1) CALL MEETING TO ORDER
Meeting called to order by Chair Nelson at 7:00 p.m. Commission members present: Chair Nelson, Commissioner Thomson, Commissioner VanRossum, Commissioner Ward and Commissioner Zastrow. Excused: Commissioner Magray and Commissioner Yaggie. Staff present: Steve Dunks, Zoning Administrator; and Melissa Hongisto, Deputy Clerk.

2) APPROVE AGENDA
Motion by Thomson to approve the agenda as presented, second by Ward, motion carried 5-0.

3) CONSENT AGENDA
   a) Approve the Minutes of the Wednesday, June 8, 2016, Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
   b) Approve the Minutes of the Tuesday, June 14, 2016, Board of Appeals Meeting
   c) Building Permit Report: June 2016
      Motion by VanRossum to approve the consent agenda as presented, second by Ward, motion carried 5-0.

4) PUBLIC FORUM (NON-AGENDA ITEMS): Anything which may be brought before the Planning & Zoning Commission for which no referral shall be made or action shall be taken. No one spoke.

5) DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION: Request by William Chambers III, 12400 Velp Ave, Suamico, WI for approval of a 1-lot Certified Survey Map, as prepared by Michael Soletski, Location Supply LLC, on parcel SU-633. Located on the east end of Mulligan Way. Zoned RS

   Staff Report:
   • A home already exists on this proposed lot. The required road frontage comes from the western end of the parent parcel which fronts on Mulligan Way. This frontage remains on the parent parcel keeping it conforming.
   • Because the parent is larger than 10 acres, we do not require it to be shown on the CSM. Although Brown County is likely going to ask that it is shown because it is located with-in the sewer service area.
   • The building set-back in this area is 35ft, not 40. This needs to be corrected.
   • Staff believes the western part of Mulligan Way has already been dedicated and should not be labeled “Future”.
   • The eastern dedication of Mulligan Way does not seem to serve any purpose. East of that is entirely wetlands and will not be developed under today’s regulations. The southern property owner does not have room for a home on
In the past we have had conditions relating to the shelter, containment & waste disposal/storage. Staff would recommend similar conditions if recommending approval.

Jeff Lepak, 2045 Susie Ct; came in to voice concerns about having the horses in front of his house (which is across the street). He feels it would be more appropriate if the horses were boarded somewhere else, that the area is not right for horses. The location is about 275 feet from his house. Feels that Mr. Schomaker should come back once he takes ownership of the property. In addition, he had issues with how the letter was mailed out with the appearance that the current property owners were asking for the conditional use.

Scott Schomaker, 3092 Sunray Ln; was here to discuss where he would like to put the horses. He is asking for two horses on a parcel that is 5 acres. Village code permits one horse per two acres with this particular zoning.

Discussion was held whether or not the horses should be moved to a different location. At which point Mr. Schomaker said that he was just giving an example of where they could be.

Commissioner Zastrow and Commissioner Thomson see nothing wrong with this request. It is within the code to allow the property to have horses.

Commissioner VanRossum would like a different footprint and would like to meet the neighbor halfway. Does not feel comfortable approving this conditional use if there is not another option brought forward.

Motion by Thomson to recommend, to the Village Board approval of the conditional use to allow horses on SU-48-6 with the following conditions
1. An appropriate shelter & containment area shall be provided for the horses.
2. All waste shall be contained and disposed of in a manner that will not create unsightly views or objectionable odors for surrounding properties.
4. The Village reserves the right to review the Conditional Use permit for violations of the conditions of approval and rescind if necessary,
Second by Ward, motion carried 4-1 (Nay – VanRossum).

6) DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION: Request by Shipyard Marine (Howitt Realty, LLC), 780 Longtail Beach Rd. for a rezone/zoning clarification to HWY Business for parcels SU-964-A-11 thru SU-964-A-64 and SU-569. Located on the north side of Longtail Beach Rd at Longtail Beach Ln. Zoned Business/ Residential Sewer?
Staff Report:
• Exhibit A is a Plat of Survey dated July 12, 1960. It shows the property in question as the Lysle J Legare & Rosemary Legare property.
• Exhibit B notes a May 14, 1962 Town Board meeting rezoning the Lyle Le Gare property from residential to business. Staff believes this was the entire property outlined in Exhibit A.
• Exhibit C is a CSM which divided the property into what exists today. The map was created in 1981. No additional rezoning’s were noted at this time.
• Exhibit D is the letter to, the then owner, Craig Braun reflecting a rezone from either EA or R-2 to Family Service & Entertainment, with conditions. The minutes of that meeting are also included. Considering Exhibit B, not really sure why this took place. We have no records indicating any change in zoning from the 1962 motion. The minutes of that meeting indicate discussion about a condominium Plat which would lead me to believe the rezone at that time was to include the duplex that exists, which the current map still shows as RS(Exhibit E).
• There is also a conditional use on SU-569 which allowed the storage building on that parcel.
• All things considered, staff believes the all property’s associated with this business should, based on records, all be zoned B. The family Service & Entertainment no longer exists and staff has not found any records or what those said properties were changed to when that zoning was eliminated.
• The Village Attorney, Paul Umentum has reviewed all of the attached documents and is recommending a rezoning to a Highway Business classification to eliminate and consolidate all the zoning and conditional use issues that exist today.
• This business has been located on these parcels since the late 1960’s. This is a substantial taxpayer and eliminating this as a business property would leave a void in the tax base that could not be filled by any residential development on this property. The benefit of this company is not just the tax base. Without Shipyard taking on the dredging of the channel to the bay it is unlikely any pleasure craft would be at the docks of the properties along Longtail Beach Ln. A large amount of those using the drop-in service that Shipyard provides are Suamico residents.

A representative of Shipyard Marine was present to explain the need for the show room. Annual sales are about $10 million, about 22 seasonal employees, a good portion of their parts are purchased locally.

Joan Mutz, 830 Longtail Beach Rd; came and spoke regarding the history of Shipyard Marine. Wanted to know if anyone else has any knowledge of this marina and the history. (Commissioner Zastrow worked for Carver from 1979-1998 and is aware of the history of the marina and Commissioner Magray has been on commission since 1993.) She is not in favor of the boats being outside as they were supposed to be stored inside. Feels there was missteps almost every step of the way. Wanted to know if the question mark at the end of the description was intentional.

Ricky Marto, 2544 Longtail Beach Ln; concerned about semis going down the road with the road being so narrow. Doesn’t mind the business, but it is growing
and getting bigger. The boats are getting faster. Concerned with conditions that were in place and have been changed. Who will enforce the conditions? No one enforces anything right now.

Richard Marto, 2584 Longtail Beach Ln; wanted to know if they pay taxes on the docks and he had a couple of old minutes that he gave to us to add to the record (they are attached to the minutes).

Monica Mutz, 830 Longtail Beach Rd; wanted to know why they are asking for a rezone. Basically the general requirements of highway business and business are the same. It appears as if the zoning they have is good enough. Feels they are rezoning to get more options in the future.

Discussion among the commissioners was held. Things have changed in the last 35 years. They are trying to consolidate all the different parcels and put a zoning designation that makes sense. They determined that they want to do things right and that it is the right time to create a marina ordinance.

Motion by Ward to refer this back to staff to create a marina ordinance, second by VanRossum, motion carried 5-0.

7) DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION: Agriculture Farmland Preservation recertification update

Staff Report:
The Commission was alerted to the upcoming Farmland Preservation update by Brown County, as required by DATCP. The attached is a memo from Brown County regarding that update. Our map is a checker board. Not sure there is any way to avoid that based on past actions. I believe when the original map was prepared we considered the historically Exclusive Ag properties and only removed a small number of those based on the likelihood of future development in the near future. That beings said, the map will either be accepted for what it is or we will be removed from the program. I can’t see spending the extensive staff time we did for the 6 plus years it took for the initial re-design of the map. Very little changed and considering only 8 farmers were taking advantage of the income tax credit tied to the program in 2008, it would not be a good use of taxpayers’ dollars.

8) ADJOURNMENT
Motion by Ward to adjourn at 8:53 p.m., second by Thomson, motion carried 5-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Melissa Hongisto, Deputy Clerk
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