

**Village of Weston, Wisconsin
OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLAN COMMISSION**

held on Monday, February 11, 2019, at 6:00 p.m., in the Board Room, at the Municipal Center

AGENDA ITEMS.

- 1. Meeting called to order by Plan Commission Chair & Village President Barb Ermeling.**
- 2. Meeting called to order by Extraterritorial Zoning Committee Chair Loren White.**
- 3. Roll Call of Village Plan Commission by Secretary Parker.**

Roll call indicated 6 Plan Commission members present.

<u>Member</u>	<u>Present</u>
Ermeling, Barb	YES
Gau, Duane	YES
Jordan, Joe	YES
Kollmansberger, Tina	NO - Excused
Mumper, Roy	YES
White, Loren	YES
Zeyghami, Hooshang	YES

- 4. Roll Call of Joint Village & Town Extraterritorial Zoning Committee by Secretary Parker.**

Roll call indicated 4 Joint Village & Town Extraterritorial Zoning Committee members present.

<u>Member</u>	<u>Present</u>
White, Loren	YES
Hull, Mark	YES
Christiansen, Randy	YES
Kollmansberger, Tina	NO - Excused
Mumper, Roy	YES
Olson, Milt	NO - Excused

Village Staff in attendance: Donner, Wodalski, Wehner, Tatro, Maguire, and Parker.

- 5. Opportunity for citizens to be heard.**

Joe Muzynoski, 5803 Mary Lane, would like to speak when the Dominika Street agenda item comes up.

- 6. Written communications received.**

- a. Matt Capodice, Graphic House – Request to change zoning ordinance Sec. 94.13.03(3)(b) Sign Area.**

Capodice stated he wanted to show the Commission the difference in how sign permits are issued at different communities. He gave examples on Pick'n Save and CoVantage and how these change when basing the square footage on a square/rectangle versus a polygon. He stated a polygon method allows more flexibility or freedom on the part of the business owner. He stated how businesses are trying to be creative with their signs, to make them stand out, and when the square footage is based on a rectangle, the signs become limited in size.

Mumper questioned what is the most common method used. Capodice stated amongst the communities, it is about half and half.

Wehner stated the rectangle method has been used here since he has worked here. What has changed with the sign ordinance is how to calculate what is allowed. Wehner stated issues are coming up primarily with the Weston Marketplace, where some businesses in the multi-tenant building are taking up more space with their signs, reducing the amount of sign space that is left for the other businesses, and with the building being 300 feet away from the road, they each want their sign bigger so it is more visible.

White commented at the last meeting they took action on the CBD Oil store, where PC made accommodations for their sign. White questioned if we want to change our ordinance, when we do currently have an avenue (through PC approval) to take care of the issues.

Capodice stated each time they work with a client, they have to take into account what the municipality allows. He feels 50% of the state uses this means to calculate the sign size. He was under the impression that there were no variance options for Weston, which is why he is bringing this in.

Wehner stated last month a large number of changes were made to the code, within those changes included changes to the variance process and on what could be applied for a variance; where essentially now, anything in the zoning code can be applied for a variance, with the exception of uses.

White stated from a sales position, how do they know when a sign exceeds the limit. Capodice agreed and said it is hard when working with a client on their desired sign design and then to come to the municipality, and find out the sign won't fit their standards. He gave examples of what Madison requires.

Wehner commented following the square or rectangle is easiest way to see what is correct. He feels the rectangle should be used; but for those signs that have two lines of text/images, to instead draw the rectangle around each line of text/images, and add up those. Wehner stated when we changed the code we made it so they were allowed less wall signage space, going from the square footage of the occupied space to the linear footage of the building wall that the sign was going to be installed on. Wehner commented on how in the past, every sign permit went through the Plan Commission for approval.

Gau and Jordan agree with Wehner's suggestion on continuing using the rectangle philosophy, and to take the square footage of each line of text/images, not the blank space.

Hull stated about when getting into the creativity of the signs, the sign manufactures will try to get the most use out of the square footage of signs. For municipalities who have lesser standards, you could end up with signs of extreme shapes and sizes, which may fit within the polygon standards. Hull stated then everyone within the strips, malls, or adjacent buildings will try to out-creative the other ones. There is some uniformity to using a rectangle.

