

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 7/14/2010

Plan Commission Offices  
Manitowoc City Hall

Regular Meeting  
Manitowoc City Plan Commission  
Wednesday  
July 14, 2010  
6:30 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present

Dan Hornung

Val Mellon

David Diedrich

Jim Muenzenmeyer

Jim Brey

Maureen Stokes

Justin Nickels

Members Excused

Steve Alpert

Staff Present

David Less

Paul Braun

Michelle Yanda

Others Present

See Attached Sign In Sheet

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of the Regular June 16, 2010 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. PC13-2010: City of Manitowoc; Public Hearing Pursuant to §66.1105(4)(h)(1) and (4)(a) Wis. Stats. Regarding Boundary and Text Amendment No. One (1) to TIF District No. 16, and Boundary Amendment No. One (1) to TIF Districts No. 7, 9 and 10

Mr. Less explained that tonight's public hearing was being held pursuant to §66.1105(4)(h)1 and (4)(a) Wis. Stats., and was for the purpose of amending various TIF project plans in the City of Manitowoc. Mr. Less continued that the public hearing requirement under the statute called for a class 2 publication, and added that notices of tonight's hearing were published in the Herald-Times-Reporter on June 30<sup>th</sup> and July 7<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Less stated that he was in possession of a proof of publication for the notice.

Mr. Less continued that the proposed amendments were as follows: (i) a proposed "Boundary and Text Amendment Number One (1) to Tax Incremental Financing (TIF) District No. 16 Project Plan"; (ii) a proposed "Boundary Amendment Number One (1) to Tax Incremental Financing (TIF) District No. 7 Project Plan"; (iii) a proposed "Boundary Amendment Number One (1) to Tax Incremental Financing (TIF) District No. 9 Project Plan"; and (iv) a proposed "Boundary Amendment Number One (1) to Tax Incremental Financing (TIF) District No. 10 Project Plan".

Mr. Less noted that the proposed amendments for each of these 4 districts were as follows: (i) TIF District 16 which would 1) amend the legal description of the district resulting in an increase in the area of District No. 16 from 190.08-acres to 228.99-acres, and 2) would amend the text of the project plan to specifically reference all potential costs related to the assessment, remediation, demolition and reclamation of the property within the amendment area, with a specific focus on the property at 1512 Washington Street – the estimated cost of this amendment was \$6,000,000; (ii) TIF District 7 which would include amending only the legal description of the district resulting in a reduction in the area of District No. 7 from 91.6-acres to 65.1-acres, and with no changes to the project plan otherwise; (iii) TIF District 9 which would include amending only the legal description of the district resulting in an increase in the area of District No. 9 from 95.71-acres to 96.67-acres, and with no changes to the project plan otherwise; and (iv) TIF District No. 10 which would amend only the legal description of the district resulting in an increase in the area of District No. 10 from 46.58-acres to 57.31-acres, with no changes to the project plan otherwise.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 7/14/2010

Mr. Less added that these amendments had been reviewed by the City Attorney who has issued a written opinion stating that in each case, the proposed amendments complied with the TIF statute.

Mr. Less then noted that the City's Joint Review Board (JRB) met yesterday to perform their initial review of the proposed amendment, and would be meeting for a second and hopefully a final time on these amendments on August 10<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Less added that upon the close of tonight's public hearing, he would ask the Plan Commission to approve 4 amendments and 4 resolutions approving the Amendments, subject to approval of the Amendments by the Common Council and JRB.

Mr. Diedrich asked if the boundaries of Districts No. 7, 9 and 10 were changing, in total, after the amendments?

Mr. Less stated that the boundaries of these 3 TIF districts were being adjusted to coincide with existing property lines and public R/W's. Mr. Less explained the problem that was created by the Northern Labs facility expansion which resulted in their building being split into 2 TIF districts.

Kenneth Ressler, 703 So. 15<sup>th</sup>, asked if the expansion of the TIF District No. 16 would impact his property value?

