PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

April 28th, 2026 at 6:30PM at the City Hall Council Chambers and via Go To Meetings

The meeting can be joined in person or by using a computer, smartphone or tablet at
https://meet.goto.com/775025133
The meeting can also be joined by phone at
1 866 899 4679 using Access Code: 775-025-133

Present: David Eades, Jeff Beirl, Ana Tochterman, Erin Cutler, Mayor Matt Mackenzie, Steven Wiley (Planning and Development Director), Terri Erickson (Assistant Planner)

Absent: Nancy Sztyndor, Laurie Gregor (Excused)

AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
Mayor Mackenzie called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm and a quorum was declared present. He introduced the newly appointed member of the Plan Commission, Ms. Erin Cutler, who is replacing the vacancy created by JoAnn Erickson, who asked not to be reappointed. The commission and staff went around the table and introduced themselves.

2. Approval of the Agenda
Mr. Beirl made a motion to approve the agenda and Mr. Eades seconded. Motion Carried 4-0.

3. Consent Agenda
Mayor Mackenzie asked for approval of the minutes from the March 17th, 2026 Plan Commission meeting. Mr. Eades made a motion and Mr. Beirl seconded. Motion Carried 3-0. (Ms. Cutler abstained from this motion.)

4. Identify potential conflicts of interest
None

5. Citizen Participation (non-agenda items)
None. Ms. Tochterman arrived (6:37pm).

6. Action Items:
    a. Public Hearing: Review and approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow a Wireless Telecommunication Facility at 2704 County Hwy A (Parcel # 201-04595-0100), zoned Future Development (FD), Applicant: Karl Gerber of Buell Consulting on behalf of City Switch

Mayor Mackenzie noted that he would like to proceed by first having staff review project information and for the commission to follow up with clarifying questions. Then we would enter into the public hearing.

Mr. Wiley reviewed the proposed request for the new facility. He gave an overview of the subject site and the area zoning. He explained the project scope and noted the property is privately owned and mostly undeveloped aside from a garage. AT&T is the carrier proposing the new tower. There would be enough space for two additional providers. There are no parking minimums, no employees on site and the parcel is already highly vegetative. No wetlands would be disturbed. They have proposed a 6-foot tall fence with another 1-foot of barb wire on top. Informational signage only would be included. The applicant noted that the rent has become economically burdensome on the existing ATC tower and there has been no satisfactory resolution. The applicant claims this is the only existing tower in the area that would meet their needs. Building a new tower would be more cost effective over the long term. There were two statements received in opposition to the project. The first was from the attorney representing ATC. The second was from Byron Mackey of 2208 County Highway A who is a neighbor to the property and concerned about the impacts to property values. Mr. Wiley noted he asked the city assessor about effects on property values who replied he is not aware that these towers have any negative impact. He went on to review legal standards and explain what is required by state statutes and federal law. He then reviewed required criteria for compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan. He noted the proposed tower will be set back 600 feet from the nearest residence and 700 feet from County Highway A. Staff recommends approval of the CUP contingent upon the following:

o All non-FAA-required lighting shall be full cut-off and downward facing. Applicant shall submit plans/specifications for all lighting proposed prior to building permit issuance.
o Approval for the six (6) foot security fencing as proposed with up to one (1) additional foot of barbed wire.
o Conditional Use Permit is only for the wireless telecommunications land use proposed and not for any additional uses or improvements. If any additional land uses are proposed such uses will require additional administrative and/or Conditional Use Permit approval through Plan Commission and the Common Council.
o Applicant shall submit structural plans and calculations and electrical plans to City staff for Inspector review and approval prior to building permit issuance.
o Applicant shall submit a code sheet listing all applicable codes and demonstrating compliance with all codes for Inspector review and approval prior to building permit issuance.
o Applicant shall furnish a financial guarantee in the form of a letter of credit as a surety to the City in the amount of twenty thousand dollars ($20,000) prior to building permit issuance for removal of the tower or restoration of the site should this be required in the future.
o Prior to the construction of any future improvements on the parcel, the applicants(s) shall apply for and obtain any required approvals and permits.
o Applicant shall maintain the tower and associated equipment and ensure all site improvements remain code compliant and in structurally-sound condition.
o Applicant shall ensure that the tower is compliant and remains compliant with all applicable Federal, State, and Local regulations.
o Applicant shall maintain liability insurance protecting against losses due to personal injury or property damage resulting from the construction, operation, or collapse of the tower, antennae, or accessory equipment and shall keep the City updated with current proof of liability insurance.
o Applicant shall remove the telecommunications facility from the property and restore the property if the applicant ceases use of the facility in the future.

