



11333 N. Cedarburg Road
Mequon, WI 53092
Phone: 262-236-2904
Fax: 262-242-9655

www.ci.mequon.wi.us

Department of Community Development
Taped and Televised

**PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
Monday, January 14, 2019
6:00 PM
Christine Nuernberg Hall**

Minutes

1) Call to Order, Roll Call

Present:

Chairman Dan Abendroth
Alderman Robert Strzelczyk
Commissioner Martin Choren
Commissioner Rick Lemke
Commissioner Brian Parrish
Commissioner James Schaefer
Commissioner Rebecca Schaefer
Commissioner John Stoker
Alternate Stephanie Hawley
Board Member James Baka - **Absent**

a) Approval of Minutes

Action

Ald. Strzelczyk made a motion to approve the December 3, 2018 minutes.

Commissioner Becky Schaefer seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken, vote passed (8-0)

RESULT:	APPROVED BY VOICE ACCLAMATION [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Robert Strzelczyk, Alderman
SECONDER:	Rebecca Schaefer, Commissioner
AYES:	Abendroth, Choren, Hawley, Lemke, Parrish, J. Schaefer, R. Schaefer, Stoker, Strzelczyk

b) PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

2) Consent

- a) P2 Development for RKC Limited Partnership. The applicant is seeking fill permit approval to excavate the foundation at 11124 N. Industrial Drive and to fill the lots at 11127 and 11050 N. Industrial Drive and 6209 W. Mequon Road (Foxtown Development).

Action

Ald. Strzelczyk made a motion to approve the 6 consent agenda items.

Commissioner Stoker seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken, vote passed (8-0)

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Robert Strzelczyk, Alderman
SECONDER:	John Stoker, Commissioner
AYES:	Abendroth, Choren, Lemke, Parrish, J. Schaefer, 2R. Schaefer, Stoker, Strzelczyk

- b) Stantec for Bill Arpe. The applicant is seeking fill permit approval for landscape pond extension (5.6. acres) and fill of cut areas (20 acres) for the property located at 4550 W. Highland Road.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Robert Strzelczyk, Alderman
SECONDER:	John Stoker, Commissioner
AYES:	Abendroth, Choren, Lemke, Parrish, J. Schaefer, R. Schaefer, Stoker, Strzelczyk

- c) Chaput Land Surveys for Bill Arpe. The applicant is seeking certified survey map approval for a 3-lot land division for the property located at 4550 W. Highland and the parcel to the immediate west.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Robert Strzelczyk, Alderman
SECONDER:	John Stoker, Commissioner
AYES:	Abendroth, Choren, Lemke, Parrish, J. Schaefer, R. Schaefer, Stoker, Strzelczyk

- d) Robert Bach for Fox Yard, LLC & FT1, LLC. The applicant is seeking certified survey map approval for a 2-lot land division for the properties located at 6209 W. Mequon Road and 11124 N. Industrial Drive (Foxtown Development).

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Robert Strzelczyk, Alderman
SECONDER:	John Stoker, Commissioner
AYES:	Abendroth, Choren, Lemke, Parrish, J. Schaefer, R. Schaefer, Stoker, Strzelczyk

- e) First Weber Inc. for James & Catherine Hurth. The applicant is seeking certified survey map approval for a 2-lot land division for the property located at 12501 N. Lake Shore Drive and parcels to the west and north.

This item was canceled by the applicant.

- f) Dawn & Jason Moll. The applicant is seeking setback waiver approval to allow for an addition to an existing dwelling for the property located at 12000 W. Highland Road.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Robert Strzelczyk, Alderman
SECONDER:	John Stoker, Commissioner
AYES:	Abendroth, Choren, Lemke, Parrish, J. Schaefer, R. Schaefer, Stoker, Strzelczyk

- g) Walter Buildings for Scott Ernst. The applicant is seeking approval for an accessory structure greater than 1,000 sq. ft. to allow for a 7,200 sq. ft. cold storage machine shed for property located at 13101 N. Wauwatosa Road.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Robert Strzelczyk, Alderman
SECONDER:	John Stoker, Commissioner
AYES:	Abendroth, Choren, Lemke, Parrish, J. Schaefer, R. Schaefer, Stoker, Strzelczyk

3) Regular Business / Public Hearing

- a) CSD for Carlson Tool. The applicant is seeking conditional use grant and building and site plan amendment approval for a 36,355 sq. ft. expansion to the industrial facility for the property located at 5545 West Pioneer Road.