Mr. Less explained that TIF was a statutorily designed program that did not change the underlying value of property, and stated that there would be no impact upon properties in the proposed TIF area.

Lynn Zunker, 2212 Emerson, explained that someone had told her that the City would be acquiring their property via eminent domain.

Mr. Brey replied that he did not envision the usage of eminent domain, and added that it had not been used during the 18 years that he has been an alderman with the City.

Kathy Lane, 1601 Clark, asked if the TIF District No. 16 modification would impact the underlying zoning of their property?

Mr. Less stated that there would no changes to the underlying zoning as a result of any changes to TIF District No. 16. Mr. Less added that in order to rezone property, the City would have to first publish and hold a public hearing on that matter.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 7/14/2010

Mr. Brey commented that he was concerned with including Block 210 of the Original Plat (Heresite Protective Coatings) into the proposed boundary amendment area. Mr. Brey noted that it was his goal to keep the TIF area as small as possible.

Mr. Less advised that expenditures that could ultimately be authorized to be made in the TIF area would first require Council approval and authorization.

Mayor Nickels noted that 4 separate motions were required to deal with the 4 separate TIF actions.

Mr. Less then recommended that the Commission approve the 4 amendments as described above, and further adopt 4 Resolutions related to the 4 proposed amendments.

Motion by: Mr. Hornung \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by: Mr. Diedrich  
Moved that: the Commission approve the Upon Vote: the motion was  
Planner's recommendation above regarding approved unanimously.  
TIF District No. 16.

Motion by: Mr. Muenzenmeyer \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by: Ms. Stokes  
Moved that: the Commission approve the Upon Vote: the motion was  
Planner's recommendation above regarding approved unanimously.  
TIF District No. 7.

Motion by: Mr. Brey \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by: Ms. Mellon  
Moved that: the Commission approve the Upon Vote: the motion was  
Planner's recommendation above regarding approved unanimously.  
TIF District No. 9.

Motion by: Ms. Stokes \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by: Mr. Hornung  
Moved that: the Commission approve the Upon Vote: the motion was  
Planner's recommendation above regarding approved unanimously.  
TIF District No. 10.

\_\_\_\_\_ Mayor Nickels explained that the Commission's action tonight to approve the 4 TIF amendments would require subsequent approval of the City Council, and the JRB to become effective.

B. PC31-2010: Manitowoc Public School District; Structure Moving Application Under Section 15.37(3)

Mr. Less explained that this was a request from Jeff Schulz, Director of Buildings & Grounds for the Manitowoc Public School District (MPSD), and that they were requesting approval to move a 24' x 30 garage structure from 721 Green Street to the north parking lot of Lincoln High School at 1433 So. 8<sup>th</sup> pursuant to Section 15.37(3) of the Manitowoc Municipal Code.

Mr. Less identified the “donor” property and the structure to be moved, as a 24' x 30' x 12' in height, 720sf, 3-car garage structure to be moved from a parcel of land located on the south side of Green Street and west of the Canadian National trackage, on a parcel identified by Tax #600-001-010. Mr. Less noted that this parcel was owned by the MPSD by virtue of a Warranty Deed dated November 15, 2006, and was more particularly described as Lot 1, and that portion of Lots 2 and 3 lying westerly of the railroad right-of-way, all in Block 1 of Wm. D. Richard’s Subdivision, together with the east 20' of vacated So. 8<sup>th</sup> Street, lying adjacent and west of Lot 1. Mr. Less added that according to the Assessor records, this parcel was currently tax exempt, and was zoned “R-4” in part at its north end, and “I-2” heavy industrial to the south.

Mr. Less then identified the “recipient” property, or the location where the structure would be moved to, as a vacant area of land being used as a parking lot by the MPSD for Lincoln High School located in Block 357 of the Original Plat as part of Tax #122-000-331. Mr. Less added that the specific location for this relocated structure was at the southwest corner of the parking lot located on the west side of So. 8<sup>th</sup> Street, and was approximately 45' from the west property line.