Mr. Wiley noted that the Class 2 public hearing notice was issued on April 9th and April 16th and discretionary letters were sent to all surrounding property owners within 200 feet of the subject property.

Mayor Mackenzie asked if there were any clarifying questions by the commission.

Ms. Tochterman made a motion to go into public hearing. Second by Mr. Beirl. Motion carried 5-0.

Public Hearing:
Stephen Adamski (2703 County Hwy A) asked how long they plan to keep the tower there?

Eric Shaw, with Buell Consulting, responded that these are typically long-term leases with a fifty to ninety-year lease standard. Mr. Adamski asked who the three providers were. Mr. Wiley noted that AT&T is the provider that this project is for. There would be space for an additional two or more providers who are unknown at this time. Mr. Wiley noted that a vacant tower would need to be removed by state law. Mr. Adamski asked how far the tower would be from the nearest house, how tall it is and how far out the collapse zone extends. Mr. Wiley stated it is over 600 feet away and that the tower is designed to collapse in an accordion-like fashion within a 190-foot fall radius. Adamski went on to express concern about the risk of being exposed to infrared signals; he noted since 5G service has been powered up, he has experienced more headaches. During the twenty-five years prior to this, he's had no problems. There are both elderly folks and infants living nearby.

Mr. Adamski asked if the company is renting the piece of property, mentioned the agricultural zoning of the area and asked if there was a CUP for the existing pole barn. He asked if this could be turned into an industrial park zone in the future.

Mr. Wiley noted that the Future Development Zone, where this is located, is a holding zone that consists of larger parcels in less developed area of the city. It could be rezoned to something else in the future that is compatible at the time and with the current Comprehensive Plan intentions. He noted the owner is currently the James C and Carol M Lawton Trust.

Mayor Mackenzie restated that this permit is only for the telecommunications tower and no other development.

Mr. Adamski asked if this project be reassessed if further health problems occur down the road by neighbors?

Mayor Mackenzie not that there are no conclusive answers to this subject.

Mr. Adamski stated that there have been issues in the past with non-English speaking workers on site doing work on the towers and not having the ability to communicate. It was noted that the lights from the tower are not bothersome and there are no noise issues.

Mr. Eades made a motion to go out of public hearing. Second by Ms. Cutler. Motion carried 5-0.

Mr. Eades moved to approve the motion with the recommended conditions. Second by Mayor Mackenzie.

Mr. Eades asked for clarification that the burden of the current tower is that the rent is too high and asked how many providers are on the current tower. Shaw was not sure about this but thought there were two or three. Ms. Cutler asked a couple clarifying questions about ownership and buildings on the property and the consultants who had joined online. Mr. Wiley answered that City Switch is the contractor and Buell Consulting assists with the approval process. The two online representatives were both with Buell Consulting.

Ms. Tochterman asked if we can anticipate what or who will utilize the open spots on the new tower and what would happen with an abandoned tower.

Mr. Wiley responded that it likely depends on the functionality that the new tower may provide over the existing one and how competitive the rent structure is. Shaw agreed that this is accurate and not an unusual circumstance with more than one tower in an area. Having more than one tower option helps keep the rent competitive in a given coverage area.

Ms. Tochterman asked, in the event that all tenants leave an existing tower, what happens?

Mr. Wiley responded that if the tower ceases to operate, it cannot just be left abandoned. The State requires that it be dismantled and removed. The city should have a letter of credit to ensure this process would take place. Ms. Tochterman asked if we have this agreement in place with this applicant and Mr. Wiley did not know. She felt this is something she would want to know more about. Shaw added that this is pretty standard in the leases with the land owners that there is removal language that is built in.

