

**PLEASANT PRAIRIE PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
VILLAGE HALL AUDITORIUM
9915 39TH AVENUE
PLEASANT PRAIRIE, WISCONSIN
5:00 P.M.
July 28, 2008**

A regular meeting for the Pleasant Prairie Plan Commission convened at 5:00 p.m. on July 28, 2008. Those in attendance were Michael Serpe; Donald Hackbarth; Jim Bandura; John Braig; Larry Zarletti; and Judy Juliana. Tomas Terwall, Wayne Koessl and Andrea Rode were excused. Also in attendance were Mike Pollocoff, Village Administrator; and Peggy Herrick, Assistant Village Planner and Zoning Administrator.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER.**
- 2. ROLL CALL.**
- 3. CORRESPONDENCE.**
- 4. CONSIDER THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 23 AND JULY 14, 2008 PLAN COMMISSION MEETINGS.**

John Braig:

Move approval as presented.

Larry Zarletti:

Second.

Mike Serpe:

MOTION BY JOHN BRAIG, SECOND BY LARRY ZARLETTI FOR APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 23RD AND JULY 14TH MINUTES. ALL IN FAVOR SAY AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Mike Serpe:

Opposed? The eyes have it.

- 5. CITIZEN COMMENTS.**

Mike Serpe:

Items A through D are public hearings. If there's anybody wishing to speak on any of those items you can hold your comments until that item is called. And if anybody wishes to speak on any other subject matter that's not on the agenda now is your opportunity to talk. We'd ask that you come forward and give your name and address. Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? We'll close citizens' comments.

6. NEW BUSINESS

A. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT INCLUDING SITE AND OPERATIONAL PLANS for the request of to consider the request of Neil Charles, agent to occupy a 1,060 square foot tenant space in the Willow Point Plaza located at 8501 75th Street for the sale of fine wine, beer and spirits with periodic on-premise tasting.

Peggy Herrick:

Thank you. As part of the hearing record tonight, the Village staff has compiled a listing of findings, exhibits and conclusions regarding the petitioner's request and they're going to be presented and described in your memo.

Findings of Fact:

1. Neil Charles, agent for Harborside Wine, LLC is proposing to occupy a 1,060 square foot tenant space in the Willow Point Plaza located at 8501 75th Street for the sale of fine wine, beer and spirits and periodic on-premise tasting. The store is to be known as Cellar Door Wines. Exhibit 1 attached to the packet is a copy of their application and related materials.
2. The subject property is located in a part of the U.S. Public Land Survey Section 9, Township 1 North, Range 22 East in the Village of Pleasant Prairie and further identified as Tax Parcel Number 91-4-122-092-0170.
3. The property is zoned B-2 (PUD), Community Business District with a Planned Unit Development Overlay. Ordinance No. 06-21, the Willow Point Plaza Planned Unit Development, which specifically talks mainly about setbacks from the existing building to property lines and some parking requirements.
4. Pursuant to Section 420-119 D. (1) (b) of the Village Zoning Ordinance, a liquor store without a drive thru is allowed in the B-2 District with the approval of a Conditional Use Permit.
5. Pursuant to the application, it is the intentions of the petitioner to create a high-class, but not high-priced, wine retail establishment that caters to local and regional customers. The store is proposed to be open 11:00 am to 7:00 pm Monday through Friday, 11:00 am to 6:00 pm on Saturdays and 12:00 pm to 5:00 pm on Sundays.

6. On July 21, 2008 the Village Board conditionally approved a Class A Liquor License for this facility.
7. Notices were sent to adjacent property owners via regular mail on July 7, 2008 and a correct notice was sent July 14, 2008 to the neighbors. A notice was published in the *Kenosha News* on July 14 and 21, 2008.
8. The petitioner was emailed a copy of this memo on July 25, 2008.
9. According to Article XVIII of the Village's Zoning Ordinance, the Plan Commission shall not approve a Conditional Use Permit unless they find after viewing the findings of fact, the application and related materials and information presented tonight at the hearing that the project as planned, will not violate the intent and purpose of all Village Zoning Ordinance and meets the minimum standards for granting of a Conditional Use Permit. Furthermore, the Plan Commission shall not approve any Site and Operational Plan application without finding in the decision that the application, coupled with satisfaction of any conditions of approval, will comply with all applicable Village ordinances and other federal, State or local requirements relating to land use, buildings, development control, land division, environmental protection, sewer service, water service, noise, storm water management, streets and highways and fire protection.