Action

Commissioner Stoker made a motion to open a public hearing.

Commissioner Parrish seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken, vote passed (8-0)

Action

Ald. Strzelczyk made a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Jim Schaefer seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken, vote passed (8-0)

Asst. Dir. Zader stated that the expansion is to the east of the existing building. It is zoned B-5 and is a permitted use but the applicant is asking for a waiver for the front set back which required the need for the conditional use grant (CUG). The code currently has a setback at 65 feet. When this building was originally built the setback was 50 feet and the applicant is proposing to place the front of the building no closer than 48 feet. The two foot difference is due to a machinery lift inside the building that must be in line throughout the building. They are asking for a 2 foot waiver to the existing building and a 17 foot waiver to the current code standard.

The architectural of the building matches the existing the building on the front. The rear elevation, which has no public visibility, will have a more standard steam finish. There is ample parking available and no changes are being made to the parking lot. The landscaping plan was reviewed by the landscaping consultant and he provided a number of comments which were forwarded to the applicant prior to the meeting. The plan included in the packet is in response to the consultant comments but there was not enough time before the meeting to fully review to new plan. It is an improvement from the original plan submitted and a condition will be that a final review of the plan is done by the landscaping consultant. The only lighting being added is the additional wall packs. Some clarification on a few of the fixtures is needed. A condition will be added that cut sheets be submitted that meet the code requirement. Staff does recommend approval according to the conditions in the staff report.

The applicant, Jerry Edquist, stated that they are matching the existing front façade. They have three crane bays in the building that run east to west that building needs to accommodate and this is the reason for the setback waiver.

The feedback from the Commission is that the landscape reviews are difficult to read and there is a request for staff to work with the landscape consultant to provider reports that are easier to understand.

Asst. Dir. Zader responded that there is a scope of services from the consultant to not only changing the code requirements and the language in the code but to establish expectations for the type of review requested and to not be so overly detailed and technical.

Action

Ald. Strzelczyk made a motion to approve the item.

Commissioner Jim Schaefer seconded the motion.

Mayor Abendroth made a request to include the technical reason for the waiver to the setback in the CUG.

A voice vote was taken, vote passed (8-0)

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Robert Strzelczyk, Alderman
SECONDER:	James Schaefer, Commissioner
AYES:	Abendroth, Choren, Lemke, Parrish, J. Schaefer, R. Schaefer, Stoker, Strzelczyk

- b) Boulder Venture for Associated Bank. The applicant is seeking building and site plan, conditional use grant sign waiver approval for a proposed two-story, 7,600 sq. ft. financial institution for the property located at 11223 N. Port Washington Road.

Action

Ald. Strzelczyk made a motion to open a public hearing.

Commissioner Becky Schaefer seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken, vote passed (8-0)

Action

Commissioner Parrish made a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Stoker seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken, vote passed (8-0)

Planner Vang stated that this proposal is for Associated Bank to build a 7,600 sq. ft. building on .99 acres in B-2 zoning, which is a permitted use. The applicant is requesting a conditional use grant (CUG) to allow for waivers to the requirements to the B-2 zoning district. The site is non-conforming to the lot size, so the Planning Commission may approve modifications to one or more district standards through a CUG. The applicant is also requesting a sign waiver for an illuminated window sign which exceeds the height requirement. The site plan shows a setback of 25.7 feet which is set further back than the PNC bank building to the south and is in line with the Starbucks building to the north. The proposed tower element does project further into the setback; having a setback of 15 feet, and does sit between the PNC and Starbucks setbacks. The placement of the building does bridge the gap between the location of the PNC Bank building and the Starbucks development to the north. This will help to create a nice gradual street edge change from the PNC Bank building on the corner and the properties to the north.

