

Plan Commission Minutes May 19, 2026, at 7:00 P.M.

Members Present: Stephanie Brassington, Luke Fessler, Karen Pominville, Chris Reynolds, Kyle Shelton, Ben Tanko

Members Absent: Eric Johnson,

Staff Present: Andrew Bremer, Kong Thao, Katie Jaggi, Cassandra Suettinger

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL

President Brassington called the meeting to order at 7:04PM.

2. PUBLIC APPEARANCES.

There were no public appearances in the room or on zoom.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

- a. Brassington motioned to approve the minutes of the April 21, 2026, Plan Commission meeting. Fessler seconded the motion. Motion carries 6-0.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

- a. Public Hearing on Ordinance 2026-07: An ordinance amending Article 11-XI Tourist Rooming Houses, also known as the Short-Term Rental Ordinance, of the McFarland Municipal Code.

Brassington opened the public hearing at 7:07 PM. Suettinger provided an overview summary of the purpose and content of Ordinance 2026-07. Brassington clarified that the public hearing is to take comments on the ordinance as drafted since that is what the Village Board referred to the Plan Commission. Suettinger clarified for Tanko that Ordinance 2026-07 is being referred to the Plan Commission similar to how a zoning ordinance is processed where the Plan Commission holds a public hearing and makes a recommendation to the Village Board who has the authority to approve or deny the ordinance.

The following people spoke in favor of the ordinance:

Kathy Carl 6014 Lake Edge Road (9 minutes, time donated from Gina Knewl and Jen Trisna).

Wendy Krone Lake Edge Road

Comments included: Limit the number of children per stay for noise complaints as well as total occupancy. Strengthen ordinance around noise pollution from rentals. Noise is amplified by decks and houses being close together. Put more weight on neighborhood testimony and videos versus requiring a decibel reader since the police would have to be called to record that and it's not a pressing issue for safety. Additional escalation process for repeated noise issues, not looking at total complaints at the end of the year. High density of TRH properties deteriorates communities. Concern over diminishing number of homeowners living in the area and rapid increase in the number of TRHs in McFarland.

The following people spoke against the ordinance:

Randy Vanderheiden 5118 Card Avenue (12 minutes, Dawn Cherek – did not speak donating time to him)

Comments included: Invested money into their rentals and do not want to lose profit with a limited season. Argued they possibly raised the property values of the surrounding houses through their increased investment. No evidence of safety issues but admit there have been some noise complaints. They advocate that TRH owners need to step up and be able to talk to guests in middle of night for noise complaints from neighbors and to increase warnings about being strict on noise during the booking process and placing reminder signs throughout the rental home guests are staying at.

Brassington closed the public hearing at 7:30 PM.

5. BUSINESS.

- a. Discussion and action to make a recommendation to the Village Board regarding Ordinance 2026-07: An ordinance amending Article 11-XI Tourist Rooming Houses, also known as the Short-Term Rental Ordinance, of the McFarland Municipal Code.

Suettinger provided summary of the agenda item, highlighting the changes in the ordinance. Reynolds inquired whether current permit holders will be grandfathered in. Suettinger answered Reynolds' question citing Wildwood Estates v. Village of Summit case, how this brings into account non-conforming uses. The Village Board can revisit the grandfather ruling if the State Supreme Court overturns the case. Tanko commented that strengthening the ordinance is needed through enforcement and increasing some penalties; however, he feels that extending the minimum stay duration of the ordinance to the longest extent allowed under state statute is a bridge too far.

Brassington motioned to recommend to the Village Board approval of Ordinance 2026-07. Reynold's seconded the motion. Motion passes 6-0.

- b. Discussion and action to make a recommendation to the Village Board regarding Resolution 2026-09, a resolution approving the grant of a utility easement within Outlot 2, Sperle Corners Subdivision.

Thao provided a summary of the agenda item. Bremer clarified the utility companies feel that it's a bit tight working within the Village's Right-of-Way and staff recommends approval. Fessler questioned if the easement could get in the way of any sort of future projects like ADA sidewalks. Bremer clarified it wouldn't be likely to impact future projects such as ADA accessibility, playgrounds, etc. in the future. The easement will be disclosed to buyers before they purchase applicable properties. Tanko questioned possible interference with underground utilities, to which Bremer answered it should be far enough underground to not interfere, but they would have to work around existing utilities if there's something planned to go across them. Bremer explained Village Right-of-Way. Public Works and Village Attorney didn't have any concerns with the 10-foot easement.