Mr. Less continued that the proposed structure move route was from the donor site west on Green Street to So. 9<sup>th</sup>, and north on So. 9<sup>th</sup> to Columbus, and east on Columbus to So. 8<sup>th</sup>, and then south on So. 8<sup>th</sup> to the parking lot; a distance of approximately 2,825' or .5 miles in travel distance between the donor and recipient properties as measured along public R/W’s.

Mr. Less noted that pursuant to Section 15.37(3), the Planning Department did send notice to the property owners abutting and adjacent to the recipient property on July 7<sup>th</sup>, and that to date, there were no responses to the mailing.

Mr. Less then explained that the requirements for issuance of a permit for moving a structure in the City included the following: (i) a building inspection report of

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 7/14/2010

the structure to be move (*no information provided*); (ii) documentation that the applicant had contacted other City officials (*other than contact with Jim Muenzenmeyer, no documentation provided that other officials have been contacted*); (iii) if improvements were required to be made to the structure by the Plan Commission, an irrevocable Letter of Credit would be required in an amount approved by the Director of Building Inspection (*no information provided*); (iv) a performance bond (at least \$25k) which indemnified the City for any costs or expenses incurred related to the moving process (*no information provided*); (v) identification of the donor and recipient properties including photographs and elevations, a scaled site plan of the recipient property; structure travel route, and delivery to the Director of Building Inspection of insurance certificates naming the City as a certificate holder (\$500k/\$1mm liability and property damage not less than \$500k levels - *no information provided*).

Mr. Less noted that except for a reference to completing this move in the latter part of 2010, there were no specifics provided regarding the date and time to complete this relocation. Mr. Less stated that the petitioner had submitted only a minimal amount of information required under City code, and that the deficient information would have to be provided to the Director of Building Inspection, and which included: (i) approval of the structure travel route and the identification of any obstruction or traffic issues from the Police Chief, Department of Public Works and MPU-Electric; (ii) a performance bond which would indemnify the City for any costs or expenses incurred by it related to the moving process; (iii) an irrevocable letter of credit pursuant to Section 15.37(2)(k); (iv) a foundation plan; and (v) the issuance of a demolition permit.

Mr. Less then recommended that the Commission: (i) recommend Council approval of the request for structure moving, subject to compliance with Section 15.37(3); and (ii) authorize the Director of Building Inspection to issue the necessary permits upon review and approval of 1) the travel route and the resolution of any obstruction or traffic issues identified by the Police Chief, Department of Public Works and MPU-Electric; 2) completion of a building inspection report of the structure to be moved by the Building Inspector; 3) a performance bond; 4) an irrevocable Letter of credit pursuant to Section 15.37(2)(k); and 5) a foundation plan.

Mr. Diedrich asked what the purpose of the letter of credit and performance bond were in this situation?

Mr. Less stated that the performance bond covered the mover to move the structure, while the letter of credit was the City's protection against the move causing problems which required a source of funds.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 7/14/2010

Mr. Hornung asked if the MPSD would be held to comply with the requirement for the letter of credit?

Mr. Muenzenmeyer stated that he had the authority to waive the letter of credit requirement, and would waive it for a garage.

Mr. Ressler asked if it was less expensive for the MPSD to move an existing structure vs. building a new garage?

Jeff Schulz, MPSD, 2902 Lindbergh Drive, explained that it was less expensive to move an existing structure vs. building new. Mr. Schulz added that the cost of the move was being paid by the Manitowoc Lincoln Football Boosters Association. Mr. Schulz added that the garage was constructed in 1995, and was in very good shape.