Capodice commented on how our sign sizes are calculated, when you have buildings like Pick'n Save, they want to make their main size as big as possible, forgetting about the other signs (pharmacy, liquor department, and the bank). He questioned if the pylon sign out front is included with this calculation.

Wehner stated in the new code, we restricted the freestanding signs, with the setbacks being the same as the sign height. He stated we also restricted them to 64 square feet on one face of the sign.

White does not have a problem with considering the polygon shape, but it still will not answer all the problems, for when people want the absolute maximum size sign. Capodice stated when working with businesses, they look at what is already out there to make the signs blend together.

Maguire stated what we see as an alternative, are the "yard signs" that businesses put out on the edges of their sidewalk.

Ermeling stated if Capodice knows our regulations, if there is a request, he could bring it to PC for approval. Wehner stated if they want to go through the variance process, it would be through the ZBA, which the procedure is \$400.00 and a longer process (45-60 days). *[Staff Note: There is a Special Exception process as stated in Section 94.13.02(9) for certain situations. These are taken to the Plan Commission or ETZ not the ZBA. They do still require a public hearing as they follow the same process as a Conditional Use Permit.]*

Donner stated this falls in line with some of the recommendations of the Department Audit, we would want to look at making modifications to our zoning code to permit these type of sign issues via PC approval, not ZBA. *[Staff Note: There is a Special Exception process as stated in Section 94.13.02(9) for certain situations. These are taken to the Plan Commission or ETZ not the ZBA. They do still require a public hearing as they follow the same process as a Conditional Use Permit.]*

Zeyghami stated the ordinance needs to be clear for the individual who are designing the sign, as far as what we accept and not accept.

Capodice stated if they have to bring every sign before PC, the process is going to get more and more expensive.

Capodice stated he is trying to make this work, and work with clients with what is allowed. He has seen a lot of secondary signage that customers will want later on. He stated this is where a variance would work, for those only allowed one sign, who may want another.

Hull stated in an example of Pick'n Save, if they have a pharmacy, and after-the-fact want that second pharmacy sign, this is where the variance works. Here it is clear in the code that one sign is allowed, but that there is the option to apply for a variance to have that second sign. Given the uniqueness of the building, and based on what is added inside, is the kind of situation where a variance would work. Hull feels another sign is an easier variance than the sizing of a sign. *[Staff Note: It would be a special exception permit.]*

Zeyghami stated they better have a good reason for requesting a variance, and the applicant should not assume their variance request will be approved automatically. *[Staff Note: It would be a special exception permit.]*

Gau stated he agrees with Hull and he also agrees with Donner, that staff should look at this and bring recommendations back to PC.

7. Approval of minutes from the January 14, 2019 – Regular PC meeting.

Motion by Gau, second by Zeyghami: to approve the January 14, 2019, PC Meeting minutes, with corrections.

Yes Vote: 6 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Ermeling, Barb	YES
Gau, Duane	YES
Jordan, Joe	YES
Kollmansberger, Tina	---
Mumper, Roy	YES
White, Loren	YES
Zeyghami, Hooshang	YES

8. Approve minutes from the January 14, 2019 – Regular ETZ meeting.

Motion by Mumper, second by Hull: to approve the January 14, 2019, ETZ Meeting minutes, with corrections.

Yes Vote: 4 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 2 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
White, Loren	YES
Hull, Mark	YES
Christiansen, Randy	YES
Kollmansberger, Tina	---
Mumper, Roy	YES
Olson, Milt	---

9. Acknowledge Report re: Staff-approved CSM's, Site Plans, Sign Permits, Commercial Zoning Permits, and Certificate of Occupancies.

10. Acknowledge Report re: January 2019 Building Permits.

Motion by Zeyghami, second by Jordan: to acknowledge the Reports in #9 & #10.

Yes Vote: 6 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Ermeling, Barb	YES
Gau, Duane	YES
Jordan, Joe	YES
Kollmansberger, Tina	---
Mumper, Roy	YES
White, Loren	YES
Zeyghami, Hooshang	YES

11. Public Hearing – Discussion and Recommendation to the Board of Trustees (BOT) on Adoption of 2019 Official Zoning Map and Official Extraterritorial Zoning Map for the Village of Weston.

a. Open Public Hearing.