With that, this is a public hearing.

Mike Pollocoff:

This is a matter for public hearing. Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? We'll close the public hearing and open it up for comments and questions from the Commission.

John Braig:

A minor detail, but the Board conditionally approved a Class A liquor license for this facility on July 21st.

Mike Serpe:

July 21st was the Board meeting.

Peggy Herrick:

Correct.

John Braig:

Yes, and that's when it was approved last Monday not two weeks ago.

Mike Serpe:

Oh, I'm sorry.

John Braig:

You've got the 14th and it should be the 21st.

Mike Serpe:

No, it was the 14th.

John Braig:

Today is the 28th. Last week was the 21st.

Mike Serpe:

21st okay. Any other comments or questions?

John Braig:

Move approval.

Judy Juliana:

Second.

Mike Serpe:

**MOTION BY JOHN BRAIG SECOND BY JUDY JULIANA TO APPROVE THE
CONDITIONAL USE AND SITE AND OPERATIONAL PLAN. ALL IN FAVOR SAY
AYE.**

Voices:

Aye.

Mike Serpe:

Opposed? The eyes have it. Welcome. Was that wine tasting going to be tonight?

(Inaudible)

Jim Bandura:

Are you going to have a lot of wines from different countries?

Neil Charles:

Every major wine tasting region will be represented, yes, even Wisconsin, which doesn't count as a major wine producing region but we'll certainly include it.

Jim Bandura:

So you'll have your French and Argentinian?

Neil Charles:

Yes, Australia, New Zealand, Germany, you name it. Can I answer any other questions?

Mike Serpe:

Welcome and good luck.

B. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A FLOODPLAIN BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT for the request of Jessica Lewis, P.E. with Crispell Snyder, Inc. agent to remove 30,708 cubic feet of floodplain and to create 32,308 cubic feet of floodplain to compensate for the floodplain proposed to be filled on the properties owned by the Village of Pleasant Prairie Community Development Authority generally located south of 104th Street (CTH Q) on the west side of IH-94 on land within the right-of-way of the 120th Avenue (West Frontage Road) and as a result of the reconstruction of 120th Avenue (West Frontage Road).

Peggy Herrick:

As part of the 120th Avenue West Frontage Road reconstruction, the 100-year floodplain is proposed to be adjusted by removing 30,708 cubic feet of floodplain, which is shown on the overhead in yellow on the map, and to create 32,308 cubic feet of floodplain to compensate for that floodplain being filled. The floodplain being created is shown in the red on the overhead or on the slide. This property is owned by the Village of Pleasant Prairie Community Development Authority and is generally located south of 104th Street, which is County Trunk Highway Q, on the west side of I-94 on land within the right-of-way of the 120th Avenue, which is the West Frontage Road. It's further identified as Tax Parcel Numbers 91-4-121-254-0131 and 91-4-121-254-0121.

According to the Village's Floodplain Ordinance the Village shall not permit amendments to the floodplain boundary that are inconsistent with the purposed of Section 420-131 of the Village Zoning Ordinance, or is in conflict with the applicable rules of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and the Federal Emergency Management Agency or FEMA.

The Village Board will consider adopting a resolution indicating community compliance at their next meeting on August 4, 2008. Upon completion of the work, an as-built survey and calculations shall be submitted by the petitioner to verify the compliance with design plans. The as-built survey and calculations shall be reviewed by the Village and the DNR prior to being submitted to FEMA for final review and obtaining the required letter of map amendment. Once

the letter of map amendment is issued by FEMA, the petitioner submit the application to amend the Village official zoning map and text. And this is a matter for public hearing.

Mike Serpe:

This is a matter for public hearing. Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? Hearing none, we'll close the public hearing and open it up to comments.

Don Hackbarth:

Move approval.

Judy Juliana:

Second.

Mike Serpe:

MOTION BY DON HACKBARTH AND SECONDED BY JUDY JULIANA FOR APPROVAL OF THE FLOODPLAIN SECONDARY ADJUSTMENT. ALL IN FAVOR SAY AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Mike Serpe:

Opposed? The eyes have it.

