

**VILLAGE OF MARSHALL  
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 28, 2012**

Chairperson Hensler called the Plan Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Members present: Krebs, Lowrey, Kiefer, Vick-Peck and Hensler. Hlavaty and Arnold were absent. Others present: Erin Ruth-Graef, Donna Hellenbrand, Heather Wright, Julie Bergholz, Joshua Rose, Art Zuleger, Joanne Cripps, Linda Jansen, William Blaschka, Lorraine Blaschka, Mike Netzer, Terry Hellenbrand, Sue Hellenbrand, and Sue Peck-Clerk/Treasurer.

1. Presentation from Joshua Rose on locating a 20 bed CBRF facility in the Village of Marshall. Mr. Rose stated he proposes to rezone a section of land to start a 20 bed CBRF facility. Mr. Rose stated he was in the Marines Corp. for 12 years and received extensive training in combat. He currently works at a small CBRF facility and is attending school for nursing. He has always had the desire to build a CBRF in Marshall. Wants to give back to the community. The property is currently zoned Business Park and is located south of the Village Waste Water Treatment Facility on David Bisbee's property. If it can't be rezoned he would like direction as to other areas. He was willing to look at other areas.

Mr. Lowrey said he would personally steer him away from that area; even the nature of the facilities around it. Mr. Kiefer said he feels it is good, but that spot may be questionable. The two CBRF's we have are in residential districts. Ms. Vick-Peck said she would hate to see us give up business zoning. The location in general isn't all that great. Mr. Rose said he is looking for about two acres. He would be strictly and independent owner. Staff will meet with Mr. Rose and provides some other areas that he may consider for his proposal.

2. Review and discussions on possible changes to be considered for the Village's ordinances regarding Signs & Billboards; Title 13 Article H of the Municipal Code.

Graef representative Erin Ruth provided a presentation on potential sign ordinance amendments the commission could consider. His presentation provided samples of what is conforming and non-conforming at some locations and what potential solutions could look like if changes were made.

Discussion: Mrs. Bergholz asked if the ordinance changes were just for businesses. Mr. Lowrey said we were approached by a business that wanted to put up additional signage and the ordinances were prohibitive. A lot of businesses have additional signs, some aren't so attractive. The Village wants to help promote businesses, but we want aesthetics as well. Ms. Vick-Peck said she sees people are just slapping up signs, but then those who are trying to conform and get the proper permits can't get what they want. She is seeing a lot of signs that aren't conforming to the codes. What looks good, what doesn't, we have a Hodge Podge going on; a lot isn't very pleasant or inviting. We can help ourselves. Not trying to throw stones, we need a starting point.

Bill Blaschka said our sign ordinances are too complicated and it contradicts itself. He has looked at it and dealt with it. He feels it needs to be dummed down and simplify it. He said his sister just got a permit for the mill and the building permit was less than the sign permit. It needs to be accommodating for the people.

Mrs. Bergholz said the issue is how to deal with businesses that have the daily special. Terry Hellenbrand said the types of businesses have changed. More malls. If you have three spots; you need multiple signs.

Ms. Jansen asked about the residential setting. She has a CBRF, the locations she can put a sign for her business she doesn't even want to put a sign. Where she is allowed to put them you wouldn't be seen.

Mr. Lowery said he feels a ground sign would be easier to maintain. Mr. Raasch said he liked functional signage, would a sign permit be required for canopies?

Mr. Hensler asked how banners can be controlled. Mr. Lowrey said the two bars in the downtown have daily specials and events. How do you present to the public that these specials/events are happening with still having it being aesthetically attractive? Signs that are intended as temporary are being used as permanent signs. The Village has let enforcement go. Ms. Vick-Peck said those banners are being used as advertising not as signage. There is too much wording. Do we want to allow this type of advertising? Mrs. Bergholz said it is an education process.

Mr. Blaschka said we need to look carefully at the non-profits who use banners to advertise their event. Mr. Lowrey said those banners go up and come down within a reasonable amount of time. There are businesses who never taken down banners.

It was felt banner usage for temporary times are appropriate. Mr. Raasch said he would like to see some more of a new permanent installation of a digital sign. Mr. Hensler said about a year or so ago there was discussion on a digital sign. Mr. Hendricks said the Village had a consultant come and give suggestions for a high resolution, multi-color two sided digital signed. The cost was \$50,000-\$70,000 for an LED sign; the life expectancy is extensive. Funding source was to be the Tax Incremental District. He used to drive by the one in Sauk every day; he looked at it every day.

Mrs. Donna Hellenbrand asked if it would be the intent to eliminate banners if a digital sign was used. Not necessarily but it would be another avenue for businesses to advertise.

It was suggested that maybe there be a requirement banners would have to meet a certain standard or be professionally done banners. Mr. Hendricks said you are branding your community when you place signs; bringing in tourism dollars. You can use make shift banner or provide something more attractive to brand your community.

Mr. Netzer asked about banners on businesses; are they banners or signs? Could a banner be framed in behind glass be an option?

Mrs. Bergholz said there are many that aren't brick and mortar businesses; we need to have a discussion on how their signs would be handled.

Mr. Raasch said he sees it as three different items: such as long-term building signs, daily specials, and banners. It won't be one size fits all.

Mr. Lowrey said Marshall is unique; we have two major highways that produce a lot of traffic and the county arteries. It is great, but also an obstacle. Where would you place an electronic sign with so many arteries? Mr. Hendricks said do you tie in the vacant lot next to the Legion Parking

Lot? Would that land area be used to create an advertising system? He suggested bringing an attractive piece to the downtown, green space, and signage.  
No action was taken; with further discussion to take place at the next meeting.

**IDENTIFICATION OF TOPICS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION**

1. Next regular meeting 4/25/12.

Adjournment

Having no further business a motion was made by Lowrey and seconded by Kiefer to adjourn at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Peck  
Clerk/Treasurer