

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/15/2012

Plan Commission Offices
Manitowoc City Hall

Regular Meeting
Manitowoc City Plan Commission
Wednesday
February 15, 2012
6:30 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the City Plan Commission was called to order by Acting Chairman Jim Brey at 6:30 P.M.

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present

Dan Hornung
Jim Muenzenmeyer
Jim Brey
Val Mellon
David Diedrich
Steve Alpert
Maureen Stokes

Members Excused

Justin Nickels

Staff Present

David Less
Paul Braun

Others Present

See Attached Sign In Sheet

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of the Regular January 11, 2012 Meeting.

Motion by: Ms. Stokes _____

Seconded by: Mr. Diedrich

Moved that: the minutes be
approved as presented.

Upon Vote: the motion was
approved unanimously.

IV. PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL HEARINGS

A. None

V. REFERRALS FROM COMMON COUNCIL

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/15/2012

A. PC7-2012: SMI/College Glen Developers, LLP; Silveridge Subdivision No. 3 - Review of Preliminary Plat

Mr. Less began a review of a preliminary plat for a proposed subdivision located west of Crossing Meadows Drive, and centered on Twin Ponds Drive in the Silveridge area. Mr. Less noted that his comments and recommendations had been previously provided to Commission members, as well as to Terence Fox, Bill Fessler and Paul Steinbrecher. Mr. Less reviewed maps displaying the entire Silveridge area, as well as current ownerships in Silveridge Subdivision No. 1 and 2, and then commented that the proposed plat for Subdivision No. 3 would cover approximately 12-acres, and would add 24 lots to the City's inventory. Mr. Less explained that there were discrepancies in the exterior boundary of the preliminary plat area that would have to be modified in the final plat.

Mr. Less then reviewed the compliance conditions that would have to be satisfied prior to approval of a final plat, and recommended that the Commission recommend to Council approval of the preliminary plat, subject to the compliance conditions. Mr. Less noted that while the SMI letter to the City referenced both a preliminary and final plat review, tonight's review was only for a preliminary plat. Mr. Less added that under State law, there was a 36 month window within which the request for final plat had to be filed from the date the Council approved the preliminary plat resolution.

Mr. Muenzenmeyer commented that the recommended compliance conditions included references to Building Inspection. Mr. Less noted that as there was no longer a Director of Building Inspection, he was expecting the Building Inspection Department to do a review of the final plat when it would be filed with the City.

Mr. Less did reference an outstanding wetland delineation issue, noting that the results of this study could modify the preliminary and final plat alignments.

There was no public comment.

<u>Motion by:</u> Mr. Diedrich_____	<u>Seconded by:</u> Mr. Hornung
<u>Moved that:</u> the Commission approve _____	<u>Upon Vote:</u> the motion was
the Planner's recommendation above.	approved unanimously.

B. PC9-2012: Krueger/Turner; Erosion Hazard Area at 1705 Revere Drive Under Section 15.370(23) of Manitowoc Municipal Code

Mr. Less explained that this was a request that, if approved by the Plan Commission, would ultimately require approval of a variance out of the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for a reduced side yard setback. Mr. Less noted that this was related to a request from Rick Turner d/b/a R. Turner Construction LLC on behalf of Rich Krueger, the owner of property at 1705 Revere Drive, adding that the owner was seeking issuance of a temporary permit pursuant to the City's "erosion hazard ordinance" which was most recently modified and effective December 9, 2008, and which added territory to "erosion hazard areas", including the parcel at 1705 Revere Drive. Mr. Less continued that the City established an "Erosion Hazard Area" (EHA) by ordinance adoption back in 1980, and cited the current Municipal Code which provided the following definitional and procedural guidance regarding an EHA:

"15.030(36) - Erosion Hazard Area. Any area so designated on the "Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Zoning District Map" which is prone to or has a history of moderate to severe erosion and is or potentially is a threat to adjoining property. The Plan Commission must approve any cutting, filling or development in an erosion hazard area before any development occurs.

