

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/11/09

Plan Commission Offices
Manitowoc City Hall

Regular Meeting
Manitowoc City Plan Commission
Wednesday
February 11, 2009
6:30 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the City Plan Commission was called to order by Mayor Kevin Crawford at 6:30 P.M.

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present

Kevin Crawford
Maureen Stokes
Steve Alpert
Valerie Mellon
David Diedrich
Jim Muenzenmeyer
Jim Brey

Members Excused

Dan Hornung

Staff Present

David Less
Paul Braun
Michelle Yanda

Others Present

See Attached Sign In Sheet

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of the Regular December 10, 2008 Meeting.

Motion by: Mr. Diedrich

Moved that: the minutes be approved as presented.

Seconded by: Ms. Stokes

Upon Vote: the motion was approved unanimously.

IV. PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL HEARINGS

A. None.

V. REFERRALS FROM COMMON COUNCIL

A. PC5-2009: Burgarino; Discussion of Public R/W on So. 22nd Street

Mr. Less provided an overview of the request from Tony Burgarino regarding the disposition of So. 22nd Street R/W to correct problems with his decking structure on the east end of his building. Mr. Less explained that the properties comprising the Burgarino/Tony's Pizza property were acquired between 1992 and 2008, and that Mr. Burgarino owned an area measuring approximately .64-acres in Block 253 of the Original Plat.

Mr. Less noted that the property featured multiple zoning district coverages including "R-4" Single and Two Family Residential (Lot 18), "B-3" General Business (Lots 19 & 20), and "B-1" Office-Residential (Lot 21). Mr. Less added that the restaurant was located on lands zoned "B-3", with a future parking area to the west located on a parcel zoned "B-1", and the parking lot to the north of the restaurant building being located in an "R-4" district.

Mr. Less continued that the question arose whether or not Mr. Burgarino could erect a roof above, or an enclosure around his outdoor deck at the east end of his building. Mr. Less noted that there were 2, previously City-issued Sidewalk Privilege Agreements ("SPA") related to this property and as summarized below:

1. Tony's Sidewalk Privilege Agreement #1 w/Tony Burgarino d/b/a Pizza Restaurant (SPA#1)
 - a. Dated June 5, 1998. Rec. V. 1298, P. 307.
 - b. Grant was "to place and install a 32' x 10' wooden deck on the east side of the building...facing 22nd Street...the east 68 feet of Lot 18, all of Lot 19, and the east 18 feet of Lot 20, in Block 253, City of Manitowoc..."
 - c. Grant was on conditions that: (i) the location of the deck would not affect the sidewalk area; (ii) the deck would not affect the visibility line near the corner of Washington and So. 22nd; and (iii) there would be compliance with local and state ordinances and codes.
 - d. Agreement terminated if the owner failed to maintain the use of the property. City retained a unilateral right to terminate the SPA upon 10-day written notice. Owner was responsible to remove all improvements.

2. Sidewalk Privilege Agreement #2 w/Tony Bugarino d/b/a Tony's Pizza Restaurant (SPA#2)
- a. Dated August 9, 1999. Rec. V. 1385, P. 591.
 - b. Superseded SPA#1. Changed deck size only to allow a 43'7" x 11'4" wooden deck on the east side of the building.
 - c. Grant was on conditions that: (i) the location of the deck would not affect the sidewalk area; (ii) the deck would not affect the visibility line near the corner of Washington and So. 22nd; and (iii) there was compliance with local and state ordinances and codes.

_____ Mr. Less further noticed that a site plan approved in 1998 included a proposed deck extending 10' from the building, and which would have been extended to 3'3" from the So. 22nd Street R/W.

Mr. Less then explained Mr. Muenzenmeyer's recent e-mail on this matter, and noted the following: (i) that the east wall of the building was on the property line; (ii) that the existing deck was located adjacent to Lot 19 (zoned "B-3") in the So. 22nd Street R/W (80' wide R/W); (iii) that a building permit for the construction of the deck was initially issued on July 6, 1998, with a second permit for a deck measuring 5'2" x 20' issued on November 29, 2004; and (iv) that the outer edge of the deck appeared to be approximately 4' from the inner edge of the sidewalk at its base, and approximately 3' from the edge of the sidewalk at its top. Mr. Less noted that it did not appear that the deck was invasive to the actual sidewalk.