The applicant is requesting several waivers to the building and parking lot. The proposed building setback is 15 feet and the required setback is 60 feet. Staff is supportive of this setback waiver request to keep a consistent building line with existing and future buildings. The site plan proposes a south side offset of 10 feet and the required offset is 20 feet. The applicant is requesting waivers to the parking lot setbacks and offsets. The proposed plan shows a parking lot setback of 15 feet while the code requires a 25 foot setback. The plan shows a 5.6 offset while the district code requires a 20 foot offset. Staff does support the waivers requested due to the size of the non-conforming lot. In addition, the applicant has worked with staff over the past several months to change the location of the drive-thru and staff supports the location of the drive-thru at the rear and west of the building.

According to the building code, the parking lot would require 26 parking stalls plus one per employee. The applicant has indicated there are 10-15 employees on a daily basis which would require 41 parking stalls. They are proposing 43 stalls and staff recommends that they reduce the parking plan by 2 stalls to still meet the code requirement as well as to increase the open space ratio.

The FAR proposed is 17.16% for the entire development which complies with the 30% requirement. The concept plan shows the green space to be at 31% which does not meet the 40% code requirement and

requires a waiver. Although staff understands the need for a waiver to the green pace requirement due to the non-conforming site size, staff does recommend reducing the parking stalls by two, which will help increase that ratio.

There is an existing right-in/right-out drive access to the south end of the site near the PNC Bank which this site plan eliminates. The access from Port Washington Road will be from the existing access driveway to the north. The new bank facility will share the access with the property to the north. A cross access easement shall be reviewed and approved by the City Attorney prior to issuing building permits. The access point does not align with the medium and it is recommended to be in line with development on the east side of Port Washington Road. Port Washington Road is under the jurisdiction of Ozaukee County and any changes are subject to the county's approval. The engineering department has stated that the exit shall have a left turn and a dedicated thru lane.

Staff has worked with the applicant on the building plan design and site plan. Many of the suggestions by staff have been incorporated into the proposed plan including the location of the drive-thru in the rear. Staff does support the proposed elevations. The building materials were detailed and renderings were shown.

The applicant is requesting a sign waiver for an illuminated window sign. Staff is denying the request based on the illumination and height of the sign.

There are many recommendations by the landscape consultant that staff supports.

Overall staff recommends the following:

- Eliminate two parking stalls
- Add to landscaping islands
- Add landscaping enhancements to the north parking row
- Add trees to the south and west along property lines to meet the 30% shading requirement
- Reduce the level of treatment on the front east portion

Asst. Eng. Henk stated that the many of the engineering recommendations are similar to previous reviews. The highlights:

- Access will line up with the development across the street and the medium and is under the jurisdiction of Ozaukee County.
- Stormwater management is required for this site due to the increase in impervious area
- Required to connect to city water and sewer.

The applicant, Robert Schmidt from Boulder Venture, thanked staff for their work over the past few months. They asked that the tower sign be removed from the approval tonight and brought back at another time.

The amount of parking stalls was discussed. The applicant stated that there will be expanded services (more employees and customers) offered at the bank building that will require the additional parking spaces. Some Commissioners voiced concern about the amount of waivers requested. There was some support for the location of the proposed building and many like that it fills in between the existing adjacent developments but not all are supportive of the setback. The building materials were well received. Commissioners do not like the big sign in the tower element and some do not like the glass staircase tower and stated that that space should not be used for marketing purposes.

There was discussion regarding the line of sight and the location of the building as well as reducing the

landscaping to the west in an effort to push the building back 10 feet.

Action

Ald. Strzelczyk made a motion to table the item.

Commissioner Jim Schaefer seconded the motion to table the item.

A roll call vote was taken, vote failed (5-3) (No: Mayor Abendroth, Parrish, Stoker, Choren, Lemke)

Action

Commissioner Stoker made a motion to approve the item with the condition of moving the building back 10 feet by using both of the landscaping areas in the front and the back, the 26 conditions listed in the staff report and removing the tower element sign from this approval.

Commissioner Parrish seconded the motion

Mayor Abendroth made a friendly comment (not a required condition) to be added to the motion that the intent of the Commission is that no open space waivers will be granted on the north parcel; they should aim to meet the 40% open space ratio.

Commissioner Stoker accepted the friendly comment.