15.370 (23) - Erosion Hazard Area, Permit to Cut, Fill or Develop. The Plan Commission shall consider and may approve detailed engineering plans for the erection of structures, for the removal or fill or storage of topsoil, sand, gravel, or other material in an erosion hazard area. Approval shall be by temporary permit issued upon approval of the City Plan Commission and/or City Planner and on condition and satisfactory documentation that such action will not have any adverse effect upon surrounding properties."

Mr. Less noted that the new territory added in 2008, which included the subject parcel that was added into the EHA district, was characterized by steep topography, and because of extreme grades, might be prone to damage from settling and the natural process of soil movement down these steep slopes. Mr. Less explained that by being pro-active in this area, he hoped to better control development on sites that were more susceptible to erosion; to promote stabilization of the hillside; and to minimize the potential for personal and property damage related to erosion problems.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/15/2012

Mr. Less stated that the subject parcel at 1705 Revere Drive was a double fronting lot with frontages on both Revere Drive and Spring Street. Mr. Less continued that the property was first acquired by the current owner back in 1983, but as of January 11, 1991, the parcel was owned solely by Rich Krueger a/k/a Richard J. Krueger. Mr. Less identified the parcel as Lot Number Two (2) of the Resubdivision of part of Block One (1) of A.W. Buel's Subdivision to the City of Manitowoc, according to the recorded plat thereof, excepting therefrom the Southeasterly 10 feet thereof (Tax #182-001-020).

Mr. Less continued that the City, in 2009, issued a "No Street Access Agreement" to Mr. Krueger for his property agreeing not to issue a special assessment for improvement to Spring Street in 2008, and which further prohibited vehicular access to his property from Spring Street. Mr. Less added that this parcel was zoned "R-4" , and was located on the south side of Revere Drive. Mr. Less explained the surrounding land uses and zoning in the area, and noted that in the "R-4" district, the setback requirements were as follows:

Front Yard - 25' from the street line.

Rear Yard - 25'.

Side Yard - 2 yards not less than 6' for each side, except can be reduced to 2' when located more than 65' from front lot line.

Mr. Less noted that the proposed new garage would exceed the side yard setback requirement and would be within the 2' requirement, ergo the need for the area variance.

Mr. Less explained that the subject parcel measured approximately 6,615sf in area, and had 48' of frontage along Revere Drive and 49.79' off of Spring Street, with an average lot depth of 136'. Mr. Less noted that improvements to the property were a 1-story masonry ranch home constructed in 1947 with an attached 32' x 14' wood deck at the rear of the home attached to an existing deck that was constructed in 2002. Mr. Less added that there was also a 1-car garage, semi-attached to the house as well, which was located approximately 95' off the Revere Drive R/W line. Mr. Less stated that the property was assessed at \$77,900, and generated about \$1,500 in annual real estate taxes excluding special assessments.

Mr. Less continued that as of today, neither Mr. Turner or Mr. Krueger had requested a variance from the ZBA for relief from the side yard setback, and that if the Commission approved tonight's request, they would subsequently file the request for a variance through the Building Inspection Department. Mr. Less added that in other

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/15/2012

words, the request for a variance would be initiated subject to the issuance of a temporary permit by the Commission under Section 15.370(23) for the disruption of the erosion hazard area.

As it related to an area variance, Mr. Less commented that in his opinion, the owner would likely have a valid argument to make to the ZBA due to the physical constraints of the site. Mr. Less noted that the ZBA could grant a variance if it determined that a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship which existed when elements such as lot area, setbacks, frontage, height etc. would unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or would render conformity with such restrictions unnecessarily burdensome. Mr. Less explained that the principle of unnecessary hardship was based on conditions that were unique to the property, and could not be self created. Mr. Less added that furthermore, it could not be contrary to the public interest. Mr. Less then displayed pictures of the subject property, and noted that from the pictures, it was clear that the south half of the property was heavily wooded, and precipitously sloped towards Spring Street. Mr. Less added that from the pencil sketch filed with the application, it appeared that the front line of the proposed garage structure would match the current garage location.