Mr. Less identified the following problems with the existing deck structure and the overall property:

- a. SPA#1 and SPA#2 granted approval to construct a deck to the east of the building on private property, but they did not include any specific authorization to locate improvements in the So. 22nd Street R/W.
- b. Based on Jim Muenzenmeyer's determination, the deck "as is" measured 11'6" x 48', and was larger than what had been previously authorized in SPA#2, thereby creating a non-conforming structure.
- c. Issuance of a building permit for the deck by the City could be interpreted to have been issued erroneously; regardless, the issuance of the permit did not establish any rights for the property owner. If the deck was constructed to meet the warrants of the 1998 permit, it would have met applicable zoning and building code requirements, and development rights would have vested.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/11/09

- d. Regarding compliance with Section 15.43(11) - Off-Street Parking in “R” Zoning District, approval was never requested by the owner, or granted by the City for this procedure at Lot 18.
- e. Regarding compliance with Section 15.43(12) - Parking Areas Development and Maintenance (Lot 20), this area was a gravel lot that did not meet the requirements of this Section. No site plan had been filed to date, and this improvement must also meet requirements under Section 15.69 (Landscaping and Off-Street Parking Requirements).
- f. Regarding compliance with Section 15.41 covering non-conforming uses, and in the absence of a boundary survey for the east property line of the Bugarino property and the private improvements in relationship to the west line of So. 22nd Street, the question as to whether or not the location and size of the deck violated SPA#2, and whether or not the deck structure was located in the R/W, and how to proceed on this matter as SPA#2 did not authorize location of private improvements within the public R/W.

Mr. Less continued that the non conforming question had to be addressed to determine: (i) if the existing structure was in fact a legal, non-conforming use, and if so, did the issuance of SPA#1 and SPA#2, and the issuance of building permits facilitate this expansion; (ii) can a non-conforming use be extended as it appeared that there was some WI court precedence to do so; (iii) it appeared that the deck was first built incorrectly and after construction, did not meet terms of SPA#1, so SPA#2 was issued in response to the construction; and (iv) did the current deck as constructed, fall within the legal authorization contained in SPA#2.

Mr. Less added that complicating this question was the fact that some WI courts have held that the natural expansion of a non-conforming use was permissible due not only to increases in volume, intensity or frequency of use, but also changes in technology or industry. Mr. Less noted that these cases clarified that expansion of the non-conforming use was permitted if done in accordance with applicable rules and

regulations, and if it did not change the essential character of the use. Mr. Less noted that such expansions became problematic and invalidated if they were coupled with an element of identifiable change in extension (ie. service change) related to the non-

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/11/09

conforming use.

Mr. Less continued that while Mr. Bugarino's letter asked for the City to sell him part of the So. 22nd Street R/W, he did not feel that this was a good remedy for this situation. Mr. Less articulated his recommendation as follows:

1. Before proceeding, the owner should commission an engineering firm to prepare: (i) a boundary survey of the east line of his property to identify the precise location of all improvements related to So. 22nd public R/W; and (ii) a legal description encompassing the area where the owner's improvements were located in the public R/W.
2. The owner should initiate having all of his properties rezoned to "B-3"; or if the owner did not want to proceed in that manner, then he should petition the City for approval to place the northern parking lot in residential zoning district under Section 15.43(11); this latter procedure would not be necessary if the rezoning was successful, and the rezoning would not create any non-conforming status for existing land uses in this case.
3. The owner should be required to have prepared and file with the City a site plan for the unimproved parking lot to the west that would meet the requirements under Sections 15.43(12) and 15.69.
4. To deal with the issue of the non-conforming status of the deck, the owner should execute a new SPA#3 to replace and supersede prior versions, and to authorize the deck to be located in the So. 22nd Street R/W for the area invasive to the R/W that would be legally described in the boundary survey under 1. above.

Mr. Less stated that he did not believe the intent of the SPA's were reflected in the manner that they were written, and re-stated that he did not believe the City should vacate R/W and sell land to fix this problem. Mr. Less added that the elements of his recommendation would accomplish the task in a more acceptable manner.

