

City of Plymouth Plan Commission

June 5, 2025

OFFICIAL MINUTES

Mayor Pohlman called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM on June 5, 2025. The following members were present: Jane Meyer, Justin Schmitz, John Wyatt, and Mayor Pohlman. Also present: City Administrator/Utilities Manager Tim Blakeslee, Assistant City Administrator/Community Development Director Jack Johnston, Fire Chief Ryan Pafford and City Clerk/Deputy Treasurer Anna Voigt.

- 1.) **Approval of Minutes from May 1, 2025:** Motion was made Wyatt/Schmitz to approve the minutes. Upon the call of the roll, all voted aye. Motion carried.
- 2.) **Discussion and Possible Recommendation of Extraterritorial Certified Survey Map; N5806 County Road M, Plymouth, WI 53073 - located in the Town of Sheboygan Falls. Scholler Property Management, LLC:** Johnston stated that Scholler Property management, LLC has submitted an application for approval of a CSM in the Town of Sheboygan Falls that is located in the City of Plymouth Extraterritorial Review jurisdiction, 1.5 miles from the City's boundaries. The land division has already been approved by the to Town of Sheboygan Falls. Motion was made by Wyatt/Schmitz to approve the Extraterritorial CSM at N5806 County Rd. M. Upon the call of the roll, all voted aye. Motion carried.
- 3.) **Discussion and Possible Recommendation of Extraterritorial Certified Survey Map; Parcel numbers 59016215041, 59016215042, and 59016215070 – located on the southwest corner of Woodland Rd and State Highway 57 in the Town of Plymouth. In-n-Out Storage LLC & Louis A. Prange Revocable Living Trust:** Ted Scharl was there on behalf of Louis Prange. He explained that he would like to split the 60 acres down the middle with the east portion going to In-n-Out storage and the west portion retained by the trust. Motion was made by Schmitz/Wyatt to approve the Extraterritorial CSM of 59016215041, 59016215042 and 59016215070. Johnston added this is located in the Town of Plymouth, but just like the previous item it is in the 1.5-mile radius of the City of Plymouth. Pohlman asked the applicant if this would be creating out lots? Scharl stated that it would not be. Lot 1 is on woodland and Lot 2 is on Hwy 57. Upon the call of the roll, all voted aye. Motion carried.
- 4.) **Public Hearing: A public hearing to take comment on a conditional use permit application for the following:**
 - a. **2600 Kiley Way, ARHC AHPLYW101, LLC (dba Aurora Health Care) regarding a conditional use permit amendment application seeking to install four (4) additional ground mounted solar arrays on their property for a total number of eight (8) ground mounted solar arrays on site in the B-3 Business Highway District as allowed through Conditional Use Permit per PMC 13-1-132(c)(1).**
White: Pohlman declared a public hearing at 6:10 PM. Johnston explained that this is an amendment application. Aurora wishes to expand the existing ground mounted solar array field located directly west of the Aurora building at 2600 Kiley Way. The want to add 4 additional units which will power 50% of the building. Code does require a Conditional Use Permit for the installation of solar rays. Code also requires a decommissioning plan with the conditional use permit application. It was reviewed by staff and does follow code. With no further comments the public hearing was closed at 6:13 PM. Motion was made by Schmitz/Wyatt to approve the

conditional use permit amendment. Upon the call of the roll, all voted aye. Motion carried.

- 5.) **Site Plan Seeking Approval: 2600 Kiley Way, ARHC AHPLYW101, LLC (dba Aurora Health Care) seeking to install four (4) additional ground mounted solar arrays on their property for a total number of eight (8) ground mounted solar arrays on site in the B-3 Business Highway District as part of a related conditional use permit application.** Johnston explained that this item is related to the previous item. This item is just for a site plan approval which is needed for commercial properties. Motion was made by Wyatt/Schmitz to approve the site plan. Upon the call of the roll, all voted aye. Motion carried.
- 6.) **Public Hearing regarding the proposed creation of Tax Incremental District No. 8, the proposed boundaries of the District, and the proposed Project Plan for the District.:** Pohlman declared a public hearing at 6:15 PM. Blakeslee gave a brief explanation of a TIF. The city is proposing TID #8 designated as a Rehabilitation District. This is to encompass the downtown Laack Block redevelopment area and adjacent properties. It is designed to support a mix of public improvements including a redesigned/rebuilt parking lot, infrastructure upgrades, property acquisition, legal and engineering services, financing, and administrative costs. The hotel and related improvements are projected to add approximately \$6.5 million in new increment value to the district. As required by state law, the “but for” test has been applied, indicating that this development as presented, including that this development as presented, including the parking lot improvements, would not occur without the support of TIF. Kayla Thorpe from Ehlers, reviewed the project plan for TID #8. Gerry Schwoerer from the public stated she is in the district and asked how it was going to affect her tax rate as opposed to the overall City. Thorpe stated that the short of it is it won’t have affect to her at all. When TIDs are created the base value of parcels at the date of creation will be frozen. That value that is frozen will be the value your taxes are generated from and distributed to the taxing jurisdictions. Any new value over and beyond that, those tax dollars will be put back into the district to pay for project costs. When the tax bill is received it won’t have a different tax rate than anyone else in the City. How the City funnels that money will be change. With no further comments Pohlman closed the public hearing at 6:42 PM.
- 7.) **Consideration and possible action on a “Resolution Establishing the Boundaries of and Approving the Project Plan for Tax Incremental District No. 8.”:** Motion was made by Schmitz/Wyatt to approve the Resolution Establishing the Boundaries of and Approving the Project Plan for Tax Incremental District No. 8. Wyatt asked if the Laack Block was in TID #5? Blakeslee stated that the parcel is not in TID #5. Pohlman added some parcels in TID #8 and TID #5 overlap in areas. Upon the call of the roll, all voted aye. Motion carried.
- 8.) **Discussion and direction on legal non-conforming structures and lots:** Pohlman explained that before the Plan Commission meeting there was a Board of Appeals meeting that is related to this item. Johnston explained that currently non-conforming structures within the City ordinance language prohibits expansions/additions to them. Johnston handed out a map to explain what a non-conforming structure would be. Non-conforming structure is a structure that has some sort of misalignment with current zoning standards. That could be heights, setbacks from property lines, it could be width of the lot. Currently the code is not flexible to property owners who have a legal non-conforming structure, which is a lot of the time their home. The Board of Appeals item, that was passed, the applicant had a legal non-conforming structure and couldn’t put on a vertical addition. Schmitz asked if the majority of the houses are legal non-conforming due to

setbacks. Johnston confirmed most of them are due to setback because of the historic smaller lots. Schmitz asked if at one time these smaller lots were conforming and as ordinances update, they became non-conforming. Johnston confirmed that is what happened and something that could happen in the future. The commission agreed that option 2 on vertical additions, they should be allowed to existing non-conforming structures so long as the addition does no expand the footprint of the non-conforming structure. Johnston asked the commission about Lateral Additions. Pohlman stated that would make sense to allow the extension of the wall line. Wyatt added there could be a problem between neighbors. If you extend the wall line you could get close to your neighbor's house. Johnston asked if the commission preferred that these come to plan commission, council or handled administratively? The commission agreed that Plan Commission should be involved and neighbors should be notified.

9.) Communication – Letters, E-mails, or reports Related to the Plan Commission (Chairman, Secretary, Plan Commission Members, City of Plymouth Staff/Alderspersons): The next meeting was moved to July 10 at 6 PM.

Motion was made by Wyatt/Schmitz to adjourn the meeting. A unanimous aye vote was cast. Motion carried.