding up traffic.*
 - p. Jon Kolb asked who has the authority to request stop and go lights in that vicinity. Could they be set as flashing yellow in the off season and having them operate normally from May to November? I think that would tremendously help the corner of Hwy G and 42.*
 - q. Megan Sawyer indicated that the Village Board would make that formal request. Since it is a state highway the DOT would get involved. The Wisconsin DOT requirements would come into play.*

11. Next Meeting

- a. June 22, 2021 6:00 PM.*
- b. Paula Cashin indicated she will not be able to make it and is concerned that we may not have a quorum. Will Jon and Chris be able to participate?*
- c. Cambria Mueller commented that they aren't likely to resubmit in time to have deliberation at next month's meeting.*
- d. Jon Kolb indicated that he does not intend to recuse himself going forward. I have been on the plan commission for three years. I have time invested into the parking issues. I don't find it necessary to recuse myself any farther.*
- e. Kathy Navis asked if the next meeting will be in person or on Zoom?*
- f. Megan Sawyer stated that the Trustees will be discussion how to handle future meetings at the June 14th meeting. More information to come after that meeting.*
- g. Commission members indicated a preference for in person meetings by a show of hands.*

12. Adjourn

- a. **Kathy Navis moved to adjourn. Seconded by Emily Pitchford.**
- b. **Motion unanimously carried.**
- c. Meeting adjourned at 2:18PM.

Minutes completed by Tom Strong on May 27, 2021. Submitted for approval on June 22, 2021.