Commissioner Parrish seconded accepting the friendly comment.

A roll call vote was taken, vote passed (5-3) (No: Ald. Strzelczyk, Becky Schaefer, Jim Schaefer).

RESULT:	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS [5 TO 3]
MOVER:	John Stoker, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Brian Parrish, Commissioner
AYES:	Abendroth, Choren, Lemke, Parrish, Stoker
NAYS:	J. Schaefer, R. Schaefer, Strzelczyk

4) Regular Business

- a) Froze Design Build, Inc. for Betsey & Jay Woody. The applicant is seeking approval to remove an existing Planning Commission imposed ravine setback to allow for the expansion of an existing home for the property located at 616 E. Juniper Lane.

Planner Vang stated that as part of a 3-lot land division in 1979, the Planning Commission added a condition that CSM 1233 show a 30 feet setback for all buildings at the top of the ravine. The current homeowners had an existing home that was within the 30 foot setback. They would like to add a one-story bedroom addition as well as a deck that encroaches within this setback. The city zoning code does not have setback requirements from the ravine. A land division in 1979 also imposed that condition and a total of 7 properties have a ravine setback on that survey.

There were not many details or explanation in the minutes from CSM 1233 as to why the setback was imposed. The minutes from the land division to the north (CSM 1089) discussed concerns with the runoff and drainage to the ravine as well as the stability of the soil.

Staff did reach out to other communities as to their zoning regarding ravine setbacks. Per Ozaukee County standards, a 75 foot ravine setback would be required for this property. Although the zoning code does not address the ravine setback, this has been imposed on previous land divisions.

Staff does not recommend the approval to remove the setback. At the time, the Planning Commission

uniformly approved the ravine setback due to concerns regarding runoff and erosion and properties have complied with the setback requirement since that time.

The City Attorney stated that if the Commission does vote to approve the removal of the setback requirement, the applicant shall alter the plat through a circuit court order that has the right to approve alteration of plats if the Commission has in writing released or waived the restriction.

The applicant, Betsey Woody, has owned the property for over 20 years and they have made many improvements over the years. They want to expand the master bedroom on the first floor so that they can age in the home as well as put a deck on the back. She stated that the roof in the back of their house is non-compliant and they wish to fix it and to build out from there. They want to replace the flat roof with a pitched roof in efforts to better match the rest of the house as well as improve runoff and drainage issues they have.

Due to the fact that Mequon does not have a code for this, they are requesting the opportunity to do an environmental study before being refused approval. They feel that the improvements would help mitigate water issues.

Asst. Eng. Henk explained that a geo technical engineer, trained in soils, erosion and foundation, would need to evaluate whether putting a building any closer to the ravine would impact the ravine itself.

There was support from the Commission to allow the applicant to hire a geo-technical engineer to conduct a study prior to a decision on the proposed request.

Mayor Abendroth requested that the geo-technical study include impacts to the neighboring properties as well and the Commission supported this request.

Action

Mayor Abendroth made a motion to table the item and allow for a geo-technical study to be conducted to include the impact on the subject property as well as the neighboring properties.

Commissioner Lemke seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken; vote passed (8-0)

RESULT:	TABLED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Dan Abendroth, Chairman
SECONDER:	Rick Lemke, Commissioner
AYES:	Abendroth, Choren, Lemke, Parrish, J. Schaefer, R. Schaefer, Stoker, Strzelczyk

- b) Gene Shikhman. The applicant is seeking specimen tree removal approval to remove four trees from the property located at 10249 N. Wildwood Court (Lot 6).

Asst. Dir. Zader stated that this request is for the removal of specimen trees for a property located in the Wildwood subdivision. He reminded the Commission that this is a unique subdivision in that at the time of the subdivision plat, given the vast amount of trees, the city along with the developer, proactively looked at each individual home site and determined equitable number of specimen trees that could be removed to place a home site on each property. There were 3 trees permitted to be removed at this site as part of the subdivision plat.

In 2016 the applicant was before the Commission requesting an additional 7 specimen trees be approved for removal for a total of 10 trees. The Commission denied that request and approved the 3 permitted trees. The current request is for the removal of 1 additional tree which is shown in the center of the driveway of the proposed site plan. The City Forester provided a memo included in the board packet detailing the condition of the trees on the site.