Ermeling opened the PC public hearing at 6:37 p.m.

White opened the ETZ public hearing at 6:37 p.m.

b. Presentation by Staff.

Wehner stated this is the annual official adoption of the zoning map. All information (rezones, land divisions, Town addressing) from 2018 have been updated. Hull questioned if this approval is through the calendar year? Wehner stated this is current to today.

c. Public Hearing/Public Comment Period.

None.

d. Close Public Hearing.

Ermeling closed the PC public hearing at 6:39 p.m.

White closed the ETZ public hearing at 6:39 p.m.

e. Discussion by Plan Commission and ETZ Members.

None.

f. Recommendation from Staff.

Wehner stated to approve.

g. Action and Recommendation to the BOT by Plan Commission

Motion by Zeyghami, second by Gau: to recommend BOT adopt the 2019 Official Zoning Map for the Village of Weston.

Yes Vote: 6 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Ermeling, Barb	YES
Gau, Duane	YES
Jordan, Joe	YES
Kollmansberger, Tina	---
Mumper, Roy	YES
White, Loren	YES
Zeyghami, Hooshang	YES

h. Action and Recommendation to the BOT by ETZ Committee.

Motion by Hull, second by Christiansen: to recommend BOT adopt the 2019 Official Extraterritorial Zoning Map for the Village of Weston.

Yes Vote: 4 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 2 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
White, Loren	YES
Hull, Mark	YES
Christiansen, Randy	YES
Kollmansberger, Tina	---
Mumper, Roy	YES
Olson, Milt	---

12. Public Hearing – Discussion and Possible Action on Conditional Use Permit Request by Harold Engelbright, to allow for the Residential Business Accessory Land Use (as Described in 94.4.09(6)) within the SF-S (Single-Family Residential – Small Lot) Zoning District at 2402 Sarus Lane.

a. Open Public Hearing.

Ermeling opened the PC public hearing at 6:41 p.m.

Harold Engelbright, 2402 Sarus Lane, was present. Engelbright stated he has been working with Wehner on this. He is looking to start a small engine (lawn mowers, chainsaws, and other Briggs & Stratton-type small engines) repair shop in the corner of his garage (a picture of the area of his garage that he was referring to was displayed). He stated he typically sees about 2 or 3 customers per day. He stated about 50% of his customers would be dropping off equipment for repair, and the rest are those where he would go and pick up the equipment for repair. He is the only employee of his business. He would keep work confined to the specified workspace, and the hours would be daytime during the week, so there should be no noise complaints.

Zeyghami questioned where he is storing equipment. Engelbright stated no equipment would be stored here. If he had more customers than what he could handle that day, he would schedule them for the following week. If this business takes off, he would have to relocate. He said he would not keep anything outside. Engelbright stated he only runs equipment long enough to make sure it runs right, he does not leave running for a long period.

White questioned how he will maintain his space. A question came up about the trailer outside for storage. Engelbright stated that is only for things being delivered. White stated if he has a large piece of equipment to fix, he may want to work on it outside. White questioned what he is doing with the waste oil. Engelbright stated he said he takes his recycled oil to a facility. He also stated that his wife keeps her vehicle in the garage, and so does he. The only parts he keeps on hand are some gaskets and spark plugs. He orders parts. He does not have the room for a full shop.

Zeyghami questioned neighbors got noticed. Wehner stated yes. Staff had not received any calls or messages from neighbors.

Gau questioned the map, and where his garage faces. Engelbright stated his garage faces Siberian Drive.

Ermeling clarified just one lawnmower or something else, and then if 2 or 3 people come that he will schedule them later. Engelbright stated he tries to get things fixed that day. He stated that he works the 3rd shift. If he has to hold onto something overnight, then his vehicle would have to sit out.

Engelbright stated other small engine repair shops like Ace Hardware and CJ's, in Mosinee, are all backed up. He feels his business will benefit the area. He said he offers free local delivery to the Weston, Rothschild area.

b. Presentation by Staff.