Ms. Tochterman was curious about the residents' concerns and feels she has limited understanding of potential negative health effects. Do additional tenants create added impact? Mr. Wiley responded that the federal 1996 telecommunications act preempts the city's ability to deny this on a radio frequency effect.

Shaw added that it is a common concern but that it is highly regulated by the FCC with documentation that can be provided with references but did not feel qualified to add more.

Mr. Beirl was concerned about all tenants leaving the ATC tower and leaving it empty. Do we have the letter of credit for that tower to have it removed? Also, the proposed tower is only three blocks from the existing one. What features does this tower have that the other one does not? Or is it just about the high rent?

Shaw responded saying this is a fair question. He noted these projects are very expensive to do. Coverage and technology are always improving as well as the desire to fill gaps and provide better service to customers. The objective is to maintain or improve service while also being financially feasible.

Ms. Cutler asked who maintains the authority to decide what goes on the tower?

Mr. Wiley responded that new providers on the tower would come through the city for a permit as well as working it out with the tower owner for co-location.

Ms. Cutler asked what the technology difference is between the equipment installed on the existing versus new tower to address the concern of the resident.

Shaw responded that, for the most part, it will be the same level of broadcasting that they run now.

Mr. Eades asked if City Switch was building the tower free of charge to AT&T with an exclusive contract so they can build-up their nation-wide network?

Shaw responded that they work for more carriers than just AT&T. They are an independent contractor and lease space to all the carriers. They have license agreements to help establish long-term relationships but are not exclusive to AT&T. In this particular case, AT&T is the client.

Mr. Eades asked for clarification if, essentially, this proposed project is solely about rent.

Shaw responded that yes, effectively this is the case, with companies looking for a more favorable long-term output operation that may otherwise become unfeasible. In some cases, the rent can be so burdensome that a company may vacate a tower if they cannot build another one.

Mr. Eades commented there will really be no improvement in coverage and its been implied that AT&T could just end their lease on the current tower and eliminate service?

Shaw stated not necessarily, but it has happened in other areas. It is a primary financial goal to improve coverage with a tower that improves service. The proposed tower has been approved to meet the objectives of the client, AT&T.

Mr. Beirl asked Mr. Wiley for his staff discussions on why we recommend approval of this?

Mr. Wiley responded that he does not see a reason to recommend denial at this point unless there was a reason provided. For example, if the city assessor had come back with data that this would reduce surrounding property values, then that might be grounds to recommend denial. He does not believe we have the ability to deny this in regards to radio frequency effects based on the 1996 Telecommunications Act. There would need to be substantial evidence of this with data. It appears they can meet the conditions of the ordinance. State statute 62.23 mandates that if ordinance conditions can be met then the CUP should be approved.

Mr. Beirl questioned what, if any, benefits does this have to the city when there is another cell tower located three blocks away.

Mr. Eades commented, you said we "can't deny" but what if both we (Plan Commission) and the City Council do deny it? Who will intervene? Mr. Wiley responded that they could appeal to circuit court, he believes, and the judge would consider and determine the outcome. Mr. Eades continued, so they don't need a valid reason to put up a new tower as long as they meet the requirements? Mr. Wiley responded yes, that is his understanding, according to the state statute.

Mr. Beirl made a motion to recognize Mr. Damske to speak. There was no second. Mayor Mackenzie suggested he attend the next council meeting to have another opportunity to speak publicly on this topic.

Ms. Tochterman stated, based on the ordinance, this would typically get approved and that it appears, by statute, the commission could not disapprove based on health concerns. Mr. Wiley agreed, that this is his understanding. She went on to say it could possibly be disapproved upon evidence property values would be reduced but that has been researched and there is no evidence of this? Mr. Wiley responded, that yes, he did look into that. She asked if legal council is recommending approval because there is no reason to disapprove it? Mr. Wiley responded no, they gave him points to consider but he did not look to them for guidance on whether or not to approve. He reiterated we cannot deny approval based on aesthetics alone. He said if there were circumstances where the provider did not exhaust all of their options, that could be a factor. He had asked the applicant if they had considered other sites and this was the only one where the property owner was on board with allowing it on their property. Ms. Tochterman noted she understands they are limited in opportunities to deny this. The benefits to AT&T are clear and she is trying to understand what the benefit is the community. The only benefit of approving it may be that if it is denied, then AT&T might leave. Mr. Wiley agreed this could be a possibility but not a given.

