



MINUTES OF THE GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION

**MONDAY, AUGUST 12, 2019, 6:00 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 604 - THE HARRY MAIER ROOM**

A. ROLL CALL.

I. Members: Timothy Gilbert - Chair, Sidney Bremer - Vice Chair, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, Lisa Hanson, Jacob Miller, Randall Petrouske and Jerry Wiezbiskie

Members Present: Veronica Corpus-Dax, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Timothy Gilbert, Sidney Bremer, Lisa Hanson, Jacob Miller, Randall Petrouske (arrived at 6:07 p.m.), Excused:

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the August 12, 2019, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Jerry Wiezbiskie, seconded by Lisa Hanson to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the July 8, 2019, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Lisa Hanson to approve the minutes. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

Chair Timothy Gilbert read into record the rules and regulations regarding the Public Hearings.

1. (CPA 19-03) A request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for the property located at 2607 Nicolet Drive from Commercial to Low Density Residential (Figure 22-6), submitted by Robert Mach, on behalf of Shekinah Glory, LLC, property owner (Ald. B. Dorff, District 1).

Chair Timothy Gilbert opened the public hearing regarding 2607 Nicolet Drive.

Chair Timothy Gilbert asked if there was anyone who wished to speak at the public hearing. No one else came forward, and the public hearing was closed.

2. (CPA 19-04) A request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for various parcels located in the Shipyard Neighborhood, submitted by the Department of Community and Economic Development (Ald. B. Johnson, District 9).

Chair Timothy Gilbert opened the public hearing regarding various parcels located in the Shipyard Neighborhood.

Chair Timothy Gilbert asked if there was anyone who wished to speak at the public hearing. No one else came forward, and the public hearing was closed.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. (CPA 19-03) Consideration with possible action on the request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for the property located at 2607 Nicolet Drive from Commercial to Low Density Residential (Figure 22-6), submitted by Robert Mach, on behalf of Shekinah Glory, LLC, property owner (Ald. B. Dorff, District 1).

Moved by Lisa Hanson, seconded by Randall Petrouske to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for the property located at 2607 Nicolet Drive from Commercial to Low Density Residential. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

2. (CPA 19-04) Consideration with possible action on the request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for various parcels located in the Shipyard Neighborhood, submitted by the Department of Community and Economic Development (Ald. B. Johnson, District 9)

Moved by Lisa Hanson, seconded by Jerry Wiezbiskie to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Lisa Hanson, seconded by Jerry Wiezbiskie to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Randall Petrouske, seconded by Sidney Bremer to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for various parcels located in the Shipyard Neighborhood. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

3. (ZP 19-17) Consideration with possible action on the request to rezone 2607 Nicolet Drive from General Commercial (C1) to Low Density Residential (R1), submitted by Robert Mach, on behalf of Shekinah Glory, LLC, property owner (Ald. B. Dorff, District 1).

Moved by Lisa Hanson, seconded by Jerry Wiezbiskie to rezone 2607 Nicolet Drive from General Commercial (C1) to Low Density Residential (R1). Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

4. (ZP 19-15) Consideration with possible action on the request to rezone various parcels located in the Shipyard Neighborhood, submitted by the Department of Community and Economic Development (Ald. B. Johnson, District 9).

Moved by Randall Petrouske, seconded by Jerry Wiezbiskie to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Randall Petrouske, seconded by Jerry Wiezbiskie to rezone various parcels located in the Shipyard Neighborhood. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

5. (ZP 19-16) Consideration with possible action on the request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow for a plant expansion to exceed the maximum height limitation within the General Industrial (GI) district at 1919 South Broadway, submitted by Tim Ellsworth, Georgia Pacific Corp., property owner (Ald. B. Johnson, District 9).

Moved by Jerry Wiezbiskie, seconded by Lisa Hanson to table the the request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow for a plant expansion to exceed the maximum height limitation within the

General Industrial (GI) district at 1919 South Broadway. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

6. (TA 19-04) Consideration with possible action on the request to Repeal and Recreate Green Bay Municipal Code Chapter 13-1700 Off-Street Parking, Drives and Loading, submitted by the Department of Community and Economic Development.