None.

c. Public Hearing/Public Comment Period.

None.

d. Close Public Hearing.

Ermeling closed the PC public hearing at 6:55 p.m.

e. Discussion by Plan Commission.

None.

f. Recommendation from Staff.

Wehner feels this will not impact the neighborhood much, and noise will be during times that people would expect to hear those types of sounds. Wehner stated if he is operating within the means of his operational plan and the ordinance, then he should be fine.

Ermeling stated concern about outside storage. Wehner stated the #5 Performance Standard states he can't store more than principal use.

g. Action by Plan Commission

Motion by Gau, second by Jordan: to approve the Conditional Use Permit for Harold Engelbright, at 2402 Sarus Lane, as drafted in the staff report.

Yes Vote: 6 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Ermeling, Barb	YES
Gau, Duane	YES
Jordan, Joe	YES
Kollmansberger, Tina	---
Mumper, Roy	YES
White, Loren	YES
Zeyghami, Hooshang	YES

13. Discussion and Recommendation to BOT on Future Planning & Building Permit Fee Philosophy and Policy.

a. Discussion and Possible Action on Request from Tom Felch, J&D Tube Benders, for Waiver of Commercial Building Permit Fees for Project 20180083 – Referred from BOT at 01/21/2019 Meeting.

Donner stated there are two different items under this agenda item. He stated the request from Tom Felch, of J&D Tube Benders, led to the next item, in reviewing our fees, and whether our fees that we are charging are reasonable, and what does correspond to our level of effort to those permit fees. This ties back to the Land Development Audit, and the requirement to look back at some of these permits and fees.

Donner pointed out Felch applied for his site plan review back in mid-2018, and asked if there was any TIF money available, which we did not have a process in place for evaluating any availability of funds for something like this. We have since talked about creating something like this. As discussion went on about this, it would not have met any strength test or strict application of the “but for” test, meaning if this project could have been done without any TIF assistance, and Felch has admitted that he does not necessarily need any assistance. Donner stated there has been a string of e-mails exchanged, and Felch attended the last Board meeting.

Maguire showed a few different work products that he put together, showing fees by other municipalities. White commented he is concerned this would be a retroactive action and could put into place a precedence for other past projects the request to return permit fees (or future projects). He questioned how far back would you go, what data would it be based on, and where are the funds coming from? White stated it is unfortunate this happened, but if we establish a policy for one, it should be for all.

Jordan recused himself from the Plan Commission and spoke from a citizen and business owner perspective. He stated from his own experience, he has had quite a few projects with the Wausau Supply property. He stated he can understand at times, if you look at it simply as just a fee, how it can seem like much; however, he appreciates how much money is invested from the Village, and that we have a department that is responsible for reviewing the overall plans. Based on his experience in many other municipalities, he feels the permit fee is reasonable. He has no issue paying those, especially because this one here is capped at \$5,000. His building permit fee in Rapid City, South Dakota, was \$40,000. Jordan stated that he appreciates the handout Donner passed out prior to the meeting (attached) and feels the fees that are being charged are reasonable. He stated to Felch’s point on how much business and how much employment he has brought in to the community, he appreciates that. Jordan stated that he had an opportunity to take part in TIF monies but had to be able to guarantee he would be employing so many people. Jordan stated that at that time, he could not do that, so he

did not take the offer. Jordan stated he feels the cost for the land in the Business Park is very valuable. He appreciates Felch is adding value, but there is a value that the Weston staff brings to the community. For what they do for the community, he is in favor, and feels it would be a bad precedent to refund any money.

Gau questioned how the surcharge works. Tatro stated for a commercial project, a brand new building would pay a \$5,000 surcharge, and a minor addition would pay \$2,500. He stated the surcharge used to be \$5,000 for all. Tatro stated once they complete their site, then they get their surcharge money back. This ensures they build to the approved site plan specifications.

Gau feels what we have now is very reasonable, and an applicant or developer should use the TIF process if it is available. Donner stated staff is still looking at that potential. Donner stated there is a community in Georgia that has a test that is applied for, even for properties outside of the TIF, depending on some of the economic development benefits provided. He stated our attorney has advised that we can, if we wish, develop a policy on waiving fees. Donner stated he feels that would not be a wise policy though.