Mr. Eades stated he would argue that these do reduce property values. He noted, in a quick online search, that even HUD (Housing and Urban Development) classified a cell tower as a hazard and nuisance and required a re-appraisal of property values around them so it is hard to say it doesn't affect property values. Mr. Wiley noted he only checked with the assessor and does not know if this varies throughout the country. Ms. Tochterman asked for clarification on what the city assessor said. Mr. Wiley responded that he said, in his experience, unlike wind farms or solar arrays or gravel pits, he has not seen an adverse impact on property values. They do not make a lot of noise or attract other nuisances.

Mr. Eades added that (in another online search) the National Association of Realtors claimed they have peer review studies that show cell towers reduce property values up to 20 percent.

Ms. Tochterman asked for clarification that if the existing tower became empty, that the city would not be responsible for taking it down. Both the Mayor and Mr. Wiley stated that the city would not be responsible and if the owner did not take it down, the city would likely pursue enforcement action against them with some type of court order that goes through the legal system and follows state statutes.

A roll call vote was taken to approve a recommendation to council for this Conditional Use Permit to allow a Wireless Telecommunication Tower. Jeff Beirl - Yes, Erin Cutler - Yes, Jeff Beirl, David Eades – No, Ana Tochterman – Yes, Mayor Mackenzie – Yes. Motion Carried 4-1.

Mayor Mackenzie noted this item will go to City Council on the May 12th agenda. He suggested checking online to verify that it is on the agenda. These are posted the Thursday or Friday before the meeting.

b. Public Hearing: Review and approval of a request to acquire a piece of former Railroad Right-of-Way (part of Parcel # 201-01078-0000), zoned Waterfront City Center (W-CC) with Waterfront Overlay (W-O). Applicant: Rick Poppe

Ms. Erickson reviewed the request for the proposed land transfer. She gave an overview of the subject site including the applicant's property in relation to the railroad property to be acquired. She reviewed the site and area zoning and a map showing the railroad running through the block as well as the certified survey map that was completed for this item. She went over the review criteria requirements for a land transfer including consistencies with the Comprehensive Plan and UDO as well as highest and best use.

Ms. Erickson summarized that the staff recommends approval of the land transfer and reviewed the conditions attached to the permit. These include:

- The applicant shall be responsible for the costs associated with the land transfer including but not limited to: Certified Survey Map, closing costs, Register of Deeds recording fees, etc.
  - Applicant shall combine the former railroad right-of-way parcel with his existing property to create one lot and City staff shall review and approve the CSM prior to recording at the County.
  - Applicant shall obtain required approvals and zoning and building permits prior to constructing any improvements on the resulting property.

- Any existing nonconformities (i.e., setbacks, lot coverage) shall not be expanded by new uses of the property. Based on staff's initial review, the home is nonconforming in its placement off St. Claire St. It protrudes beyond the property line which would not be permitted under current code.

Ms. Erickson noted that the Class 2 public hearing notice was issued on April 9th and April 16th and discretionary letters were sent to all surrounding property owners within 200 feet of the subject property. She noted that staff had received three calls asking for further clarification regarding the transfer with a couple of them expressing interest in acquiring Railroad ROW to supplement their own properties.

Mayor Mackenzie asked if there were any clarifying questions by the commission.

Ms. Cutler asked if this was currently a single-family occupancy? Mayor Mackenzie responded that it is not right now but is zoned for this. It is currently a non-conforming lot in this regard and granting the additional land would make the lot conforming for a single-family residence. Mr. Wiley clarified that it could only be rebuilt in the current location if there was a fire or other similar occurrence that the owner did not have control over. It is currently non-conforming as both a structure and use as an apartment building.

