

PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES – 9/24/2025

Government Unit Conducting Meeting: Plan Commission
Date: September 24, 2025
Time: 4:00 P.M.
Place: 410 Division Street, Park Falls, WI 54552
2nd Floor Conference Room

Members of the Board of Plan Commission Present: Mayor Tara Tervort, Michael Mader, Dixie Weidman, Gary Wollerman, Victor Ambrose

Members Absent: Lauri Hart, Michelle Scharp

Staff: Scott Kluver, William Hoffman, Shannon Greenwood

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Tervort at 4:00 pm.

Discussion & Recommendation- Ordinance 25-028 C-1-A Commercial District; Area Requirements –

This ordinance removes a provision that allows for a variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals for setbacks if the structure was built prior to 1977 in the C-1-A district. Discovered that there is no rear yard setback specific for accessory structures in the C-1 and C-2 districts. Current setback is 25 feet, which is excessive as R-2 district is 5 feet. Proposed that the setback be 10 feet for accessory structures as this provides adequate space for snow removal.

Discussion & Recommendation – Ordinance 25-029 C-2 Commercial District; Area Requirements –This ordinance would provide the same 10-foot setback for accessory structures as discussed above. Motion by Weidman/Mader to recommend approval of Ordinance 25-028 and Ordinance 25-029. Motion carried 5-0.

Review/Recommendation – Comprehensive Plan Request for Proposals – Reviewed scoring criteria used for the following proposals:

HKGi Proposal – Only submission that did not include CDBG experience, noted that they follow policies. Previous experience included New Richmond's plan which follows newer trend of being more simplified and pairing down maps and diagrams making the plan easier to digest. Did not provide much of a plan outline, stated that it will follow standards. Did not offer much of a breakdown regarding cost compared to the other two. Scored higher on community engagement due to offering a 2-day workshop with interactive mapping and paper survey.

Northwest Regional Planning Commission – Contracted for the current/previous plan. They would not be very creative for adopting a newer style, more or less an update of the previous version. Timeframe is most realistic as it takes a minimum of a year. Smaller staffed.

MSA – Ranked high but the price point was well would be over budget with all add-ons. They have 14 years of experience with the City with several different projects, knows the area extremely well, works well and is familiar with staff. Scored very high on community engagement and offers the most tools. Add on services are things that should be strongly considered. More successful and experienced at grant applications. Has a deep understanding of our challenges, and like their format and interactive website. Cost breakdown was appreciated to pick and choose exactly what you want. Has done recent projects for surrounding areas. It would be nice to get some clarity for what is provided in basic strategy for community engagement, and if add-ons need to be contracted immediately.

Motion by Ambrose/Mader to recommend that Common Council negotiate the contract with MSA Engineering and to gain more detail considering the add-on services. Motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:19 p.m.

Prepared by: Shannon Greenwood, Clerk