Don Hackbarth:

I've got a question in regard to FEMA. If DNR and Corps of Engineers looks at all these plans what role does FEMA have in there because they're more emergency management?

Mike Pollocoff:

FEMA is also the federal agency in charge of administering the floodplain maps.

C. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT to correct the Zoning Map and rezone the field delineated wetlands on the vacant property located west of 140 115th Street known as Lot 7 of Block 14 in the Carol Beach Estates Unit #2 Subdivision into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District.

Peggy Herrick:

Pursuant to NR 117 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code, the Village Zoning Ordinance and the wetland staking application filed by the property owner, on June 23rd, the Plan Commission approved Resolution #08-16 to initiate a Zoning Map Amendment to correct the Village Zoning Map as a result of the wetland staking being completed on property owned by Vicki Luebke.

On April 7, 2008, the property owner requested that a wetland staking be completed on the vacant property located west of 140 115th Street which was identified as Tax Parcel Number 93-4-123-293-0370 known as Lot 7 of Block 14 in the Carol Beach Estates Unit #2 Subdivision. I just want to note that after the wetland staking was completed, the property owner combined this vacant lot with the adjacent lot located at 140 115th Street so now it is one property and the new Tax Parcel Number of both lots is 93-4-123-293-0376.

The Village received a letter dated June 11, 2008 from the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission that indicated that the Plats of Survey correctly surveyed and correctly identified the wetlands on said property as field staked by SEWRPC on May 6, 2008.

Therefore, the field-delineated wetlands on the property are proposed to be rezoned into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District, and the non-wetland portions of the property would remain in the R-5, Urban Single Family Residential District. In addition, the entire property will remain in the LUSA, Limited Urban Service Area Overlay District and the shoreland jurisdictional area of Lake Michigan would remain. This is a matter for public hearing.

Mike Serpe:

This is a matter for public hearing. Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? We'll close the public hearing and open it up for comments.

Don Hackbarth:

In looking at the map on the back page it shows a garage and a slab. Is the property to the north owned by the petitioner?

Peggy Herrick:

No, it is not.

Don Hackbarth:

It looks like the slab is over on somebody else's property.

Peggy Herrick:

No, I don't believe that's the case. The dashed line is an easement. Oh, I see where you're saying. A slab, yes, it does appear that it is over on that property. You're correct.

Don Hackbarth:

Has there been any adjustment of that line because it's sitting on somebody else's property.

Peggy Herrick:

This is the first time I've seen that so I can let them know that that is on somebody else's property. That really becomes a civil matter between the two property owners.

John Braig:

The single story framed dwelling is legal nonconforming because it's closer than 25 feet to the wetlands?

Peggy Herrick:

Yes.

Don Hackbarth:

Are we approving something—that's a problem because—

Peggy Herrick:

We're approving the location of the wetlands and rezoning the wetlands into the C-1 District. And I will certainly make the property owner aware that the slab does encroach on the adjacent property.

Jim Bandura:

But we still have public knowledge of that being over the line. Is this going to—

Mike Pollocoff:

Even though you have public knowledge it's still a civil matter. We'll share this document with the property owner and say it's obvious that this building is in violation of the property lines and they need to correct that to get it squared away. It's in violation of the setbacks for the back lot line, but we don't know when that was put in.

Don Hackbarth:

Do we share that with the property owner to the north, too, so he knows?

Peggy Herrick:

With both of them I will send a letter.

Larry Zarletti:

With that I'll move approval.

Jim Bandura:

Second.

Mike Serpe:

MOTION MADE BY LARRY ZARLETTI AND SECONDED BY JIM BANDURA FOR APPROVAL FOR A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT. ALL IN FAVOR SAY AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Mike Serpe:

Opposed? The eyes have it.

D. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT to correct the Zoning Map as a result of a wetland staking completed for the property located at 12643 Lakeshore Drive and the two (2) vacant properties across the street on the west side of Lakeshore Drive.

Peggy Herrick:

Pursuant to NR 117 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code, the Village Zoning Ordinance and the wetland staking application filed by the property owner, the Plan Commission approved Resolution #08-15 to initiate a Zoning Map Amendment to correct the Village Zoning Map as a result of the wetland staking being completed on properties currently owned by Robert and Margaret Barnato.

