

VILLAGE OF BROKAW PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

Date: Thursday, August 10th, 2017

Place: Village of Brokaw Village Hall, 218 Second Street, Brokaw, WI

Minutes

Call to order: 6:45 p.m. President Jeff Weisenberger (Brokaw Board of Trustees and CBA-Oversight

Commission called to order as well)

Pledge of Allegiance was recited prior to Water Utility Commission meeting.

Roll call: Present- Jeff Weisenberger, Brenda Weisenberger, Matt Deffner, Rochelle Frank, Jenny

Glovinski, Ann Ovel. Absent- Mary Baumann

Motion to approve Minutes of the June 13, 2017 Plan Commission meeting as submitted/Glovinski.

Second/Frank. Motion carried unanimously.

Items requiring Plan Commission recommendation:

- A. Mathy Construction-re-approve CSM creating Lot 1-presented by Joshua Prentice, REI and Rob Kudick, Mathy Real Estate Manager. Mr. Prentice explained the history behind the original approval and that the CSM was not recorded within the designated timeframe according to Statute. The CSM was now being brought forth for re-approval. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the reasons behind the delay, the current status of the parcel, boat ramp access and access to the parcel from WW.

Some highlights of the discussions:

Will the boat ramp remain open to the public? Mr. Kudick answered by saying that was the intention but that for safety reasons an alternate road to the boat ramp was recommended to isolate Mathy truck traffic from public traffic to the boat ramp.

Is the County buying (or being gifted) the land? Mr. Kudick explained that while there had been discussions with the County regarding transferring ownership to them, there is currently not an official agreement in place. He also stated that whatever entity will finally take over ownership of the proposed parcel, it is irrelevant to the process of approving the CSM.

Could the parcel be sold to anyone, even a private buyer? Mr. Kudick replied that it could, but the desire of Mathy was to deed it to a public entity to keep access open to the boat ramp.

What is the access to the parcel? 2 easements identified in paperwork separate from the CSM were identified as providing access to the parcel by both Mr. Kudick and Mr. Prentice.

Has the contamination on the site been remediated? Mr. Kudick explained that it was in process.

Why weren't the easements shown on the CSM? Mr. Prentice explained that the re-approval was of the CSM submitted in 2014. The map (CSM) is unchanged from the original submittal, which did not include the Easements. The easement documents that were in the packets for Commission members were not included with the original CSM. They were added later as suggested access options.

There were also comments by Commission member Frank regarding the long history of public use, as well as the frequent current use, of the ramp. Commission member Glovinski reminded Mr. Kudick that the original approval of the CSM came with the understanding that the County was ready to assume ownership and construct a road to keep public access to the ramp open. Mr. Kudick mentioned that while the intention of Mathy construction was to transfer ownership of the parcel to a public entity to keep the ramp accessible, it is on private land and could be closed to the public. Commission President Weisenberger pointed out that access could be re-established from 4th street allowing for much cheaper road development costs. There was discussion on whether an easement constituted access per the current ordinance and that the CSM did not show reasonable/approvable access to the lot from a public road.

Motion to recommend denying the CSM for failure to comply with Village Ordinances/B. Weisenberger. Second/Glovinski. Motion carried unanimously

Motion to adjourn at 8:19 p.m./Glovinski. Second/B. Weisenberger. Motion carried unanimously.