Mr. Less continued, noting for the record the following points:

1. That no geo-technical report of any type or kind had been prepared or provided to the City by a professional engineer including an evaluation of the site's inherent erosion hazards, site stability and proposed mitigation measures sufficient to avoid on-site and off-site erosion hazards.
2. That no geo-technical report of any type or kind had been prepared to support the design of the foundation, below-ground wall and floor slab construction, soil bearing capacities, as well as a comprehensive subsurface analysis that reflected the proposed building elevations and location.

Mr. Brey asked Mr. Less for his recommendation.

Mr. Less recommended: (i) approval by the Commission of the temporary permit under Section 15.370(23) of the Code with the express understanding that the approval granted tonight would be based solely on the representations made by the petitioner/owner's agent, and that no analyses of any type or kind including, but not limited to soils reports, topographic surveys, foundation or structural reports and the like,

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/15/2012

had been filed with the City; and (ii) if the ZBA issued a variance for the project, that prior to issuance of a building permit for the structure within the EHA, the City would prepare, and the property owner and the City would sign, an Affidavit to be recorded at the property owner's expense, which, at minimum, included the following requirements and conditions:

- 1) A legal description and tax identification number of the property;
- 2) The owner or owner's agent representation and warranty that: (a) the property included lands within the EHA; (b) the owner had undertaken appropriate inquiry into the suitability of the property to support the proposed development, including a review of any boundary, topographic or geo-technical surveys authorized by the owner and prepared for the property (if any), and the owner was fully aware of, and determined that all soil and subsurface conditions were adequate for the construction of the proposed development; (c) the owner had determined that utilities in sufficient capacity and quantity could be provided to the proposed development at reasonable costs of installation; (d) the owner agreed to indemnify, defend and hold the City harmless, and pay all costs and expenses for any on-site or off-site erosion damage problems arising out of any work of any type or kind conducted on the subject property, including any damage to property or improvements at abutting properties; and (e) the owner would, at owner's expense, be responsible for correcting to the City's sole satisfaction any off-site erosion or land disturbance actions, and damages to property or improvements of abutting property owners occurring as a result of the owner's work in the EHA.
- 3) The City's representation and warranty that it: (a) had issued a temporary permit under Section 15.370(23) based upon representations and warranties by the owner or owner's agent; (b) had not performed any independent boundary, topographic or geo-technical survey for the property (if any), and that the determination that all soil and subsurface conditions were adequate for the construction of the proposed development were expressly that of the owner or owner's agent; and (c) the City's issuance of a temporary permit under Section 15.370(23) would in no way be implied as a representation or warranty by the City as to the condition or suitability of the owner's property to support

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/15/2012

the proposed development, or its compliance with any other federal, state or local laws or regulations, environmental or otherwise.

Mr. Less continued that his recommendation also included that the Commission's approval should be expressly predicated upon the owner performing all of the following: (i) receiving a variance from the ZBA; (ii) executing the above referenced Affidavit; and (iii) securing a building permit by midnight on October 31, 2012, and that failure to satisfy all of these conditions would invalidate and terminate the Commission's approval of the temporary permit, effective November 1, 2012.

Rick Turner, 4104 Hecker Road, commented that he acknowledged that the owner was in a tight situation.

Motion by: Mr. Diedrich _____ Seconded by: Mr. Hornung
Moved that: the Commission approve _____ Upon Vote: the motion was
the Planner's recommendation above. approved unanimously.

C. PC8-2012: City of Manitowoc; Declaration of Dedication for Spruce Drive Purposes

Mr. Less explained the proposed Declaration for lands at Spruce Drive to be dedicated for future public R/W, and then recommended that the Commission recommend approval and acceptance of the Declaration to Council.

Motion by: Mr. Hornung _____ Seconded by: Mr. Diedrich
Moved that: the Commission approve _____ Upon Vote: the motion was
the Planner's recommendation above. approved unanimously.