Mr. Diedrich asked what the objections would be to a "B-3" zoning if he was a property owner in the area?

Mr. Less replied that the existing restaurant could be physically expanded in the "B-3" zoning district; a district which was more permissive in terms of permitted uses than the "B-1" or "R-4" districts.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/11/09

structure on City-owned property.

Ms. Mellon added that tables and chairs were permitted in the public R/W for private businesses, but those were not permanent improvements.

Mr. Less stated that if the improvement was just a deck, his recommendation made sense, but if the discussion was about a building, it could be potentially more problematic, and the owner had to recognize that in his favor, the deck already existed. Mr. Less continued that while the previously issued SPA might not be correct, they certainly demonstrated the intent of the City to allow the improvement to happen.

Mayor Crawford concurred.

Mr. Muenzenmeyer stated that from a building code perspective, the deck and a building were both permanent structures.

Mr. Less stated that he felt his recommendation was more aligned with a deck, and not necessarily a building.

Mr. Muenzenmeyer noted that he felt that attaching the deck to the building and crossing a lot line created a nonconforming structure.

Mayor Crawford asked what was allowed, as the intent of the City via issuance of the SPA's, was to authorize Mr. Burgarino to build his deck?

Mr. Muenzenmeyer stated that the deck was allowed to be built, and felt that the City should sell or lease the R/W to Mr. Burgarino. Mr. Muenzenmeyer added that he did not think a SPA was the vehicle to correct this situation.

Ms. Mellon stated that if the City ever wanted to modify that intersection, selling R/W land could ultimately cause the placement of the R/W closer to the business.

Mr. Muenzenmeyer noted that he did not foresee So. 22nd Street ever needing to be widened in the future.

Mr. Less stated that technically, the City could not just sell the R/W, nor could they lease the R/W to the business, and that if the decision was made to vacate the R/W, that the City would give up lands that they fought hard to gain title to acquire over the years. Mr. Less felt that the situation should be fixed as per his recommendation.

Mayor Crawford asked if this area of the building would be heated?

Mr. Muenzenmeyer noted that the plans identified windows, not screens, which led him to believe it would be heated. Mr. Muenzenmeyer added that he had not seen any heating plans.

Mr. Brey noted that in his conversation with Mr. Burgarino, he was under the impression that the improvement was just going to be a cover over the existing deck. Mr. Brey continued that Mr. Burgarino had told him that at the time the SPA was being discussed, former City Attorney Wyss had advised him that the City should sell the R/W to him. Mr. Brey added that he did not think the intersection would ever change as suggested by Ms. Mellon, and added that this was a successful business, and that he had no problem with selling the R/W.

Mr. Muenzenmeyer commented that So. 22nd Street was wider at 80' than other streets in the area at 66' in width. Mr. Muenzenmeyer noted that he believed that the wider nature of So. 22nd Street was because that street was envisioned to take the traffic from the 21st Street Bridge. Mr. Muenzenmeyer added that the bridge was suppose to empty out onto So. 22nd Street instead of So. 21st, and that was why it was wider. Mr. Muenzenmeyer noted that he could not validate this contention, but he felt it was the rationale for the original street R/W width.

Mayor Crawford commented that based on what he had heard, it sounded like the sale or lease of R/W would make the most sense.

Mr. Less again stated that the City could not just sell or lease public R/W, so if the City wanted to accommodate Mr. Burgarino, they would have to do it through a vacation proceeding.

Mr. Brey commented on the success of Mr. Burgarino's business, and felt that as the street would never be changed in this area, he would like to see the R/W vacated.

Mr. Less stated that if vacation was the direction of preference, then the City Engineer would need to figure out how large/wide the area to be vacated should be, as well as to determine what would happen with the sidewalk and terrace areas in terms of maintenance responsibilities and the public's continued ability to cross over the sidewalk, should it no longer be part of the R/W due to a vacation proceeding. Mr. Less felt that if the door was opened to vacation of the R/W, he did not think it a good remedy in this situation, and was instead, encouraging the problem.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/11/09

Additional discussion was held, and the decision was made to invite Mr. Bugarino to next month's Commission meeting to find out with more clarity what his plans were regarding the myriad of issues identified above by the Planner, and to determine the most appropriate next steps.