Asst. Dir. Zader stated that there is a 50 foot building setback on the north end of the property from the approved subdivision plat that is no longer valid due to the original road design change. The side yard offset is only 20 feet, so if the house could be shifted to the north up to 30 feet, only 3 trees would need to be removed. The driveway has been slightly modified and does not impact additional trees although the City Forester has recommended protective tree fencing to keep the trees safe from damage during construction.

Staff and the City Forester recommend shifting the building to the north and eliminating the 3 permitted trees and the applicant would be required to spend the required 75% of replacement trees or pay the equivalent into the Tree Fund. If the Commission supports this recommendation, the surveyor will need to do an affidavit to make a correction to the plat to indicate the mistake is noted and reduced to 20 foot offset per the code.

The applicant, Gene Shikhman, stated they moved the house 30 feet as recommended by staff but it is too close to the neighboring property and there is not enough room in the front of the house and the driveway is too small with the adjustment. They originally asked for 7 trees and they are only asking for 1 tree at this time.

Action

Commissioner Stoker made a motion to approve the removal of the additional tree (4 trees in total), the required replacement trees or fee paid to the Tree Fund will be adjusted based on the 4th tree and is required.

Commissioner Lemke seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken, vote passed (5-3)(No: Ald. Strzelczyk, Becky Schaefer, Jim Schaefer)

RESULT:	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS [5 TO 3]
MOVER:	John Stoker, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Rick Lemke, Commissioner
AYES:	Abendroth, Choren, Lemke, Parrish, Stoker
NAYS:	J. Schaefer, R. Schaefer, Strzelczyk

5) Policy

- a) An Ordinance Amending Chapter 58 Zoning Code as it relates to Permitted Uses in the B-5 Zoning District to allow specialty trade contractors or building service providers.

Action

Mayor Abendroth made a motion to approve the item.

Ald. Strzelczyk seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken, vote passed (8-0)

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Dan Abendroth, Chairman
SECONDER:	Robert Strzelczyk, Alderman
AYES:	Abendroth, Choren, Lemke, Parrish, J. Schaefer, R. Schaefer, Stoker, Strzelczyk

- b) An Ordinance Amending Chapter 58, Zoning Code, to Rezone the Property Located at 4828 W. Donges Bay Road from B-3 (Office & Service) with Floodway and Flood Fringe to NC (Neighborhood Commercial) with a PUD (Planned Unit Development) with Floodway and Flood Fringe and Amending the City's Land Use Plan Map from Residential 1 - 1.5 Acres to Neighborhood Commercial

Reed Kailing – 10545 N. River Lake Drive - is concerned about noise issues that may be associated with the proposed commercial rezoning. They have collected 100 signatures of other concerned neighbors that support the desire to have the property zoned residential.

Noreen Oelschlaeger – 10440 N. River Lake Drive – is opposed to the proposed zoning along with the group of concerned neighbors. Her concerns involve safety, security, noise, increased light and erosion. She supports staff recommendation to rezone the property to single-family residential.

Marti Carr – 10513 N. River Lake Drive - supports planning staff recommendation to rezone the property to single-family residential. Her concerns include noise, light, and erosion as well as decreased property values if the property is zoned commercial.

Joseph Bastin – 10443 N. River Lake Drive – lives directly across the river from the property in question and is opposed to the rezoning and does not wish to live across the river from a commercial property. He feels that the single-family residential zoning is the best fit for that area. He worries about the reduced public safety and feels that it will cause decreased property values.

Spencer Koenig – 10139 Hunt Club – supports the applicant's right to have the property continued to be zoned commercial as the corner is filled with commercial properties.

Perry Robinson – 4811 N. Donges Bay Road – appreciates the moratorium study conducted by the city. He is supportive of the staff recommendations of single-family residential. He feels that it aligns the property with neighboring properties along the river. He feels this is an example of spot zoning and should not be allowed. He also has environmental concerns of noise and traffic to the area.

Craig Raddatz - 3620 W. Normandy Court – supports the applicant and feels that he has a right to maintain the commercial zoning he paid for when he purchased the property and expects for his property.