D. PC48-2011: Wenzel/Reichert Realtors; Amendment No. 1 to Temporary Access Easement Agreement Over Unopened Street

Mr. Less explained that the consideration for the Amendment had been previously discussed at the Commission, and then recommended that the Commission recommend approval of the Amendment to Council with the petitioner to pay the recording fees.

Motion by: Mr. Hornung _____ Seconded by: Mr. Diedrich
Moved that: the Commission approve _____ Upon Vote: the motion was
the Planner's recommendation above. approved unanimously.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/15/2012

- E. PC1-2012: Wenzel; Quit Claim Deed to the City of Manitowoc for .018-Acre Area for Woodland Drive Purposes

Mr. Less explained the proposed R/W dedication on Woodland Drive, and recommended that the Commission recommend approval and acceptance of the Deed to Council.

Motion by: Mr. Hornung _____ Seconded by: Mr. Diedrich
Moved that: the Commission approve _____ Upon Vote: the motion was
the Planner's recommendation above. approved unanimously.

- F. PC1-2012: Wenzel; Quit Claim Deed to the City of Manitowoc for .32-Acre Area for Spruce Drive Purposes

Mr. Less explained the proposed R/W dedication on Spruce Drive, being a part of existing TR2, and recommended that the Commission recommend approval and acceptance of the Deed to Council.

Motion by: Mr. Hornung _____ Seconded by: Mr. Diedrich
Moved that: the Commission approve _____ Upon Vote: the motion was
the Planner's recommendation above. approved unanimously.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

- A. PC3-2012: Sign Me Up/Gutman; Proposed On-Premise, Fixed Animated Sign at 3624 Calumet Pursuant to Section 15.450(18) of Manitowoc Municipal Code

Mr. Less explained that this was the continuation of a discussion from the January meeting regarding a proposed fixed, animated ground sign at 3624 Calumet. Mr. Less stated that there was an attachment sent last month in advance of the January meeting, as well as a new attachment update that he had emailed earlier this afternoon. Mr. Less identified animated ground signs and animated billboards in the area. Mr. Less added that the proposed animated ground sign was expressly for the Gutman Insurance Agency. Mr. Less noted that the billboard on the property would not be available to Mr. Gutman to advertise upon.

Mr. Less commented on the principle problem with the Sign Me Up proposal; that the proposed animated sign was not in compliance with the 30% rule under Section 1.450(18)(h)2. of the Municipal Code. Mr. Less provided Commission members with

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/15/2012

graphics provided by Sign Me Up regarding a proposed pole sign with an attached animated sign. Mr. Less also raised the issue of proximity of the proposed sign to the nearby intersection. Mr. Less added that the original intent of the animated sign ordinance was to not allow freestanding 100% animated signs, and that they had to be integral to a larger sign structure, but not more than the lesser of 30% of the area of the sign structure or 30sf. Mr. Less stated that based on the graphics presented, he would recommend against approval of the animated sign. Mr. Less commented that he did not understand the purpose of the sign for this type of business, but noted that this was not relevant to the discussion.

Mr. Hornung asked if the sign graphic as proposed by Sign Me Up would be treated as 1 or 2 signs?

Mr. Less stated that he would treat it as 2 signs.

Mr. Hornung asked if the 2 signs abutted each other, would it then be counted as 1 sign?

Mr. Less replied that it would be a matter of what the Commission was comfortable with.

Mr. Muenzenmeyer commented that the original intent of the ordinance was to not have stand alone, boxed animated signs, and that they were to be integral to a larger sign structure. Mr. Muenzenmeyer added that in the case of the proposal, if the 2 signs touched each other and were of the same width, he would view them as integral. Mr. Muenzenmeyer continued that while the animated sign ordinance was a good start, it had the effect of encouraging larger signs. Mr. Muenzenmeyer noted that as depicted, he would consider this as 2 signs.

Paul Radermacher, Sign Me Up, 422 Mill, Howards Grove WI, questioned if having the signs touching would constitute being integral?