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

C. PC32-2010: Domestic Violence Center; Request for a Conditional Use Permit Under Section 15.23(3)2. for Property at 300 E. Reed Avenue

Mr. Less explained that this was a request from Sue Sippel, Executive Director of the Manitowoc County Domestic Violence Center (DVC), as the contract purchaser of property at 300 E. Reed Avenue, who was requesting that the City issue a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for operation of a DVC at this location pursuant to Section 15.23(3)2. of the Manitowoc Municipal Code. Mr. Less added that the CUP would be considered in accordance with Section 15.37(27) of the Code. Mr. Less noted that Section 15.37(27) established procedures for the issuance of a CUP by which, the Commission and Council had to determine if the proposed use was reasonably necessary for the convenience and welfare of the public, was in harmony with the character of the surrounding area, and would have a minimal or no effect on the surrounding property values. Mr. Less added that the Commission and Council could affix conditions to the CUP to provide assurances that the proposed use would not have a negative impact on the surrounding area.

Mr. Less noted that the DVC was currently located at 1127 So. 22<sup>nd</sup> Street, midway between Marshall and Hamilton. Mr. Less explained that they were located in a 2-story, 9-bedroom, 6,638sf masonry (former apartment) building that was directly south of the St. Francis Cabrini Middle School. Mr. Less added that the City issued the DVC a

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 7/14/2010

CUP for this location back in November, 1987, and that there were no operating conditions attached to the CUP other than retention by the Council of the right to review the permit on the anniversary of the CUP grant. Mr. Less continued that the DVC acquired title to this property in June, 1988 from St. Mary's Immaculate Conception Congregation. Mr. Less added that previous to this use, the DVC was located at 1203 N. 16<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Less commented that the DVC was a 501(c)(3) non profit organization that operated a 24-hour facility focused on wife and child abuse. Mr. Less stated that they currently had an occupancy capacity of 20 on So. 22<sup>nd</sup>, which was a level just below that which would require them to sprinkler their building. Mr. Less continued that the DVC was also the contract purchaser of property located on the north side of E. Reed Avenue, west of Johnston Drive; a parcel that was formerly occupied by Dr. Jennifer Garvin-Cress, and was identified by Tax # 520-043-010. Mr. Less noted that the E. Reed Avenue parcel was currently owned by the 300 Reed Avenue, LLC, and was described as Lot 43, except for the east 4.5' thereof; and also the east 50' of Lot 44, all in Oehler and Guenther's Subdivision. Mr. Less added that the current owner acquired title to the property in mid-October, 2007.

Mr. Less explained that the E. Reed Avenue property was zoned "B-1" Office-Residential District, and measured 145' of frontage along E. Reed with a depth of 354', for a total of 51,330sf or 1.17-acres. Mr. Less continued that the property included a single story, masonry building measuring approximately 5,948sf in area with an adjacent blacktopped parking lot for 32-vehicles, was assessed in total at \$356,300 and had an estimated fair market value of \$372,500, and generated around \$7,250 in annual property taxes. Mr. Less noted that the parcel was currently vacant and for sale.

Mr. Less noted that the DVC had entered into a "Commercial Offer to Purchase" for the E. Reed Avenue property, which was countered and accepted on June 3<sup>rd</sup>. Mr. Less continued that the Offer specified an August 31, 2010 closing date, completion of an environmental assessment of the property, a requirement that the DVC obtain approval and permits to construct a residential facility to the north of the existing building within 60 days after the date of acceptance of the Offer, and receipt of a CUP from the City.

Mr. Less explained that it was the DVC's plan to acquire the property, and to ultimately construct a 6,000sf residency facility to the north of the existing building. Mr. Less continued that at the same time, the Center would attempt to sell the So. 22<sup>nd</sup> Street property, and would continue to operate a residence for DVC victims with a capacity of

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 7/14/2010

20 including children and infants. Mr. Less noted that the E. Reed Avenue site would serve initially to house some administrative staff, but would primarily be used for support group and client meetings. Mr. Less added that the proposed addition was initially targeted for construction in the summer of 2011, would be a sprinklered facility designed for 30 residents including children and infants, and would eliminate a portion of the existing parking lot. Mr. Less then explained the land uses and zoning surrounding the E. Reed Avenue property.