Ermeling stated there were some ideas of how we could handle this. She said an idea that came up was to simply drop all the building permit fees and make the taxpayers pay for it, but then you would have to raise the taxes for everyone. She stated the fees that we charge do not cover the costs of the services that we provide. Technically, the taxpayers are picking up over 50% of costs for our building services. Ermeling stated the taxpayers are paying for those improvements. She does not want to put more burden on the taxpayers.

Jordan feels the Village has done a good job operating conservatively to keep the fees down.

No motion was made, and the matter died.

Jordan stated he would be willing to go with Donner to go and speak with Felch. Donner stated Maloney would like to go too.

b. Discussion of BOT Request for Planning & Development Department to Review its Planning & Permitting Fee Schedule, and Possible Action on a Recommendation to BOT Regarding the Same.

White commented the comparison table that staff has provided reflects that the fee schedule is comparable with surrounding municipalities (though Wausau was not included). White feels our fees should reflect the average amount of time that all staff expends conducting the process and allow adjustments for those big-scale projects that may exceed the average. The fees should also reflect material costs, such as filing fees, permitting, publishing fees, paperwork, legal fees, etc. If the process is to establish a reduced or return of fees there should be a bonafide application process beforehand, to assess why, economic impact, employment generation, increment generation inside the TID, has to meet the "but for" clause; and outside the TID where would this come from. Residential permits, even though they don't generate jobs or economic advancements, they still provide a tax base for the Village. If fees are waived by the Village, is the Village willing to make up for the budget impact with cuts in services or tax increases? It was brought up that there was roughly \$290,000 collected in 2018 permit fees.

Donner stated Maguire has been working on that analysis, and there is more work to be done. Donner stated part of this process is to educate our elected officials on what our permit fees cover.

Maguire stated the time study assessment will take a while as we have not actively tracked that. Maguire gave a presentation on how we came in lower than everyone else, when breaking down the specific permit fee areas for residential buildings. Maguire then showed his graphs for commercial permit fees.

Mumper questioned, for someone applying for a permit, if there is anything that explains what the permit fees are going towards? He suggested we put together a standardized write-up explaining what the fees go towards. Maguire stated this is a work product we are putting together. The best thing we have now is a fee

breakdown. Roman stated once an application is submitted, we can breakdown the individual fees. Donner stated the same goes with utility rates.

There was discussion on Rib Mountain's fee schedule, and how they contract out for review process. The Municipality does not take in those fees. Hull suggested to put an asterisk next to Rib Mountain explaining that. Wodalski suggested to call Rib Mountain and see if they can give us an estimate.

White feels it is a good thing to go through this exercise. This also allows the committees and commissions to understand. Maguire stated our role is to educate and preserve/increase property values in the community, not be the enforcement hammer.

Gau stated there are some communities where the fee structure is tied to economic development. Sometimes taxpayers are picking up a piece of it, but it helps economic development and the community as a whole.

White gave the example of street reconstructions, where taxpayers pay for 1/3. White feels there is too much here to make a motion, and how he feels staff is heading in the right direction.

No motion made.

14. Remarks from ETZ Committee Members.

None.

15. Adjournment of ETZ Committee.

Motion by Hull, second by Christiansen to adjourn the ETZ Committee at 7:37 p.m.

16. Unfinished Business – Discussion and Possible Recommendation to the BOT on the Petition to Vacate an Unimproved Portion of the Dominika Street Right-of-Way, Laying South of Mary Lane.

Joe Muzynoski, 5803 Mary Lane, was present. Muzynoski explained how he built this house to have its look and with the sweeping driveway. His wife, Lori, and he filed this petition. This house was built by Stan Budleski, they discovered the home was built without following the setbacks that were submitted with the building permit, and now the home is only 5 feet from the property line. He stated his entire driveway is within the right-of-way. He stated his home was constructed at a value of \$300,000, and they realized they would need to downsize at some point. Now they are ready to do this, but with the setback issue, his home is unsalable. He feels to move the driveway would devalue his property. Already spent \$1,000 on a survey, and \$500 for this petition. He learned if any development were to occur to south, there are two other streets that would extend south, so his hope is the Village will not need all three streets down there. He stated that area south of him is pretty wet, so he is not sure how much buildable. He commented on how if the vacation of Dominika Street were to be approved, half of the right-of-way would go to his neighbor to the west, though, his neighbor has already indicated he would forfeit his right to take ownership. He is hoping for approval, so his home and driveway can remain unchanged.