On August 12, 2005, the Village received an application from Marion McMahon, then owner for a wetland staking to be completed on the three properties generally located on Lakeshore Drive between the 12600 and 12700 block in the Village of Pleasant Prairie and further identified as Tax Parcel Numbers 93-4-123-323-0075; -323-0250 and -323-0255. These are Lots 40, 62 and 63 of the Chiwaukee Subdivision.

The Village received a letter dated May 30, 2006 from the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission that indicated that the Plats of Survey correctly surveyed and correctly identified the wetlands on said property as field staked on December 8, 2005. And those are the wetlands as shown on the slide.

On July 26, 2008 the owner received a permit from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources to install shore protection on Lot 40 and to fill approximately 0.007 acres or 305 square feet to construct a single family home and a driveway. The properties were then acquired

by Robert and Margaret Barnato who installed the shore protection and filled the wetlands as allowed by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources fill permit. A revised survey showing the location of the wetlands on Lot 40 after the fill was completed was submitted and the Barnatos began construction of new single family home on Lot 40. This home is at 12643 Lakeshore Dr.

The Zoning Map Amendment proposes to correct the Zoning Map and rezone the field delineated wetlands on Lots 62 and 63 of the Chiwaukee Subdivision as shown on Exhibit 1 of the attached ordinance, and the field delineated wetlands on Lot 40 of the Chiwaukee Subdivision as shown on Exhibit 2, which excludes the area that were filled, into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District. The non-wetland portions of the properties would remain in the R-5, Urban Single Family Residential District. In addition the LUSA, Limited Use Service Area Overlay District and the shoreland jurisdictional boundary will remain on all of the properties and any floodplain zoning on the properties will also remain. This is a matter for public hearing.

Mike Serpe:

This is a matter for public hearing. Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? We'll close the public hearing and open it up to comments and questions.

Judy Juliana:

Move to approve.

Larry Zarletti:

Second.

Mike Serpe:

MOTION MADE BY JUDY JULIANA AND SECONDED BY LARRY ZARLETTI FOR APPROVAL OF THE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT. ALL IN FAVOR SAY AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Mike Serpe:

Opposed? The eyes have it.

E. Discuss Village Sign Ordinance.

John Braig:

Thank you. The Village has an ordinance or statute dealing with recreational vehicles and boats, the storage of them in conspicuous locations and so on, and in their wisdom the Board elected not to enforce that ordinance because it didn't seem to be appropriate. I'm almost feeling the same

situation dealing with the sign ordinance. This started earlier this year. I travel around the Village an awful lot, Highway 50, Highway 165, Sheridan Road, Chiwaukee Prairie and so on. In one instance I was removing signs at the driveway entrance to what is this right out here on 165, I can't think of the subdivision, the big new one, Village Green. I think I was pulling about eight or nine signs and they're typical. It's a realtor's sign with an arrow pointing to where there's a house for sale. While I was doing it one of the cars exiting the subdivision said stop and says way to go. I mean they were pleased that the signs were removed because there were that many.

Also, on Highway 50 there's a ton of signs not so much now because some of them have been removed, but it's not only signs but one of their habits is to pound two identical signs together next to each other maybe four or five feet apart. We've got a ton of these things and all of them are on the road right of way. In fact, some signs that I have removed already are on the traffic island. I'm just wondering whether our ordinance is too strict or whether we should start enforcing it.

And for that matter, pennants, there's pennants and flags and stuff all over. Those are prohibited. We've got one individual or one business in town that puts a sign out every weekend, retrieves it before Monday morning. If you go to RecPlex I think RecPlex might even be in violation. On the east side of the building there's a banner flag or some sort of sign tacked on the building that says summer camp or day camp or something like that, and there's a half a dozen flags and pennants on the sidewalk entering it.

I wonder if we should take a look at the ordinance. Specifically, one of the things I'd like to recommend, maybe I'm all wet on this and I'm looking for input from the rest of you whether you feel the same way about it, but a thought I have is if we work to pursue enforcement a little bit more, the ordinance should show that they've got ten days to pick up a sign that's been removed and if they don't the Village will destroy the sign. Any ideas?