Mr. Eades made a motion to go into public hearing, seconded by Mrs. Tochterman. Roll call vote: Motion carried 5-0.

Public Comment:
Don Jaskowiak (121 North Willis Ave) approached the Commission and clarified that this is a four to five-unit apartment complex. He noted he has lived in this area for forty years of which the first thirty-three have been quiet and the last seven have not. He mentioned the problems at 609 St. Clair Street. He stated he has no problem with Mr. Poppe purchasing the city-owned property but feels there should be contingencies made before an approval. Painting needs to be finished which was started six years ago. Broken windows and rotted sills/frames are an issue as well as trash around the building and unlicensed vehicles in the yard - such as motor homes, camper and utility trailers. He also felt that anyone wanting to purchase these railroad properties should have to pay the full property value. He noted he also speaks for other neighbors in the area.

Property photos Mr. Jaskowiak emailed were passed around. It was further clarified by staff that the phone calls received were mainly to get additional clarification on the transfer in regards to location and also to express interest in acquiring former adjacent railroad right-of-way to add to their own properties.

Mayor Mackenzie noted this is something we've been dealing with for the last four years and clarified the purpose for these transfers (to help new Commission member, Erin Cutler, to better understand the background). He noted this gets the property back onto the tax roll and also re-establishes a conforming lot without being at the city's expense.

Mr. Beirl made a motion to go out of public hearing. Second by Mrs. Tochterman. Motion carried 5-0.
Mr. Eades moved to approve the motion with the recommended conditions. Second by Mrs. Tochterman.

Discussion:
Mr. Eades stated he appreciates the comments from the neighbor. He questioned if these issues aren't already covered in the ordinance as an enforcement matter. Mr. Wiley responded that they are covered in the property maintenance ordinance. These matters and future violations would continue to be enforced through that process. Mr. Eades asked if it is fair to say, by making it a conforming lot, that this would allow

the property owner, or a future owner, the ability to make improvements more readily. Mr. Wiley agreed, and said this gives the owner more ability to place a garage and/or storage shed to help contain items that may be a visual hindrance currently. Mayor Mackenzie added that there has been a recent change in ownership of this property through inheritance.

Ms. Tochterman asked if all the issues noted in public comment are regulated by code and if it would make any sense to add a condition for reference to the land transfer. Mayor Mackenzie responded we could try to do something like this. She feels it would be a good idea to include something, if it is allowed, with a time-frame attached to it. Mayor Mackenzie noted that this would be a type of development agreement for property issues to be brought into compliance. Mr. Wiley noted that he would have to talk to the applicant and see how soon it could be done within a reasonable time frame. The property looks better now than it has in the past. Mayor Mackenzie asked if she was making a recommendation for this to be added. Subsequently, a motion was made by Ms. Tochterman, to amend the CUP to add a condition to the transfer requiring the property to be brought into compliance with current city ordinance over the next six months. Mr. Beirl seconded. Mr. Eades asked, so then if the improvements aren't made in that time frame, then does the land stay with the City? Mayor Mackenzie does not believe we could transfer it and then turn around and take it back easily. We would have to allow them the time to make corrections and once they are completed, then we can follow through with the transfer. Mr. Wiley agreed with this protocol.

Mayor Mackenzie called a roll call vote to amend the original motion. The motion carried 5-0.
Mayor Mackenzie asked if there was any further discussion. Mr. Beirl asked if there was no purchase price. Mayor Mackenzie confirmed there is none and this is consistent with how the city has been doing it with other property owners. Mr. Beirl asked about the tax roll value for this once it is added - when it is transferred for zero value. Mayor Mackenzie said this is up to the assessor. Mr. Beirl asked if there are tax implications that would require a 1099 form as the city is essentially gifting this land which is something of value. He then asked what a city lot is going for. Mayor Mackenzie replied that staff will have to explore that and look into a revised value but the main goal is to get it back on the tax roll as it is really of no value to any others.