Mr. Less then explained that under the current "B-1" zoning, permitted uses included medical, dental, mental health clinics; hospitals; professional and business offices; funeral homes; schools; single and two family residential subject to the "R-4" district regulations; multiple family dwellings subject to the "R-5" district regulations; and community living arrangements and day care center for not more than 15 residents. Mr. Less added that conditionally permitted uses included bed and breakfast operations; domestic violence centers; tattoo and body piercing establishments; and community living arrangements and day care center for 16 or more residents.

Mr. Less then explained that notices were mailed from Planning to property owners within 200' of the subject property on July 7, 2010. Mr. Less stated that he received a telephone call this afternoon from the adjacent owner to the west, Cheryl Linzmeier, who stated that she had no problems with the DVC proposal, but had questions about the internal security for their building and addition. Mr. Less noted that he told her that these issues would have to be handled by the DVC, but were beyond the scope of the CUP land use authorization. Mr. Less stated that he e-mailed her a copy of the proposed recommendation and compliance conditions being considered this evening. Mr. Less added that other than this phone call, there were no other comments received in response to the mailing.

In closing, Mr. Less noted that the City's 2009 Comprehensive Plan identified the subject property as "general business", adding that the 2009 plan described this district to include commercial and retail uses at a neighborhood scale or at a larger community-scale. Mr. Less concluded his comments by noting that this proposed CUP would be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Brey asked Mr. Less to clarify that until the DVC acquired the E. Reed property, they would continue to operate the So. 22<sup>nd</sup> Street property and the CUP would remain in effect.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 7/14/2010

Mr. Less replied that the CUP remained in effect on So. 22<sup>nd</sup> Street, and would terminate when the DVC sold that property, or they no longer occupied it.

Mr. Hornung asked Mr. Less if the CUP on E. Reed was not approved, would the denial of that CUP also terminate the CUP in place for the So. 22<sup>nd</sup> Street operation?

Mr. Less stated “no”.

Sue Sippel, DVC, 1127 So. 22<sup>nd</sup> Street, stated that she thought they had 3 CUP’s, and would have to confirm that status with Mr. Less.

Barry Morrison, 1429 Daisy Drive, asked if the DVC would have an impact on surrounding property values?

Mr. Less explained that he was not aware of any diminution of property values related to the siting of a DVC, but did note that in the past, the City Assessor had indicated that the siting of approximately 28 community living arrangements throughout the City did not have an impact on surrounding property values. Mr. Less noted that he did not expect there to be any impacts related to the DVC proposal.

Mayor Nickels asked Mr. Less for his recommendation.

Mr. Less recommended that the Commission recommend to Council approval of the CUP under Section 15.23(3)2., subject to the compliance conditions on file in the City Planner’s office.

<u>Motion by:</u> Mr. Hornung_____	<u>Seconded by:</u> Ms. Stokes
<u>Moved that:</u> the Commission approve the Planner’s recommendation above.	<u>Upon Vote:</u> the motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Less advised Ms. Sippel to keep him abreast of the status of their E. Reed Avenue property sale, and encouraged her to pay attention to the critical dates included in the CUP.

V. REFERRALS FROM COMMON COUNCIL

- A. PC28-2010: Olson; Petition for Direct Annexation Pursuant to §66.0217(2) Wis. Stats. for Property on West Custer - Interstate #15

\_\_\_\_\_ Mr. Braun explained a proposed annexation of lands located on the south side of West Custer, east of I-43 and west of Edgewood Lane. Mr. Braun commented that the Olson's had filed the Petition for Direct Annexation with the City, and that the City had just received a letter from the WI Department of Administration stating that the proposed annexation was found to be in the public interest.

Mr. Braun explained the various deeds for dedication, along with Public Works Petitions that were being required to be executed by the Olson's. Mr. Braun recommended that the Commission recommend to Council approval of the annexation, with the property to be given a temporary zoning designation of "B-1" Office-Residential District pursuant to §66.0217(8)(a) Wis. Stats.