Ms. Stokes asked if a site plan was required to be filed with the City prior to approving the demolition of the home that occupied that site, and would the owner be required to file a site plan in order to construct the parking lot to the west of the building to meet code?

Mr. Less stated that the property to the west of the restaurant was zoned "B-1", and that creation of the area as parking did not require City approval, but that as the property was being used for off-street parking, a site plan would be required to complete its development.

Mr. Muenzenmeyer added that his department had previously sent 2 or 3 letters on that topic to Mr. Bugarino.

Mr. Less noted that the City was now being put into a position to respond to Mr. Bugarino's development that had previously proceeded without compliance to City codes.

No action was taken. The matter was deferred until the March meeting.

- B. PC1-2009: City of Manitowoc; Quit Claim Deed to the City of Manitowoc to Combine Several City-Owned Parcels Along Quay Street and So. Lakeview Drive into a Single Parcel Measuring .598-Acres

Mr. Less explained the above referenced deed.

Motion by: Mr. Diedrich _____ Seconded by: Mr. Muenzenmeyer
Moved that: the Council accept the _____ Upon Vote: the motion was
deed as referenced above. approved unanimously.

- C. PC1-2009: City of Manitowoc; Quit Claim Deed to the City of Manitowoc to Combine Several City-Owned Parcels Along Quay Street and So. Lakeview Drive into a Single Parcel Measuring .002-Acres

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/11/09

Mr. Less identified a correction to be made in this deed; that being the area covered by the deed was incorrectly stated as “106 acres” which should read “106 square feet”.

Motion by: Mr. Diedrich _____ Seconded by: Mr. Muenzenmeyer
Moved that: the Council accept the _____ Upon Vote: the motion was
deed as referenced above, including the _____ approved unanimously.
noted correction.

D. PC1-2009: City of Manitowoc; Quit Claim Deed to the City of
Manitowoc to Combine Several City-Owned Parcels Along Quay Street
and So. Lakeview Drive into a Single Parcel Measuring 2.48-Acres

_____ Mr. Less explained the above referenced deed.

Motion by: Mr. Diedrich _____ Seconded by: Mr. Muenzenmeyer
Moved that: the Council accept the _____ Upon Vote: the motion was
deed as referenced above. _____ approved unanimously.

E. PC7-2009: City of Manitowoc; Declaration of Dedication for 2.48-Acres
for Quay Street and So. Lakeview Drive Purposes

_____ Mr. Less explained the proposed declaration, and noted that the City was taking its own land and using it for R/W purposes.

Motion by: Mr. Brey _____ Seconded by: Ms. Stokes
Moved that: the Council accept the _____ Upon Vote: the motion was
Declaration as referenced above. _____ approved unanimously.

F. PC1-2009: City of Manitowoc; Utility Easement for Fessler Drive
Purposes

Mr. Less explained the proposed easement.

Motion by: Mr. Diedrich _____ Seconded by: Mr. Muenzenmeyer
Moved that: the Council accept the _____ Upon Vote: the motion was
easement as referenced above. _____ approved unanimously.

G. PC1-2009: City of Manitowoc; Utility Easement for Vits Drive Purposes

Mr. Less explained the proposed easement.

Motion by: Mr. Diedrich _____ Seconded by: Mr. Muenzenmeyer
Moved that: the Council accept the _____ Upon Vote: the motion was
easement as referenced above. approved unanimously.

H. PC6-2009: Reinertson; House Moving Application Under Section 15.37(3)

_____ Mr. Less explained that this matter had been previously referred to the Plan Commission from the Common Council, but that no detail had been provided to the City from the applicant other than the original letter request. Mr. Less added that he would keep this item on the agenda for a few months to provide the applicant time to file the information required under this section of the code.

Mr. Muenzenmeyer commented that he had talked with the applicant, and advised that it would take a few months to develop and prepare the required information. Mr. Muenzenmeyer stated that he felt the deliberation on this matter was a few months out.

No action was taken.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. PC60-2008: Eckert; Request to Rezone Property at 2215 Marshall Street from "B-3" General Business District to "C-1" Commercial District

Mr. Less explained that this rezoning had completed the formal public hearing phase, and was now back at the Commission for its final consideration and recommendation. Mr. Less advised that there was no public opposition present at the Council's public hearing. Mr. Less stated that while he had previously expressed his concerns, he did not see any opposition from the neighborhood, and then recommended approval of the zone change.