A motion was made by Sidney Bremer to approve the Repeal and Recreate the Green Bay Municipal Code Chapter 13-1700 Off-Street Parking with the addition that an additional drop space be added for day cares. There was no second. Motion fails.

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Jerry Wiezbiskie the Repeal and Recreate the Green Bay Municipal Code Chapter 13-1700 Off-Street Parking, Drives and Loading as proposed. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

F. INFORMATIONAL.

I. Director's Report.

Kevin Vonck presented the Director's Report. No action needed.

2. Date of next meeting: Monday, September 9, 2019.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Lisa Hanson, seconded by Jerry Wiezbiskie to adjourn. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

VERBATIM MINUTES

Speaker I: Good afternoon. Welcome to the Monday August 12th meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission. First item on the agenda is roll call. Tim Gilbert, Chair, is present. Sidney Bremer, Vice Chair.

Vice Chair: Present.

Speaker I: Alder Veronica Corpus-Dax.

NA: Present.

Speaker I: Commissioner Lisa Hanson.

Commissioner: Present.

Speaker I: Commissioner Jacob Miller.

Commissioner: Present.

Speaker I: Commissioner Randall Pertrouske.

Speaker?: Detained by a train.

Speaker I: Detained by a train. And Commissioner Jerry Wiezbiskie.

Commissioner: Present.

Speaker I: Thank.

Speaker?: I think the bridge is out. [back ground talking]

Speaker I: Next point. Approval of the agenda, for the August 12th, 2019.

Speaker?: Second.

Speaker I: Motioned by commissioner Wiezbiskie and seconded by Commissioner Hanson to approve the Agenda. All those in favor say "I"

Speakers?: I.

Speaker I: Opposed? – It is approved. Next item. Approval of the minutes from the July 8th, 2019 Meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Speaker?: Approval.

Speaker?: Second.

Speaker I: We have motion by Commissioner Bremer to approve and seconded by Commissioner Hanson. All those in favor say "I".

Speakers?: I.

Speaker I: Opposed? – The minutes are approved. We have two public hearings tonight. These public hearings have been properly posted and public notification has been published in the Green Bay Press Gazette. The Plan Commission is interested in hearing public comments on the subjects agenda items. We invite your comments and asked that after your name has been called, you state your name, your address, whether you represent a group or association, and whether you favor, oppose, or only providing information in the matter, and then obviously your comments and concerns. We also ask that you define your testimony to the facts related to the proposal on hand and try to avoid repetitive testimony. You must be recognized by the Plan Commissioner to speak and please address your comments to the Chair. Comments will be limited to five minutes. We will now open the public hearing on CPA 19/03, a request to amend the city's comprehensive plan for the property located at 2607 Nicolet Drive from Commercial to [unintelligible 00:02:41] city residential submitted by Robert [unintelligible 00:02:42] on behalf of [unintelligible 00:02:45] LLC, property owner. Is there anybody that wishes to speak on this? – Yes, sir.

Speaker?: My name is Jeremy Shaw, my address is [background talking] 2603 Nicolet Drive, which is adjacent to the subject parcel, and I belief this is probably the best thing that could happen to this property. I am all for

it. That's about all I have. This could be traffic, parking, and any other issues associated with the other rezoning. I think it's the best ones.

Speaker I: Thank you. Does anybody else wish to speak. – Yes. Alder.

Speaker?: I don't have any strong feelings either way, I am just curious as to what is the [unintelligible 00:03:51] LLC and what is the plan to put there? Is it purchased? Is there a home that is going to be put there? Do we know any of that?

Speaker?: That's the current owner of the parcel.

Speaker?: Do we have any information on that?

Speaker I: The LLC is the current owner of the property. The applicant [unintelligible 00:04:15] is working on behalf of the client who wishes to build a single family home on.

Speaker?: The current owner is building the home on the property?

Speaker I: The current owner is [unintelligible 00:04:32].

Speaker?: The current owner and then they are selling it or whatever is going to happen, there is going to be a home build there. We are just zoning it residential and that's all that came put forth?

Speaker I: I think the future property owners are doing due diligence to get the property zoned appropriately.

Speaker?: Okay. Thank you, that's all the questions I have.

Speaker I: Thank you.

