

Approved: 06.18.2024

Posted: 06.26.2024



508 Second Street, P.O. Box 277, Pepin, WI, 54759, Phone 715-442-2461

Emails: [clerk@pepinwisconsin.org](mailto:clerk@pepinwisconsin.org) and [treasurer@pepinwisconsin.org](mailto:treasurer@pepinwisconsin.org)

## ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

Village of Pepin Municipal Building

June 4, 2024 at 6:00 pm

### MINUTES

1. **Call meeting to order.** – Mike Michaud called the meeting to order at 6 pm.
2. **Roll Call** - Members present were Mike Michaud, John Hurtley, Dan Fedie, Pat Sandstrom, Julie Wheeler. Also present were numerous citizens.
3. **Review and Approval of Minutes from June 24, 2023 and May 15, 2024** - Minutes from May 15, 2024 motion to Approve by John Hurtley, Second by Dan Fedie. Motion passes. Minutes from July 24, 2023 (rather than June 2023) were discussed. Members had not reviewed the video. Motion to Table by Mike Michaud, second by John Hurtley. Motion passes.
4. **Public Hearing on proposed Changes to Chapter 151.060 Sign Ordinance.** - Mike explained that this is an effort to streamline the sign approval process and update with additional information including definitions. We went from one page to three pages of text.

A suggestion was made to post copies of the proposed ordinances on the Village website.

There was a discussion of why the 25% vs 50% limit in Section 4, Commercial buildings about size of signs flat on the building. Explanation that this is the limit of what the Zoning Administrator could approve on his/her own authority.

A suggestion was made that some signs should be allowed without a LUCR. A comment was made that it was never intended to require every sign to have a LUCR. It was pointed out that many signs in this new draft version do not need a LUCR.

A concern was raised about whether signs for Art Tour events would need a LUCR. Perhaps clarify language in section V(11) to apply in both Commercial and residential zones.

A concern was raised about the sign size limits in section III (5).

Approved: 06.18.2024

Posted:06.26.2024

Regarding page 2 item 13, how long is temporary?

A question was raised about lighted signs. What is OK? What if in a window?  
How to handle brightness? Flashing?

A comment was made that these rules are too restrictive, that we should be supporting signs for businesses. These rules go beyond what is required for zoning rules.

Questions were raised about out of town signs, signs regarding businesses not in the Village. (billboards)? There was an expression of support for allowing "out of town" signs for nearby businesses. Discussion of whether on Village right of way or on private property. Suggestion that these signs are not harmful to the Village. How are these different from real estate signs? What radius of distance of business is reasonable?

Next steps will be for this committee to review comments and decide on any changes.

5. **Public Hearing on proposed Changes to Chapter 151.076 Land Use and Construction or Remodeling Permit; Application; Fees.** Mike explained that the reason for these changes is to adjust the fee for LUCRs to match the actual costs of processing a LUCR. We did a sampling of what other governments charge and the fees are all over the place. Added language about renewal fees, and a penalty clause for not obtaining a LUCR.

Fees are based on project cost; how do you determine this? It was clarified that this is a Zoning permit and not a Building Permit, a building permit is also required. This review includes compliance with zoning rules.

A comment that these fees will discourage investment in the Village that provide jobs, this could be a hardship for lower income people. Lots of empty buildings in town. An \$86 dollar fee today would go to \$556 a 500% increase? Looks a lot like a tax, very punitive. Doubling LUCR Fees if you don't get one seems very punitive. Allow the Zoning Administrator to judge whether the penalty needs to be applied if you don't get one. Ask yourself whether a person building a house will get \$2,000 worth of services from the administrator?

In Section C, change the word "will" to "may" to fix penalty language.

There was a question about why a LUCR is needed for demolitions?

The one-year renewal time is too short, projects can take longer. Expand to 18 months or 24 months? Add time flexibility for unforeseen events?

A suggestion was made to take out the \$3/1000 parts of these proposed fees, not relevant to zoning.

Approved: 06.18.2024

Posted: 06.26.2024

A suggestion was made to set two different time periods based on whether its residential or commercial.

6. **Discussion/Action on proposed Changes to Chapter 151.060 Sign Ordinance.** – It was a consensus that we need to spend more time on the sign ordinance. Dan Fedie made a motion to meet again in a couple of weeks to review required changes. Motion seconded by John Hurtley. Motion passes.
7. **Discussion/Action on changes to Ch 151.076 Land Use and Construction or Remodeling Permit; Application; Fees.** - John Hurtley suggested we should further investigate the actual costs of processing a LUCR. Also, what is the actual time needed for completing major project time frames. Dan Fedie made a motion to meet again in a couple of weeks to review required changes. Motion seconded by John Hurtley. Motion passes.
8. **Set next meeting date.** – The meeting will be sometime during the week of the 17<sup>th</sup>, depending on member availability.
9. **Adjourn** – John Hurtley made a motion to Adjourn, seconded by Dan Fedie. Motion passes.

Mike Michaud  
Committee  
Chairman