Mayor Mackenzie took a roll call vote to recommend approval of this item, with the approved condition amendment, to move onto council. Motion carried 5-0.

c. Public Hearing: Review and approval of a request to rezone City-owned land area of Parcel #s 201-03768-0000, 201-03717-0000, and 201-03772-0000 from Public Institutional (PI) to Heavy Industrial (HI), to be included as a combined parcel via Certified Survey Map. Applicant: Planning and Development Department

Mr. Wiley presented the proposed item for a zone change request. He explained that the city would be swapping land with Mr. William Gast who currently owns property that the community uses for public ski trails to the west of the medical center. He reviewing the property location and uses, the reason for the zone change and the background behind the request. He reviewed the CSM prepared by Pine Ridge Surveying requested by the city to combine the area into one parcel. This item was introduced to the Committee of the Whole at a previous meeting. For city-initiated right-of-way vacations, the state statute requires a resolution introduced by council that then gets referred to staff and Plan Commission for a recommendation. He reiterated this item is only for the zone change to keep things moving as there are a few moving parts to the entire process. He reviewed the existing zoning of the area. He then spoke about the required standards for review regarding compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan. He explained that Mr. Gast has the intention, after a successful land swap, to transfer the exchanged land to the adjacent land owner of Chicago Iron and

Supply so he can further develop and improve his business and property. This zone change does not approve any future development which would likely require a Site Plan Review and/or a CUP Review through Plan Commission. He noted there are buffering and screening requirements between the different use zones for any future use, intensity or development modifications. Chicago Iron is working to make both site and business improvements to their work flow and continue to incorporate environmentally conscious methods into their operation. He summarized that staff recommends Approval of the request to rezone this City-owned land area with the following condition:

- Zone Change shall take effect after the new parcel is created via Certified Survey Map (CSM). The CSM must be approved and recorded at the Ashland County Register of Deeds prior to the zone change taking effect.

Mr. Wiley noted that the required Class 2 public hearing notice was issued on April 9th and April 16th and discretionary letters were sent to all surrounding property owners within 200 feet of the proposed zone change. No comments were received.

Mayor Mackenzie asked for any clarifying questions and then a motion was made to go into public hearing by Mr. Beirl. Second by Mr. Eades. Roll Call vote carried 5-0.

Public hearing had no comments.

A motion to go out of public hearing by Mr. Eades. Second by Mr. Beirl. Carried 5-0.

A motion to recommend to approve the zone change to City Council made by Mr. Beirl. Second by Ms. Cutler.

Discussion: Mr. Eades asked for clarification on the purpose of the zone change and proposed land exchanges. He asked where the money is coming from to maintain the ski trails. Mr. Wiley responded this has been a concern. They are currently maintained by a volunteer group. He maintained that Mr. Gast would like to see the trail land go to the city instead of a private property owner who could shut down the trails. If the volunteer group is unable to maintain these down the road, the city may have to let it go back to a natural state. Mr. Eades asked what might Chicago Iron want to do on the property that is not allowed by current zoning. Mr. Wiley responded that he does not think they could add their retail component under the current PI (Public Institutional) zone or be able to combine their lot in order to operate as one site. Mr. Eades asked what rights do they have under the HI (Heavy Industrial) zone? Mr. Wiley said there are more intensive uses that would be allowed compared to the PI zone.

Mayor Mackenzie noted that Mr. Gast approached the city with the intention to transfer the ski trails to the city with altruistic intentions, with the hopes that they will stay there for public use. He is not out to make money on this and was looking to trade properties with the city. He was asked to look at property the city had to see what he might be interested in. He has a relationship with the Chicago Iron owner who is interested in putting in a new driveway and felt this could be a win-win for all involved. The hope for Chicago Iron is to add a public driveway that would access the front of the proposed future storefront.

Mr. Eades commented that there is nothing assuring us that Chicago Iron will buy this property. What if it ends up in someone else's hands as a HI zoned use? Does it open a door to something we don't want to have there?

Ms. Cutler asked if the ski trail has a non-profit status managing the volunteers for the trails. Mr. Wiley noted he thinks it is volunteer only.

