

Plan Commission Meeting Minutes of November 3, 2025

PC meeting was called to order by Chairman Kuehn1 at 6:35pm. Roll call was taken. Present were Chairman Kuehn1, Commissioners Maertz, Kunde, and Pfaendtner and Giese, and Secretary Brazee. ZA O'Connell arrived after roll call and 6 others were present.

Motion made by Kunde to approve the minutes of 10/6/25; seconded by Pfaendtner. Motion carried.

1. CSM for William Popke/ 0260119 & 0260118: Brazee read overview from ZA's opinion (as he was not yet present). Chairman Kuehn1 asked Mr. Popke for details of what he's looking to do w/ this CSM. Mr. Popke noted that he's trying to utilize the occupation line of a fence on the southern line of his land to become the new lot line. The new lot line would then create 2 out lots. Popke has a verbal sale agreement w/ Rangeloff for Outlot #1 with the 14' frontage. He hasn't determined how to title Outlot #2. His surveyor, Kromm, noted that the large structure located on the lot line is ready to fall down at any time. He doesn't feel it's necessary to encumber more of Mr. Popke's land because of the Schonscheck shed. Kromm noted that the CSM resolves the North and South sides of the parcel and gets the structure on the appropriate property. Proposed CSM makes the situation better than it is currently.
Kuehn1: Fence line on the south end of the property will now become the actual lot line. 30 years ago surveys were redone in the area and everyone is finding out that the lot lines may be off in areas.
Kromm: The metal markers are called governmental fractional sections. 100 years ago many farmers agreed to measure out areas themselves, not fully aware of the fractional status.
Maertz: Feels the PC should accept as is and if anything is built- it will need to be built w/in the setbacks of the property line. Mr Popke is trying to solve a current problem and we shouldn't be making it difficult for him.

Kunde: Agrees w/ Kuehn1 and Maertz and confirmed that the shed is very close to falling down.

Popke: Asked how PC recommends that he title Outlot #2.

Kromm: Popke's question is probably a good one for title co or attorney to advise on. And wanted to stress that Mr. Popke is trying to solve the current problem with this CSM.

Motion made by Maertz to accept the CSM as originally drafted and combine 2 parcels (0260118 and 0260119) into 1 parcel/seconded by Kunde. Motion carried.

2. CUP/Sturm/026002601: ZA noted that an outbuilding is permitted in A2 zoning, but the application fails to show how the outbuilding involves agricultural activity. ZA noted that the PC can deny based on non-ag use or allow the building under a CUP with conditions.

Wittmann (Contractor & friend of Sturm) noted that he has 5 tractors to store in the outbuilding. Sturm also has items stored at many different storage facilities that he's trying to combine into one building on his own property. He also would probably not have more than 1 or 2 deliveries in a year. And that Mrs. Sturm was considering a big garden in that area as well.

Kuehn1 questioned why Sturm is not utilizing driveway on Woodenshoe for access vs. on County Rd G. Also reviewed the CUP for outbuildings in A2 zoning which notes it's supported by agricultural activity.

Farrey: Co Hwy access depending on which hwy- the access may be from 600-1000 feet setback between driveways. And from his experience on the Town Board A2 outbuildings pertained to production Ag. Ag classification does not need to be commercial but product does need to be produced from said property

Wittmann: Mrs Sturm intends on production from a garden on the property. Also questioned what good is the land if you cannot put a building on it.

Davel (surveyor) noted the application is not fair in saying that he's running his business out of the building.

Resident: Concerned about truck sitting in the back yard for over 9 months along w/ other items.

O'Connell: Frequency of sun tunnel deliveries is the biggest concern as it seems a form of warehousing, but the PC can recommend limiting the number of deliveries.

Brazee: What is the size of the proposed outbuilding?

Wittmann: 60'x100'

Kunde: The use of the outbuilding does not support ag activity, therefore he cannot support

Maertz: Struggles with the agricultural component and thinks that the use is not terrible for the area. Also understands limiting the number of deliveries would help, but does struggle w/ Ag intent.

Pfaendtner: Doesn't see how this supports ag activity

Wittman: several property owners in the area have large sheds and do not relate to ag production

Motion made by Giese to deny based upon the outbuilding not supporting Ag activity as defined/seconded by Kunde. Maertz abstained. Motion carried. Kuehnl advised Wittman and Davel that the final ruling will be determined at the Town Board meeting on November 11th.

3. Comprehensive Plan Updates: Sedlar w/ McMahon went thru completed updates of several maps and approximately 20 pages of verbiage. Co Super Farrey addressed the PC regarding the current County Shoreland Zoning topic in which the County Zoning Department has a deadline of Nov 21st to be given proof that a Town zoning map exists to include the shoreland areas to the lake. Zoning Dept feels that once the Shoreland overlay is removed several parcels in the Town will need to be given proper town zoning which involves notifying each property owner and provided public notice for the zoning approval. Chairman O'Connell will be attending the meeting w/ the Co Exec on Nov 5th to get some clarity on where the Town stands w/ our current map.

PC finished going through the updates of the comp plan including the suggestions and updates. Sedlar indicated that one more meeting may complete the review and indicates that he will draft a resolution for the Town Board to present the updated Comp Plan for approval.

Next review of the Comp Plan will be January 5, 2026.


Motion made by Maertz to adjourn/seconded by Giese.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10pm

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Brazee

PC Secretary



Joe Kuehn, Chairman