Motion by: Mr. Brey _____ Seconded by: Ms. Stokes
Moved that: the Commission recommend _____ Upon Vote: the motion was
to Council approval of the rezoning as per _____ approved unanimously.
the Planner's recommendation.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/11/09

Mr. Less explained to Mr. Eckert that the Council would be asked to adopt the rezoning ordinance at its next meeting. Mr. Less noted that the date after ordinance publication would be the effective date of the zone change.

- B. PC59-2008: City of Manitowoc; Proposed Vacation Under §66.1003(4) Wis. Stats and Official Map Amendment Under §62.23(6) Wis. Stats. for CTH "CR"/So. 42nd Street, South of Dewey Street

Mr. Less explained that this matter had also gone through the Council's public hearing process, and explained that once these processes were completed, the City would work with the developer to prepare the promissory note and sale agreement pursuant to the City's developer-funded TIF agreement, for the development parcel being created as a result of this process. Mr. Less then recommended that the Commission recommend to Council approval of the Official Map ordinance, as well as approval of the resolution to vacate the public R/W.

Motion by: Ms. Stokes _____ Seconded by: Ms. Mellon
Moved that: the Commission recommend _____ Upon Vote: the motion was approval of the vacation and Official Map amendment recommendation as stated above. approved unanimously.

- C. PC52-2006: FY2007 Comprehensive Planning Grant - Multi-Jurisdictional Project with Manitowoc County:

1. Update - Manitowoc County Planning Advisory Committee (MCPAC)

Mr. Muenzenmeyer explained that a MCPAC meeting had been scheduled for March 4th at 7:00 P.M.

No action was taken.

2. Vandewalle Update - Review of Downtown Plan

Mr. Braun explained that Vandewalle & Associates would be present at the March Plan Commission meeting to review the draft of the comprehensive plan. Mr.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/11/09

Braun noted that the regularly scheduled meeting to be held March 11th, would begin at 5:00 P.M.

Mr. Braun further noted that staff would be traveling to visit Vandewalle in Madison on February 18th to discuss various aspects of the plan. Mr. Braun noted that the special study for the Expo Grounds would begin shortly.

No action was taken.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. PC9-2009: City of Manitowoc; Proposed Extension of Fessler Drive in Manitowoc I-43 Industrial Park

Mr. Less explained that this discussion was about the potential to extend Fessler Drive from its current terminus, approximately 150' to the east including a cul-de-sac at the new terminus of the improvement. Mr. Less noted that this improvement would be limited to grading and graveling, and would be for the express purpose of enhancing ingress and egress into this area of the Park, enhancing a potential purchaser/developer's ability to view the land, and improving opportunities to sell and develop the property. Mr. Less stated that he hoped this project, estimated at approximately \$20,000, would be implemented in 2009, and would utilize proceeds resulting from favorable bid awards that were below budgeted capital project amounts. Mr. Less emphasized that this improvement was integral to the infrastructure investments planned in the I-Park area.

Mr. Brey asked Ms. Mellon where the funds to pay for the extension would come from?

Ms. Mellon replied that they would hopefully come from the bids taken on other projects that were under budget.

Mr. Less stated that he felt this was a small ticket item.

Mayor Crawford noted that he felt the Planner's assessment of the I-Park was correct.

Bill Fessler, 5629 Calumet Avenue, commented that the cul-de-sac should be shifted to the north to better fit the lay of the land. Mr. Fessler added that in 2009, he would be seeding the entire 120-acre area into grass/hay, so it would be a nice looking area. Mr. Fessler further suggested that the City consider adding an additional lighting

fixture in the extension area to make the area safer and to discourage dumping.

Mr. Brey stated that he felt this made sense.

Mr. Fessler noted that the lay of the land was such that the extension of the road would open up the area for viewing.

Mr. Less recommended that the Commission recommend to Council that they grant authorization to the City Engineer: (i) to proceed with implementing the improvement, including preparation of cross section and other design details; (ii) to coordinate with Manitowoc Public Utilities for lighting in the new area; and (iii) to facilitate change orders or amendments to 2009 construction contracts to implement the improvement.