Fessler moved to recommend to the Village Board approval of Resolution 2026-09. Brassington seconded the motion. Motion carries 6-0.

- c. Discussion regarding the Village's 2026 Park Impact Fee Study.

Bremer provided a summary of the agenda item and previous Plan Commission discussions. Bremer clarified Reynolds question about where the level of service goal of 18.5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents came from, which was the 2025 Outdoor Recreation Comprehensive Plan (CORP), and industry standards. Bremer said there's not an acceptable national standard due to there being a lot of ways to measure the quality of parks. He emphasized that the Village showed a desire in their 2025 CORP to support growth of their Village with adequate greenspaces and parklands, which the impact fees support. Also, some communities have different values on how much they value public parks. Reynolds expressed worry about annual flux of consumer price index (CPI). Bremer stated they may be able to take an average of the last five years to balance the price bouncing around. He will ask the consultant for advice about it but feels it is likely at the Village's discretion.

Shelton asked for clarification on the Park Impact Fees versus the Park Improvement Fee. Bremer clarifies that they are both Park Impact Fees but one of them is for improvement and the other is for park land. Shelton then asks for the total amount spent for each to compare, to which Bremer answers that he would not be able to answer that off the cuff. Fessler followed up by saying that would be difficult to calculate as it can vary year to year based on what projects the Village is undertaking. Shelton also wanted to know how the Village's fees compare to other communities. Bremer led with communities valuing parkland differently and that some haven't kept up with inflation or haven't done an Impact Fee Study for a significant period of time,

which will skew results. Bremer provided a summary of park impact fees from other communities.

Brassington feels McFarland's projected numbers would be off-putting to developers in the area and would like to explore if there are opportunities to see if not raising the Impact Fee would be better. Reynolds wonders why our Impact Fee number is so high compared to other close communities. Fessler brings up that McFarland needs to decide what level of service they want to offer to the community, especially as it grows.

Brassington wants to know what it would look like if 18.5 acres were changed to 16.5 acres per 1,000 residents. Bremer calculates that for a single-family development, the price would go from \$4,245 per family to \$3,443. Tanko feels that we are overstating the importance of the Impact Fee and that the cost difference of a changed fee will turn out to be nominal for the developer. Shelton follows this by stating that it's important to regard that McFarland desires to be competitive for developers and to attract the right ones who will shape McFarland into the community they will be proud of. He also feels like this is part of McFarland's long-term plan and that it may be helpful to involve the Steering Committee for the 2027 Comprehensive Plan. Bremer feels it is separate from the 2027 Comprehensive Plan in the sense that this is coming from the 2025 CORP, and is also not part of the RFP put out for the upcoming 2027 revision.

Brassington clarifies the next steps. Bremer will present the draft impact fees to the Parks and Recreation Committee for their feedback, including input on considering changes to the 18.5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, which would require amending the 2025 CORP. The Plan Commission will then meet to review that feedback, hold a public hearing on the impact fee study, and then will give their recommendation to the Village Board.

Reynolds recommends getting developers involved at the public hearing to get their thoughts. Shelton is wondering if we are having a problem attracting developers. General consensus is that there are many factors to where and when land is developed and that McFarland has never outright marketed itself to bigger developers. Brassington states that she knows developers talk and that they will know our development fees are high.

Fessler wants to see how all the Village impact fees add up together with the park impact fees so the Commission can better understand the total number of fees and their cumulative total for developers.

Bremer said we might swap out ACS data for 2025 (if it is out yet) which may change the data. Additionally, he will ask the consultant if it would be appropriate to use the overall Village average of people per household versus the owner-occupied

household. Board concluded that the number established will be the ceiling of what can be charged. However, the fee can be less than that amount as long as it's even amongst all developers in the Village jurisdiction.

6. SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING DATE.
 - a. Tuesday, June 16, 2026, at 7:00 PM.

7. ADJOURNMENT.

Brassington motioned to adjourn. Reynolds seconded the motion. Motion passed 6-0.

Meeting adjourned at 9:11 PM.