Paul Apfelbach – 10820 N. Cedarburg Road – he supports the applicant and his rights to maintain the commercial zoning and feels that it is an appropriate space for this zoning as it is surrounding by high intensity commercial uses.

Cheryl Bragstad – 4320 W. Fox Run - stated that she feels that everyone can work together and find a compromise that is acceptable. Her biggest concern is how the waterway may be used and the noise it may cause and disruption to the conservancy across the river from this property. A day time office type use would be acceptable but not a business that has lights during the evenings or on the weekends.

Director Tollefson stated that in an effort to finalize the moratorium recommendations and measures, which were recommended by the Commission in December and adopted by the Common Council last week, this one piece was held out to discuss the zoning. The vote at the last Commission meeting was tied at 3-3 and the issue seems to be the competing interest of land use and planning policy recommendation versus private property rights.

In response to the Commission pulling this one property out from the general approval, it was recommended by staff and the Council that a compromised approach to the property owner be offered. Staff and the LaSage family worked out an agreement for Neighborhood Commercial zoning and agreed upon conditions listed for the PUD. There is still concern from the neighbors regarding this zoning. She stated that the applicant previously proposed a youth camp to be located at the property and that would not be allowed as it would only be allowed under a Park zoning district.

The Neighborhood Commercial zoning was recommended based on good land use and zoning practices as well as the surrounding neighborhood. Although the number of uses allowed in this new zoning district is restricted, it does allow for greater flexibility than the B-3 district.

The property is currently being used as single-family residence and based on a letter received from the LaSage family, there are a few home occupations being run out of the single-family home. The PUD would require a permit to be completed for approval of those uses at the site.

The applicant, Jeremy LaSage, stated that he did not propose a zoning change; this has been initiated by the city through the moratorium. He purchased his property as B-3 and paid more for it because of this zoning and he wants to keep the current zoning and not have it changed to residential as he would lose a lot of property value. He is upset about his property rights potentially being taken away. The property has been zoned commercial for 40 years. He also is a firm believer in cleaning up the river and takes efforts to do his part to keep it clean.

Mr. LaSage stated he does plan to gut and repair the 5,000 sq. ft. building on his property and his intent is to use it for a commercial use.

Dir. Tollefson explained that all residential zoning districts allow for a home occupation; which requires a permit; and is essentially office transactions conducted within in a residential home. If the principal use on this property, under the commercial zoning, becomes commercial, the single-family home needs to be removed. The current single-family residence and structure are non-conforming in the current B-3 zoning. One of the public policy objectives included in the moratorium is to clear up as many non-conforming properties as possible.

There was discussion amongst the Commission about which zoning is most preferable. The Commission acknowledged the fact that a group of residents are concerned about the rezoning of this property. The Commission does not feel comfortable taking away a property owner's rights and devaluing the property.

Motion

Ald. Strzelczyk made a motion to approve the Neighborhood Commercial/PUD overlay per staff recommendations with the restriction that all business use is limited to 4828 N. Donges Bay Road and have access from Donges Bay Road only.

There was no second to this motion.

Dir. Tollefson suggested that if the property is left as it is currently zoned (B-3) it would be the most agreeable to all. This site was not of particular focus when enacting the moratorium. In addition, it may be

best to determine zoning, if and when the owner brings forward a proposal. It would be considered an outlier and non-conforming to its use, however the issue regarding the intensity of a potential use under the Neighborhood Commercial/PUD zoning is concerning to the surrounding neighbors.

Motion

Commissioner Lemke made a motion to keep the current B-3 zoning.

Commissioner Stoker seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken; vote passed (8-0)

RESULT:	DENIAL [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	John Stoker, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Rick Lemke, Commissioner
AYES:	Abendroth, Choren, Lemke, Parrish, J. Schaefer, R. Schaefer, Stoker, Strzelczyk

6) Announcements

The next meeting is Monday, February 11, 2019 at 6:00 p.m.

7) Adjourn

Action

Commissioner Becky Schaefer made a motion to adjourn.

Ald. Strzelczyk seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken, vote passed (8-0)

The meeting concluded at 9:07 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jac Zader