Jim Bandura:

Just a question to Mike. Just out of curiosity, what's our procedure for when this does happen and they do stick a sign out there? How do we notify them and what's the fine, the cost? What's the procedure.

Mike Pollocoff:

If we know there's a sign that's inappropriate, if it's pennants or balloons or flags on a home we'll send them a letter telling them that is in violation of the ordinance and they need to remove them and not put them back up again. If they continue to do it then we can continue a citation. Before we issue a citation our prosecuting attorney wants us to give the property owners some due process notice for a chance to after they receive that second notice to remove the violation and correct it. If that hasn't happened in that period specified in the notice letter, then we can take it to court and have the judge fine them.

Those that we have done we haven't been able to get a prosecution on. Basically the judge has said take the sign down, and if it doesn't come down or we don't catch it again we're not able to

obtain a municipal prosecution. So then the next thing would be to go to circuit court and a more expensive process.

I know Jean talks to people and so do Tom and Peggy to try and get these things correct. Some of the more typical problems that are depicted by Mr. Braig's visual display here is typically a business owner going out and wanting to either get people to look at a listing that's not on the right of way or not close to a major right of way but they can direct them to that site or a business that's opening, how you get to it.

We try to exercise some judgment. Sometimes in some places there's construction going on and people aren't sure how to get to a place and we've given them some latitude during construction to have some directional signage to get them there. But that being said there's a lot of signs that show up. And typically there's a lot of open house signs that show up on Sunday and you hope that they're gone on Monday. Some realtors are good about picking up the signs and some aren't, and then some signs just show up.

We don't have anybody on staff that looks for zoning violations, zoning enforcement where we have somebody out cruising that does that. If a notice comes in, if we think we can get it squared away with a letter then if we have to do it with a letter we will. If it's in the right of way we'll pass the word on to public works. If they're in the right of way they can pick it up if they've got something going on in that area. They typically don't have somebody that's available to just go out and pick signs up. But if there's somebody around they'll do it.

Our policy has been what we're trying to achieve is compliance of the ordinance so we get the signs we bring them back to Prange and they can pick them back up but we tell them you can't put them back where you put them because they're just going to get picked up again and everybody is wasting time. Some learn fast and some learn slow. It guess that's the honest truth about it. Some of them just get mad at us because we took it out.

The sign ordinance, especially in those areas where there's a lot of new construction is once somebody is in their house they don't want to see any more signs in their area, but it was okay before they got in their house when they were looking for a house and they wanted to see the signs. We have this kind of constant tension or push and pull. But right now we just respond to the complaints as we get them as much as we can.

I know Commission Braig has gone and retrieved signs and that's helpful. I think that probably if we sat down and thought about it it's probably not good policy to have a decision maker, someone who has got the authority to cast a vote on someone's zoning or conditional use or certified survey map or plat be the same person that is out there enforcing an action. That's getting the balance out of whack. I think that at some point could bring somebody into trouble but I appreciate his efforts and concern. But it is a nuisance, and some times of the year it's more of a nuisance. We have it during the political season when people are putting campaign signs out. The first test of a candidate to see if they can read is see if they read the notice that says you can't put signs in a right of way and almost fail that first test and signs are in the right of way. So it's a non stop problem.

I think if we were to remove it from the ordinance then we'd have no way to enforce it at all. But as it is with any ordinance most ordinances are adhered to by 95 percent of the people. You tell them once and they understand it. It's the five percent that just keep pushing and pushing.

Mike Serpe:

I have a question. I don't know if it would be feasible to give this some consideration or not. But if we're going to pick up signs in the right of way, and I'm only talking about the Village's right of way and not the County's or the State's, but the Villages right of way, for example what John picked up tonight, these Starbucks signs are rather expensive and they deserve to be picked up, would it be possible to put an ordinance together that if any signs, whatever they are, that are picked up in the right of way, in the Village's right of way, they can be retrieved for a \$5.00 fee? In other words, if you want this sign back, we had to go out and send a crew out there to pick this thing up, \$5 or \$10 or whatever, and if you want this one back it's going to cost you a certain amount of money. If you don't then we'll just throw them away.