Mr. Diedrich asked Mr. Braun how many properties remained outside of the City limits on the south side of West Custer?

Mr. Braun explained that if the Olson property was successfully annexed, there were 2 parcels remaining that were located outside the City.

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

- B. PC18-2010: SMI, Inc./Manitowoc Tool & Machining, LLC; Release of Easement in Manitowoc Industrial Park

Mr. Less explained that the "Release of Easement" document was related to a matter previously discussed and recommended for approval by the Commission back in April, 2010. Mr. Less noted that the Release was in regard to eliminating an easement that bisected the company's current expansion project.

Mr. Less recommended that the Commission recommend to Council that they approve entering into the Release, that the Mayor and Clerk be authorized to sign the document on behalf of the City, and that the Release be recorded with either SMI or the company to pay the cost of recording.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 7/14/2010

Motion by: Mr. Diedrich  
Moved that: the Commission approve the  
Planner's recommendation above.

Seconded by: Mr. Muenzenmeyer  
Upon Vote: the motion was  
approved unanimously.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. None

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. PC33-2010: First Presbyterian Church; Proposed Animated Sign at 502  
N. 8<sup>th</sup> Street Pursuant to Section 15.45(18) of Manitowoc Municipal Code

Mr. Less explained a proposed animated sign for the Church, and advised that he had previously sent out his fact sheet and recommendation regarding this sign. Mr. Less noted that upon his review of the sign, it appeared to be in excess of 24sf in total area, which was the maximum sign size as specified for a property in a "B-1" zoning district under Section 15.45 of the Manitowoc Municipal Code. Mr. Less noted that as such, his recommendation, based upon the current design, was to recommend denial of the sign.

Mr. Less continued that earlier in the day, Mr. Muenzenmeyer had advised him that a new sign design had been submitted, which was now below the 24sf threshold. Mr. Less stated that if this was the case, then his recommendation would be to approve the sign, with the additional waiver of the separation distance requirement from existing single and 2 family residential land uses, which were located to the southwest. Mr. Less noted that the directionality of the proposed sign was not in a sight line with the existing residential land uses. Mr. Less asked Mr. Muenzenmeyer if the new design met code?

Mr. Muenzenmeyer stated "yes", and that the sign had now been scaled back to less than 24sf.

Ms. Mellon asked if the proposed sign would be in the same orientation as the existing sign?

Mr. Muenzenmeyer stated "yes", and then provided Mr. Less with a drawing of the revised sign.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 7/14/2010

Motion by: Mr. Diedrich \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by: Mr. Brey  
Moved that: the Commission approve the \_\_\_\_\_ Upon Vote: the motion was  
special permit as described above for \_\_\_\_\_ approved unanimously.  
the revised drawing, and to authorize the Building  
Inspector to issue the permit subject to compliance  
with all relevant sections of 15.45.

B. PC34-2010: American Home & Garden; Proposed Animated Sign at  
2950 Menasha Avenue Pursuant to Section 15.45(18) of Manitowoc  
Municipal Code

\_\_\_\_\_ Mr. Less then explained a proposed animated sign to be located at the Ace Hardware on the north side of Menasha Avenue. Mr. Less reviewed the fact sheet and recommendation previously sent to the Commission, and recommended approval of the sign, with a waiver of the 100' separation requirement from an existing intersection.

\_\_\_\_\_ Mayor Nickels asked if both of the animated signs discussed would meet the landscaping requirement under the ordinance?

Mr. Less replied that both signs would have to comply with the requirement. Mr. Less added if an existing sign was already landscaped at its base, there was no further action required in that area, but if not, it would have to comply with the ordinance.

Mr. Less then recommended approval of the proposed special permit for the animated sign, subject to: (i) a waiver of the 100' separation requirement (15.45(18)(g)9.) from an existing or future intersection with a finding that the proposed sign would not promote visual clutter, would not have an adverse effect on nearby property, and would not create a safety hazard; and (ii) that the Director of Building Inspection be authorized to issue a sign permit, subject to conditions specified herein, as well as compliance with all relevant sections of 15.45.

