



PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

Monday, October 6, 2025

Chairman, Russ Gehm called the Plan Commission meeting to order at 6:09 p.m.

Gehm read the statement regarding the posting of the meeting.

PRESENT: Russ Gehm, Andrew Court, Steve Peterson, Mark Welch, Troy Wescott, and Robbie Woldt III. Absent: Bob Shest

APPROVAL OF AGENDA. Motion by Court, second by Woldt, to approve the agenda and to deviate from the order as necessary. Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES. Motion by Court, second by Peterson, to approve the minutes from the June 2, 2025, Plan Commission meeting with the noted changes. Motion carried unanimously.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF CITIZENS: Jesse Rankin, Director of Municipal Operations; Attorney Charles Adams, Town Counsel Law & Litigation, LLC; and Jason Hutter, Little Village Pizza Crust.

NEW BUSINESS.

F1. Discussion and possible recommendation on the conditional use permit at 107 E Green Bay Street, Parcel 107-70050-0570, for a light industrial facility producing food with cooling and packaging area in the C-1 Commercial District. Rankin started by explaining the conditional use permit decision form. Jason Hutter's request for a conditional use permit at 107 E Green Bay Street must comply with the zoning code ordinance and provisions. There are no drawings or sketches of the work done on the property to support the conditional use permit application.

Rankin reviewed each order-related question and determined with the Plan Commission how the conditional use permit request aligns with district and Village goals.

1. Is the proposed conditional use in harmony with the purposes, goals, objectives, policies and standards of the Village of Bonduel Comprehensive Plan; zoning ordinance; and any other plan, program or ordinance adopted or under consideration?

The structure at this location is a house connected to another building. The Village does not have state-approved plans for a commercial building. Brian Noe, the State Building Inspector, has been contacted, and as of now, he has no building plans for this building.

2. Will the proposed conditional use in this location result in a substantial or undue adverse impact on nearby property, the character of the neighborhood, the natural environment, traffic, parking, public improvements, orderly development or improvement of public property, or other matters affecting the public health, safety, or general welfare, now or as it may in the future be developed?

Currently, this is a vacant building that Hutter agreed to raze if he ever wanted to expand his facility into it. The Village has a document from his conditional use permit at 109 E Green Bay Street and a 2017 agreement that he would connect to water and sewer, raze the building, or leave it vacant. Andrew Court inquired about the status of the house's water and sewer connections. Rankin replied, there is no water and sewer to this building. Hutter stated that there is water and sewer because the house shares it with the building at 109 W Green Bay Street. The two buildings were built at the same time by the same people, there is a tunnel, and the buildings are connected; this has been the case for 109 years.

Rankin stated that there is currently no separate water or sewer service connected to 107 W Green Bay Street. Mr. Hutter agreed to hook up if he ever intended to use this location, which he has yet to do. He agreed to this at two separate times. He also agreed to raze the building if he intended to use the property for commercial purposes.

3. Will the proposed conditional use maintain the desired consistency of land use, and land use impacts as related to the environments of the subject property?

If granted, this would be considered an industrial use rather than a commercial one. There wouldn't be any employees. No foot traffic would be permitted in the building. This would not be appropriate for the commercial district or the property's intended use.

4. Is the proposed conditional use located in an area that will be adequately served by and will not impose an undue burden on any of the improvements, access roads, drainage, necessary facilities, utilities or services provided by public agencies serving the property?

Currently, no utilities are connected to the building.

5. What are the public benefits of this proposal? Do the potential public benefits of the proposed conditional use outweigh potential adverse impacts of the proposed conditional use?

There is no increase in public benefits. There are no plans to demonstrate or deny public benefit.

After reviewing the questions, the permit conditions would then have to be determined. Essentially, the commission must consider what has been presented as facts. Personal opinions should not be considered when making decisions; only facts should. At this point, the commission has the option of approving, approving with conditions, or denying the conditional use permit. There may not be enough information at this time to approve the conditional use permit.

There have been prior agreements with Hutter to connect the building to water and sewer and to raze the building if he expands his existing business. These documents were not followed.

Steve Peterson questioned if the drawings were the only thing needed to decide. Rankin responded that the Plan Commission makes the decision on the permit, but there are no drawings to work with. Right now, all information is hearsay. Hutter claims he is not adjusting structural support, which is not known. The decision could be postponed until more information is received or the state building inspector reviews it. Peterson inquired about the type of drawings required, such as sketch drawings or state-approved drawings. Hutter stated that state-approved plans are only required if something structurally changes, and that nothing has changed structurally, so he believes state plans are unnecessary.

The Village has previously experienced similar issues with Jason Hutter's Pizza Crust facility and the apartments above the facility. Hutter stated that everything was drawn out for those projects, even if it was done after the fact, by an engineer and approved by the state. Rankin questioned Hutter about previously signed agreements with the Village. Hutter made accusations that he did not sign the agreements and there were papers that the Village Clerk

provided him that were not signed. Hutter stated that there was a conversation in which he stated that if he were to expand to a full topping facility, he would demolish the house at the time. Clerk Maroszek stated that the paper in question was provided by Hutter when he applied for his last conditional use permit and requested an easement from the village. Hutter argued about the origins of the document.

Hutter and Rankin exchanged words. Chairman Gehm, called the meeting back to order and returned to the agenda item for the conditional use permit. Robbie Woldt stated that the Plan Commission considers both sides of the issue but is unsure whether State plans are required. Hutter tells them they are not needed, while Rankin tells them they are. Is there anyone who could come in and tell the Plan Commission what they need for this project? Woldt stated that the Plan Commission requires additional information before making a decision on this. Motion by Woldt, second by Welch, to table the agenda item until there is more information to decide on the conditional use permit. Motion approved unanimously.

F2. Discussion and possible recommendation on the signage application for 300 S Cecil Street, 4Z Pet Spa Grooming Salon. Michael and Sierra Dootson have purchased the property located at 300 S Cecil Street. The Dootsons operate several businesses, including a dog grooming service and a construction company. They have submitted an application for a two-sided sign to promote 4Z Pet Spa Grooming Salon and Top Gun Construction. The proposed sign complies with the Village's ordinance regarding size requirements. Motion by Court, second by Peterson, to recommend that the Board approve both signs for 300 S Cecil Street as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

F3. Discussion and possible action on 2026 Plan Commission Budget. Maroszek reviewed the 2026 budget figures with the Plan Commission. The wages, employer contributions, and other miscellaneous expenses remain unchanged from last year. Additionally, the expenses incurred for outside services provided by Shawano County Economic Progress Inc. will now be included in the TID budget instead of the Plan Commission budget. Motion by Westcott, second by Welch, to approve the 2026 Plan Commission budget as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

Maroszek asked the Plan Commission what information they wanted to gather for the next meeting regarding the conditional use permit. The Commission requests information from the State regarding the plan requirements for Hutter's building and project. It would be ideal if the State Building Inspector could provide a letter or other form of documentation. Village

Attorney Charles Adams stated that, regardless of the other items, the Village has an ordinance requiring him to connect to the water for that building. The Commission would like bullet points for any violations or items required for Hutter to be in compliance.

According to Village Attorney Charles Adams, Mr. Hutter will be required to provide information to the Plan Commission to answer questions on the conditional use permit decision form. Adams encouraged the board to use this form to support their decision. Adams proposed sending the decision form to Mr. Hutter so that he could answer questions and bring it back to the Plan Commission's next meeting.

Next meeting: Monday, November 3, 2025, 6:00 p.m.

Motion by Court, second by Woldt to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 6:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Michelle Marosszek, Clerk/Treasurer