Mr. Less commented that this interpretation would be about as liberal as it could be construed. Mr. Less explained that he would like to see a truly integrated sign, into which the animated portion would be a part of a single, fixed structure. Mr. Less added that the design should meet the spirit of the Code.

Mr. Rademacher asked about the sentiment regarding the Code issue of the proposed sign being within 100' of the Calumet/So. 37th Street intersection?

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/15/2012

Mr. Less stated that he would defer to the Commission on that question.

Mr. Brey commented that he had no issue with waiving the proximity to the intersection requirement in this instance.

Ms. Mellon added that she agreed with Mr. Brey, noting that she liked the 100' separation distance requirement so as to be able to evaluate and avoid future conflicts. Ms. Mellon added that regarding the proposed sign, there were no problems.

Mr. Rademacher asked if the Commission would deny their application, or if it could be revised and the matter held over to the next meeting?

Mr. Less stated that the matter could be deferred.

Mr. Hornung asked if the matter could be approved tonight, subject to approval of the final design by the City Planner, and with compliance with the 30% requirement?

Mr. Less stated "yes", and as such, recommended approval of the Special Permit by the Commission pursuant to Section 15.450(18)(e) of the Code for a fixed, animated ground sign at the location specified above, subject to the filing, review and approval of final designs for the sign by the City Planner which would comply with a requirement in Section 15.450(18)(h)2. that the animated sign comprise no more than the lesser of 30% of the sign's total allowed sign face, or 30sf /sign face. Mr. Less recommended further that the Building Inspection Department be authorized to issue a sign permit upon approval of the design by the City Planner, subject to all relevant requirements under the City's sign ordinance (Section 15.450).

Mr. Diedrich expressed concern with the cluttering effect of these signs on Calumet Avenue and this property in particular.

Mr. Less explained some of the issues relative to the City's current sign ordinance.

Mr. Hornung stated that the sign ordinance was counter productive in this instance.

Mr. Less encouraged using the existing ground sign to make the proposed sign work.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/15/2012

Mr. Muenzenmeyer asked about the existing billboard on the Gutman property, and a picture recently taken with the east face of the billboard promoting the Gutman agency.

Mr. Less stated that the billboard was on the Gutman property, and was problematic in that the billboard would not be permitted to promote an on-site business. Mr. Less added that billboards were for off-premise promotion, and as such, the on-premise advertising for Mr. Gutman would be limited to the proposed ground sign, with Gutman no longer permitted to advertise on the billboard. Mr. Less noted that the billboard on the Gutman property was not designed for, nor legally to be used for the advertising of his on-site insurance business.

Mr. Muenzenmeyer noted that the billboard would use up all of the available on-premise sign square footage.

Dennis Gutman, 3624 Calumet, commented that he needed the animated sign, and cited the free standing Medicare Insurance poster on his front lawn that had directed people to him, as people did not know that he sold this type of coverage. Mr. Gutman continued that this sign could be replaced with an animated sign to distribute that message, along with promotion of other types of insurance products he offered.

Additional discussion was held.

<u>Motion by:</u> Mr. Hornung	<u>Seconded by:</u> Mr. Muenzenmeyer
<u>Moved that:</u> the Commission approve	<u>Upon Vote:</u> the motion was
the Planner's recommendation above.	approved. Mr. Diedrich abstained.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Discussion Related to Plan Commission Role in Review and Approval of Certified Survey Maps and Animated Signs

Mr. Less explained that this item was briefly discussed at the January meeting, and was held over for more discussion to occur tonight. Mr. Less began by noting that his preference was that there be no change in the protocol for review and approval of Certified Survey Maps (CSMs) and animated signs, adding that he liked the additional set of reviewing eyes from the Commission. Mr. Less added that in light of staff cuts, the franking role of the Commission was more important than ever.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/15/2012

Mr. Braun noted that with the current methodology, there had not been many problems, and felt that it was better to have the Commission for discussion, debate and support of decisions made regarding CSM's. Mr. Braun explained that he could tighten up his presentations, and could email the materials to the Commission members to further simplify the process.