Motion by: Mr. Hornung \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by: Ms. Stokes  
Moved that: the Commission approve the \_\_\_\_\_ Upon Vote: the motion was  
Planner's recommendation above. \_\_\_\_\_ approved unanimously.

VIII. MISCELLANEOUS

A. Manitowoc County Activities:

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 7/14/2010

1. Mr. Brey commented on the status of the underlying funding for the Bay-Lake Regional Planning Commission, and noted that Brown County had decided to withdraw its funding from that organization. Mr. Brey noted that this was a financial hit of approximately \$80,000. Mr. Brey then explained that Manitowoc County paid for the entire county's membership, and advised that he was initially concerned that the loss resulting from Brown County's withdrawal would be re-distributed and re-allocated to other remaining counties, but added that this would not be the case. Mr. Brey commented that Bay-Lake was considering partnering with other regional planning commissions as well.

Ms. Mellon added that Bay-Lake was also in discussion with Brown County regarding some potential partnerships, but where this would go was not clear at this time.

No action was taken.

B. Certified Survey Maps (CSM):

1. Nelson/Schaff; Certified Survey in the SE $\frac{1}{4}$  of the SW  $\frac{1}{4}$  Sec. 6, T.19N., R.24E., Town of Manitowoc

Mr. Braun explained a proposed CSM for property located north of Goodwin Road and east of CTH "Q". Mr. Braun noted that the abutting property owners, Mr. Nelson and Mr. Schaff, were tenants in common for a 35-acre parcel of land, and that they would like to split the acreage into 2 parcels. Mr. Braun continued that Nelson would take title to the proposed northern parcel of approximately 12-acres, and Schaff the southern parcel of approximately 20-acres. Mr. Braun identified a stream and potential wetland area at the east end of the proposed northern tract, and commented that the plan was for Mr. Nelson to then sell the northern parcel to a third party. Mr. Braun noted that he was not sure if this creek area was to be included in the new parcel, or if it would be a freestanding lot. Mr. Braun noted that the Official Map R/W for Goodwin Road would have to be shown on the new CSM. Mr. Braun stated that there were no other issues, and recommended approval of the CSM as proposed.

Mr. Less commented that he wanted to make sure the creek area was tied into a larger, developable tract, so as to not encourage the parcel to go tax delinquent.

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES - 7/14/2010

Motion by: Ms. Stokes \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by: Mr. Alpert  
Moved that: Commission approve the \_\_\_\_\_ Upon Vote: the motion was  
CSM as presented, subject to required \_\_\_\_\_ approved unanimously.  
easements, petitions, and other conditions  
as specified above.

2. Holy Family Memorial Medical Center; Proposed CSM Being Pt. Lot 4 of Subd. SW¼ of SE¼ Sec. 17, T.19N., R24E., City of Manitowoc

Mr. Braun explained that this parcel was located on the south side of Reed Avenue, between N. 2<sup>nd</sup> and N. 4<sup>th</sup> Streets. Mr. Braun noted that Holy Family Memorial (HFM) wanted to adjust the existing property line for the parcel that included their Tamarack facility (TR1), and that the adjustment would be to reduce the area of proposed TR2, and add to TR1 the entire parking lot and landscaping areas which would bring the final size of TR1 to 276' along Reed Avenue x 280' in lot depth. Mr. Braun explained that currently, the lot line separating TR1 and TR2 bisected the parking lot. Mr. Braun stated that an easement for ingress/egress between the proposed TR1 and TR2 would be required. Mr. Braun stated that he did not have any problem with the proposal, and recommended approval of the CSM as proposed.

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

- C. Summary of Site Plans 6/10/2010 - 7/7/2010:

1. None

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:20 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

David Less  
Secretary