Mumper sent e-mail to staff. Donner stated he forwarded Mumper's e-mail to our attorney this morning, and just received a reply from our attorney. Mumper explained how he raised the question of adverse possession, and this may meet exact criteria.

Donner explained a similar situation the Village had with pedestrian bridge. The reply from the attorney is if a road were improved and maintained, adverse possession is impossible. There is a ruling that prohibits local government from adverse possession. Donner stated there would have had to be 20 years of use prior to the request, and there has not in this case.

Donner then stated we did not bounce this issue off our attorney. Mumper feels we should submit this to our attorney for his opinion before taking action. Donner stated there is also a question if the Village's insurance would cover, or if the owner should take action against the builder.

White motioned to defer this topic. Wehner stated he thinks we are required to take action tonight, as we may be under statutory time. It was explained that we need to either approve or deny.

There was some discussion of how the parcel to the south could be developed, as far as the street layout, and how this can be shown on our official map, to guide the potential future developer. There was some discussion of the utility services that will need to serve this area, and how we would still want an easement where the Dominika Street right-of-way is, for water.

It was found that the timing to approve this is based on the date of the introduction of the resolution, which has not happened.

Motion by White, Second by Mumper, to defer action on this item, until we receive legal opinion from our attorney.

Yes Vote: 6 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Ermeling, Barb	YES
Gau, Duane	YES
Jordan, Joe	YES
Kollmansberger, Tina	---
Mumper, Roy	YES
White, Loren	YES
Zeyghami, Hooshang	YES

17. Discussion and Recommendation to BOT on a Request from FB & Company, LLP, and R. Bender Family Properties, LLC, to Accept a Proposed Right-of-Way Dedication for a Portion of Schofield Avenue, Identified by Outlot 1, in Certified Survey Map Number 18255, Recorded in Volume 89, of Certified Survey Maps, on Page 113. Project 20190007.

Donner stated this is a housekeeping task, for our TIF project amendment. The large parcel on south side, had a remnant piece of land along the north side. To be compliant with the Department of Revenue, this parcel had to come out. The agreement with the property owner is that the Village took care of the Certified Survey Map, and the owner agreed to quit claim that parcel to the Village. [Staff Note: After speaking with the Village Attorney a Quit Claim is not required only the ROW dedication by CSM.]

Motion by Gau, Second by Mumper, to recommend approval to the BOT, Project 20190007.

Yes Vote: 6 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Ermeling, Barb	YES
Gau, Duane	YES
Jordan, Joe	YES
Kollmansberger, Tina	---
Mumper, Roy	YES
White, Loren	YES
Zeyghami, Hooshang	YES

FUTURE ITEMS

18. Next meeting date(s):

a. Monday, March 11 @ 6pm

- b. Monday, April 8 @ 6pm
- c. Monday, May 13 @ 6pm
- d. Monday, June 10 @ 6pm
- e. Monday, July 8 @ 6pm
- f. Monday, August 12 @ 6pm
- g. Monday, September 9 @ 6pm
- h. Monday, October 14 @ 6pm
- i. Monday, November 11 @ 6pm
- j. Monday, December 9 @ 6pm

19. Topics for future meetings.

None.

20. Remarks from Staff.

Donner stated due to the weather, we are changing the date for the next all staff meeting to February 20th.

Wehner stated there will be more information on sign discussion at the next meeting.

Maguire will keep working on fee schedule discussion.

21. Remarks from Commission Members.

None.

22. Announcements.

None

23. Adjournment of Village Plan Commission.

Motion by Gau, Second by White to adjourn at 8:02 p.m.

Barb Ermeling, Plan Commission Chair & Village President
Jennifer Higgins, Director of Planning & Development
Valerie Parker, Recording Secretary