Mike Pollocoff:

We could definitely put that in. It's got to be related to our actual cost which is going to be a guy in a pickup truck doing it. Some of these signs like these Starbuck signs were probably during construction like when Highway 50 is under construction. We allow all businesses to put up temporary directional signs so somebody during construction can get to where they want to go if the traffic patterns are altered or disturbed. So we may want to call them back and say somebody brought us your signs and you can come and get them. I think that's a good idea. Because right now, to be honest with you, we just don't with our staffing we don't have someone who cruises the streets doing enforcement.

Mike Serpe:

Probably not a bad idea to have John, Jr. and you get together and just let the highway department know that if you see something that's real obvious, and these signs are all over the place, and you're in that area just get it on the truck and pick it up. Make a note of it and just pick it up. Especially during the political sign. Now, Edna has put a couple articles in the paper just recently about political signs going up and we're going to see the violations. Unfortunately, the ones that we see mostly are on the County roads and that we don't have control in picking those up and you notify the County and if they have time they'll do it and if not they just won't.

Larry Zarletti:

I believe that the County has a policy like that already with the highway department. It's just commonplace for them to be out doing their thing and if there's a sign in the right of way they throw it in the back of their truck. They put it behind the building out at the County Center, and if you're looking for your signs that's where you look. They leave them there for a period of time and then they throw them in the dumpster. If you did the same thing here that would be great. But I think if you're going to try and assign somebody to go out and do the signs the cost is going to be ridiculous to try to keep track of them, who has got it here, \$10 to pick it up, I mean it just—I think unless it's a blatant violation in the middle of the median somewhere that's blocking somebody's vision when they're making a turn I think it should just all be turned over to the

highway department. It should become a part of their regular business that if they're out doing their business. This way they're covered. If they get out of the car, they get hit, they got hurt picking the sign up or whatever, I think it should all be done by our in-house people.

Mike Serpe:

I agree with who it should be done with. I think we should consider putting some type of fee for somebody who wants to consistently violate the ordinance. One other question on the signing stuff. A person, could be anybody holding a sign next to the curb I mean, number one, that's definitely dangerous and a distraction to the drivers and they're usually done on the main roads, Highway 50, Highway 31, and that's just--now, you can't throw the kid in the back of the car, but I think that would be just as much a violation as a fixed sign in the right of way? Would it be? I would think it would be.

Mike Pollocoff:

It is.

John Braig:

One of the concerns that I had that this whole business is based on is we've got an awful lot of law abiding citizens who know what the ordinance is and they adhere to it. And I think in fairness to them we've got to go after those that are violating the ordinance. It puts the law abiding citizen at a disadvantage not to do something about it. I've got a question. In a given year how many letters or notices do we normally send out regarding signs?

Peggy Herrick:

Probably very few regarding signs, maybe 10 to 15 regarding signs. If someone files a complaint we'll follow up on it. But junk and debris is mostly what we do our complaints on. Very few signs.

Mike Pollocoff:

That's not to say--I know the Village planner will make a phone call especially if it's somebody that the Village has been working with, say if it's a real estate sign or a real estate development or if they have balloons or festoons or whatever. She'll make a call. I've been in her office a number of times where she'll tell somebody I was out looking at something and I saw the signs up or whatever and you need to take them down before she starts an enforcement action.

Peggy Herrick:

Similar to the sign you have there, now hiring machine operators and they have a number, I've called that number before and told them to take the signs down and they have. That's new. I have not seen that sign yet in the Village.

John Braig:

That sign has been—I've seen those any number of times. They'll list different trades that they're looking for for workmen in a certain trade or something like that but it's always the same number.

Peggy Herrick:

Oh, it's always the same number?

John Braig:

Sure.

Larry Zarletti:

Do you need it in the form of a motion or just a recommendation from the Plan Commission to the Board that someone make a decision that it just become a part of a regular duty assignment for the highway department?

John Braig:

I think this is just an administrative situation. I don't think it requires a motion.

Mike Serpe:

I think Mike can handle this in-house with Junior and community development.

John Braig:

I'm satisfied with the discussion.

7. ADJOURN.

Larry Zarletti:

Motion to adjourn.

Judy Juliana:

Second.

Mike Serpe:

Motion made and seconded to adjourn. All in favor say aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Mike Serpe:

Opposed? The eyes have it.

Meeting adjourned at: 5:37 p.m.