Mr. Diedrich asked Mr. Braun how he would tighten up his material?

Mr. Braun explained his ideas in this area.

Mr. Hornung commented that several of the CSM's were "no brainers", and could be approved by staff without Commission approval.

Mr. Brey commented that he liked the Commission's review and approval authority for CSM's, and added that often, these maps were approved quickly.

Mr. Less agreed with Mr. Brey, and commented that reliance on the Commission was very important in this area.

Mr. Muenzenmeyer stated that he felt continued review and approval by the Commission was of fundamental importance, even for "no brainer" CSM's, as they could move through the Commission quickly, while the Commission would retain its opportunity to review the multiple issues typically related to these proposals.

Mr. Diedrich commented that reasoning for raising this issue was to allow the Planning Department to focus on more activities in light of budget cuts, and acknowledged that staff time was at a premium due to staffing cuts around City Hall. Mr. Diedrich added that he felt the CSM process was very efficient, and could be done without having to come to the Commission, which might make it easier on staff to process these requests to better serve customers.

Mr. Hornung noted that there was no problem with bringing issue-rich CSM's to the Commission.

Mr. Brey noted that his only concern was that the Commission could better address some of these matters, and cited the issue of Remiker Lane, which was a 3-year running problem. Mr. Brey noted that even the "no brainer" CSM's could lead to controversy.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/15/2012

Ms. Mellon commented that Engineering was doing this already for “no brainer” driveway permits, and added that her preference was to only bring issue-rich CSM’s to the Commission.

Mr. Less noted he had no problem with staff approval for simple lot splits, but felt that the Commission should continue to review and approve any CSM’s that had dedication, access or other issues related to them. Mr. Less continued that CSM’s could be referenced on the agenda in the same manner as sites plans were referenced. To bring closure to the discussion, Mr. Less recommended that: (i) staff be given approval authority for approving CSM’s that only involved routine or standard lot splits for lands in the City; (ii) that all other CSM’s would continue to be reviewed and approved by the Commission; (iii) that if there was any concern from staff regarding whether or not a CSM was a “no brainer”, that the CSM would be brought to the Commission for review and approval; (iv) that staff approved CSM’s would be listed on the agendas going forward; and (v) that regarding animated signs, the Commission would continue to review and approve these requests as they have done in the past.

The Commission approved this new protocol, but did not officially vote on this matter. The Commission was unanimous in its consent to proceed under this new protocol as detailed in the recommendation above.

B. Discussion Regarding Composition of City Plan Commission Pursuant to Section 3.050(2), Manitowoc Municipal Code

Mr. Less outlined the materials provided to the Commission, and a proposed ordinance amendment to modify the composition of the Commission. Mr. Less noted that his proposal encouraged flexibility in the design of the Commission.

Mr. Brey commented that he preferred to have a representative specifically designated for placement on to the Commission from the Streets Committee Mr. Brey added that much of the material flowing through the Commission flowed ultimately through the Streets Committee.

Mr. Less also noted problems with references in the Code to the “Director of Building Inspection”, that were not consistent with the new re-organizational plan.

Mr. Muenzenmeyer noted that the re-organization also impacted the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) in that the person serving as staff to that group reported ultimately to the Planner. Mr. Muenzenmeyer added that this was not a good design.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/15/2012

Mr. Less replied that he did not see this arrangement changing, other than making sure a firewall was in place between the Building Inspector to the ZBA and himself.

Commission members deferred action on this discussion until the next meeting.

Additional discussion was held.

No action was taken.

C. PC10-2012: City of Manitowoc; Three Year Harbor Assistance Program Statement of Intentions (2012 - 2014)

Mr. Braun explained the proposed 3-year “Harbor Development, Statement of Intentions” for the City for the term of 2012-2014. Mr. Braun continued that he had worked with Mike Huck, Harbor Master on this “Statement” which was due to WisDOT by April 1st. Mr. Braun reviewed the projects contained in the “Statement”, explaining that they had been slightly re-ordered and re-organized when compared to last years filed “Statement”, who provided insight into their plans at the City Centre LLC property. Mr. Braun noted that he had also worked with Peter Allie on the “Statement”.