Motion by: Ms. Mellon _____ Seconded by: Mr. Diedrich
Moved that: the Planner's recommendation Upon Vote: the motion was
as presented above be approved, and for- approved unanimously.
warded to Council for consideration.

VIII. MISCELLANEOUS

A. Manitowoc County Activities:

1. None

B. Certified Survey Maps (CSM):

1. Executive Estates LLC; Proposed CSM Being a Resubdivision of Lots 12 & 13, Block 11, Woodridge Estates Subdivision No. 7, located NW 1/4 of SW 1/4, Sec. 8, T.19N, R.24E, City of Manitowoc

_____Mr. Braun explained a proposed lot split in the Woodridge Estates No. 7 subdivision, for lands located north of Woodridge Drive and east of Stoney Brook Court. Mr. Braun noted that the proposal involved 3 parcels of land--1 owned by Executive Estates LLC, and 2 parcels owned by Stephan Nordstrom. Mr. Braun explained that the plan was: (i) to combine the 2 Nordstrom lots (including a flag lot) into a single lot of record; (ii) to transfer the flag lot access to Executive Estates; and (iii) to split the Executive Estates lot into 2 separate parcels-- a southernmost parcel to measure .88-acres containing an existing storm water pond, and a northernmost vacant

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/11/09

parcel measuring 1.32-acres. Mr. Braun explained that Brandon Bartow d/b/a Executive Estates, would retain ownership of these 2 parcels.

Mr. Braun noted that a storm water pond existed on the proposed .88-acre parcel, and that this parcel with the pond would be retained in ownership by Mr. Bartow, and would not be sold to Mr. Nordstrom. Mr. Braun added that Mr. Nordstrom wanted to combine his 2 parcels so that he could construct a home on one of the lots in the area of the common lot line, along with a guest house on the other lot, without having lot line limitations. Mr. Braun noted that the zoning in the area was "R-5". Mr. Braun noted that he had talked about the status of the storm water pond with Janet Sosnosky, the City's storm water expert, who did not have any problem with the proposed lot split, and the isolation of the pond on to a separate lot of record.

Mr. Less did raise a concern regarding segregating the pond onto a separate lot of record that was of questionable development potential. Mr. Less added that he could envision the scenario where that parcel would be allowed to go tax delinquent, and eventually become the property of the County or City. Mr. Less questioned what would be the economic benefit for Mr. Bartow to retain ownership and pay taxes on that parcel? Mr. Less added that he wasn't suggesting that this would happen, but noted that it certainly could under this arrangement.

Mr. Diedrich responded that he felt that the new lot of record containing the pond would be very marketable, and would be purchased by someone.

Mayor Crawford commented that from a state-wide perspective, it appeared that municipalities around Wisconsin would eventually be legislated to take over and inherit the responsibility for these ponds, which would be another cost borne by the local taxpayers.

Brandon Bartow, 32 Albert Drive, stated that he was trying to understand where the discussion was headed regarding the land split, but it was now clarified.

_____Mr. Less stated that he was not suggesting that this pond scenario would occur, but noted that it was a "what-if" scenario that had to be discussed.

_____Mr. Bartow asked what the negative would be if it did go tax delinquent, as it would just be more green space?

Mr. Less stated that as it already existed, it would continue to benefit everyone

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 2/11/09

in the area, but technically, in terms of ownership, it could default to the City.

Mayor Crawford added that the taxpayers would then become responsible to pay for the cost of maintaining the pond.

Mr. Diedrich acknowledged that Mr. Less' point was valid, but felt that it would not be an expected action in this area.

Mr. Less added when a pond was part of a larger lot, or an integral part of a development parcel that, to him, was a safeguard against letting the pond go tax delinquent.

_____ Additional discussion was held.

Motion by: Mr. Brey

Seconded by: Mr. Alpert

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

Upon Vote: the motion was approved unanimously.

C. Summary of Site Plans 1/8/09 - 2/4/09:

1. SP1-09: City of Manitowoc - Aquatic Center, 940 N. 18th Street - New Construction (approved).
2. SP2-09: Merwynn Trade Group, LLC/Sherwin Williams, 3813 Dewey - New Construction (pending).

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

David Less
Secretary