Ms. Tochterman asked what the assessed value of the property is. Mr. Wiley answered he is not sure and would have to ask the assessor. Mayor Mackenzie noted we would be ending up with more property than what we'd be transferring.

Mr. Eades asked why the urgency to rezone. Mr. Wiley responded that Mr. Gast intends to transfer it to Chicago Iron. Mr. Eades asked if we can put that as a condition. Mr. Wiley felt that we could, either as a condition of the rezone or of the transfer. Mr. Eades understands this is a multi-layer process including vacating rights-of-way and creating an easement for sewer. Even if we have a condition for the transfer to Chicago Iron, rezoning it now seems premature.

Mayor Mackenzie responded that part of the urgency is Mr. Gast wanting to get this done. The discussions have been happening for quite some time and the slowest piece of this is the vacation of the right-of-way's along with a council resolution and a longer notice process. He does not see Mr. Gast wanting to do anything else with this property. Mr. Eades added that it seems problematic to put a condition on the rezone to be transferred. How would that work? Mr. Wiley responded it would probably have to be on the land transfer. Because we would still own the land at that point, we could hang on to it, if it comes to that.

Ms. Tochterman added that if you consider the full zoning map of the city you can see what a tiny portion of area this is. Mr. Wiley noted that the HI zone would never expand any further beyond this as it wouldn't make sense. Ms. Tochterman added that in the past it has come up that we shouldn't spot zone and that this is not doing that.

Mr. Beirl agrees that it is a small area and that for now the city still owns it and is in control. Mayor Mackenzie reiterated this is for a specific purpose and we are truly trying to capture the ski-trail property and it seems like more than a fair transfer offer.

Mayor Mackenzie took a roll call vote to recommend approval of this item to move onto council. Motion carried 5-0.

7. Discussion Items:

Mr. Wiley gave a short update on the Bay View apartment project. He mentioned that the city was awarded a Vibrant Spaces grant that was received from the WEDC (Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation) for an alley beautification project between 110 and 112 Main Street West (between Kravin's and the building to the west). There were some legalities to work through with that. The city has joined the "America in Bloom" group and will help with beautification efforts around town. A task force has been created by the Parks & Rec Director.

a. Update on Property Maintenance Enforcement

There are a few properties the city is working on abating with warrants. Mayor Mackenzie added the city was in the process of condemning and tearing down a house that has been sitting for a couple years in an unsafe condition. They were given notice and they filed an appeal to the court. The city entered into an agreement to give additional time to make the corrections. If it isn't satisfied by then, the city will proceed with the tear-down.

b. Update on Building Permits for February 2026

None

c. Update on Miscellaneous Planning and Development Items

Mr. Wiley clarified specific information shown for the Bay Vue apartments on the makeshift spreadsheet permit report. This was a result of the down-time that occurred during the software transition. He noted Vision Inc. is serving as their own general contractor and have sub-contractors who have been hired out for portions of the work.

2. Announcement/Reports/Comments/Questions

The Mayor reported that the city is placing a cement restroom on the Baron Radiator Property which is supposedly vandal proof, self-cleaning and heated for winter use. The contracts are in place, the boat launch work and the funding issues with that project have been resolved. The farmers market has been moved to the parking lot across from City Hall. A study was done evaluating the existing parking downtown and it confirmed that we have an abundance of spaces - up to 2,000 spots. This study will help with upcoming streetscape efforts in the target area including Vaughn Avenue including the portion from US-2 up to 6th Street. A couple different strategies were explained with relation to the beautification efforts. Mr. Wiley mentioned that the city is planning on doing an update to the Comprehensive Plan starting this year. The city is in the process of selecting a consultant. He is looking at forming a steering committee who would come before the plan commission. Mr. Eades expressed interest in being on this committee. Mayor Mackenzie reiterated that staff is available to answer questions when they come up and to please call and give them a heads up if possible so they have time to look into it.

3. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn by Ms. Tochterman, Second by Ms. Cutler. Motion carried 5-0.
Meeting closed at 8:39 pm.

Recorded by:
Terri Erickson
Assistant Planner