Mike Huck, 1002 Glenview Drive, noted that Project No. 4 in the “Statement” regarding Red Arrow Products was at the stage of DNR review. Mr. Huck added that he felt the “Statement” was complete based on the current status of the harbor.

Mr. Muenzenmeyer asked for an update on the bridge removal projects.

Mr. Huck advised that the 2 bridges flanking the Canadian National (CN) property had been torn down, and that the fixed bridge south of location No. 2 on the “Statement” was still present.

Ms. Mellon added that there were still dredging needs to be addressed in the river in the area where the bridges had been removed. Ms. Mellon stated that this dredging would occur this spring.

Mr. Braun noted that according to Mr. Allie, some ships were having problems with hitting ground and bottoming out.

Mr. Huck added that this was particularly the case at the outer part of the turning basin. Mr. Huck noted that the Corps of Engineer (COE) did an annual survey of the

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/15/2012

channel, adding that as a result of the removal of the bridges which had historically constricted dredging access to the river, the COE would hopefully straighten out the channel contours in this area. Mr. Huck noted that he was hopeful the dredging work would be completed this summer.

Mr. Braun noted that the COE might be moving out of Kewaunee, and was looking for alternative locations to site an office, and was considering location No. 1 on the "Statement". Mr. Braun recommended that the Commission recommend to Council approval of the "Statement", and added that there was a companion Resolution that the Council would be asked to introduce and adopt next Monday night.

Motion by: Mr. Diedrich _____ Seconded by: Ms. Mellon
Moved that: the Commission approve _____ Upon Vote: the motion was
the Planner's recommendation above. _____ approved unanimously.

VIII. MISCELLANEOUS

A. Manitowoc County Activities:

1. None

B. Certified Survey Maps (CSM):

1. Manitowoc County Habitat for Humanity, Inc.: Proposed CSM Being a Re-Survey of TR3 of CSM Rec. V. 28, P. 383, Section 31, T.19N., R.24E., City of Manitowoc

Mr. Braun explained that this proposed CSM was in regard to a proposed split located east of So. 21st Street, on the west side of So. 19th Street, and north of Flambeau Street. Mr. Braun noted that the proposal was for the division of an existing lot into 4 tracts of approximately 1/4-acre each in area.

Motion by: Mr. Hornung _____ Seconded by: Mr. Diedrich
Moved that: the Commission approve the _____ Upon Vote: the motion was
CSM as presented, subject to required _____ approved unanimously.
easements, petitions, and other conditions
as specified above.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/15/2012

2. Davison: Resurvey of TR2, V. 28, P. 63 of CSM located in NE¼ of NE¼, Section 35, T.20N., R.23E., Town of Kossuth

Mr. Braun explained a proposed CSM located south of Rockwood Road and on the east side of CTH "R". Mr. Braun noted that the proposal called for the creation of 2 lots of record out of a single .65-acre tract of land. Mr. Braun added that the CSM would ultimately require County and Township approvals, and would be subject to any conditions imposed by those entities.

Motion by: Mr. Hornung

Moved that: the Commission approve the CSM as presented, subject to required easements, petitions, and other conditions as specified above.

Seconded by: Mr. Diedrich

Upon Vote: the motion was approved unanimously.

C. Summary of Site Plans 1/5/2012 - 2/9/2012:

1. SP1-2012: Only C Good, LLC/Americollect, 1851 S. Alverno - Building Addition (approved)
2. SP2-2012: Bank First National, 1039 S. 39th - Parking Lot Expansion (approved).

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Commission members determined that due to scheduling conflicts for several members, there would be no meeting in March, and that the next regular meeting of the Commission would be held on April 11th.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

David Less
City Planner