Roger: My name is Roger Georgia, and we live adjacent to the property at 2611 Nicolet Drive, which is right next door, and I'm definitely in favor of being home.

Speaker I: Okay, thank you. Does anybody else wish to speak on this? Does anybody else like to speak on this? Does anybody else wish to speak? Okay, very well, let the record reflect that nobody else came forward for this public hearing, or how they call it. The next public hearing is CPA 19-04, a request to amend the city's comprehensive plan for various parcels located in the shipyard neighborhood, committed by the Department of Community and Economic Development, Is there anybody wishes to speak on this? Yes, sir.

Chris: My name is Chris Messiah, I own a property on [unintelligible 00:06:17], and looking at the letter that I was sent according to if the property is a four-unit, so my question would be is; is this going to be grandfathered in to be continued as a four-unit? We got four different maps on that proposition, or what is it, that looks like their proposal is to make us one or two-family properties, and in this, it says that the grandfathered in whose only takes effect the change of our expansion that grandfather abuses proposed.

So I guess the question would be; okay, is it going to be grandfathered in as current users of the four-unit? And that also does this mean when we decide to liquidate, that it has to be sold as a single or two-family, or it can be sold as an existing four-unit investment property as it is now? Or is this going to impact? Because I thought it was going to be my retirement.

Speaker I: I've got an idea to forward for the--

Speaker 2: I'm actually taking [unintelligible 00:07:37] surprisingly, we can discuss a little bit more when this zoning action comes up about the property-specific things, but everything that exists now will continue to exist in perpetuity as it's grandfathered into our code, so if you have an existing four-unit, it would stay as a four-unit for as long as you would like it's remaining that way, the only time that that grandfathered lapses is if you've had that unit be vacant for more than 12 months, or if you want to expand that use in some house, if you want to have two additional units, then that would be allowed, or you have to get a conditional use permit depending on what zoning district we're going towards.

Chris: Okay.

Speaker 2: So we can go over the specifics if you're talking a little bit more after the meeting if you would like, but there are only four companies that have that grandfathering, so I'm not sure if you looked through that list to see if that was one of them.

Chris: Does it say [unintelligible 00:08:24]?

Speaker 1: We can discuss this further when we get to that fact.

Speaker 2: Yes, there's action to the specific to the zoning, so we might be able to answer more questions at that time.

Chris: Yes, all right, is there time to ask also now if we sell the property, does the grandfather clause continue with the new buyers?

Speaker 2: Yes, as there's an existing use, there's no change at all, it only changes, again, if that you want to expand that use, or it gets discontinued. so if it's a occupied four-unit, you sell it as an occupied four-unit, it would remain that way.

Chris: All right, thank you.

Speaker 1: thank you, does anybody else wish to speak on this? Is there anybody that wished to speak on this? Yes, sir.

Gary: My name is Gary Van Sistine, and I own a couple of properties in that area, today, and I read the letter, but I own the property at 824 South Broadway, and it's C1, and it says permitted to committed, I don't know if I understand exactly what that means, sorry if I'm being ignorant here.

Speaker 1: being ignorant here. I just need to understand. I called somebody on just want to check in. I know there's, I'd like to make some improvements at 824 South Broadway, in particular, probably blacktop of parking lot, which is not real big, but it would be nice to have a black car. Then I know there's a procedure to go through for all that and I'll do my best to follow that. I have another property. It's at 820, excuse me, 613 Hubbard, corner of Hubbard and Ashland. That's not in your plan, apparently, that's just on the outside. Even though it goes all the way to Ashland. Is there any particular reason why that kind of property is not included? Because I could do improvements that are just not advertised.

Speaker 2: It's just not part of the ship yard.

Speaker 1: Okay. It just isn't?

Speaker 2: We can address this further again with item, agenda number four.

Speaker 1: The chair seems that you've been following that district, but you'll have to tell me that. Can somebody answer my permitted to permitted?

Speaker 2: Yes, we can address that further at that agenda item number four.

Speaker 1: Okay, agenda item number four.

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: Okay. Thank you.

Speaker 2: Thank you.

Speaker 1: Does anybody else want to speak on this? Is there anybody else that wants to speak? Is there anybody else? Okay, Let the record reflect that no one else came forward. This public hearing is also now closed. Next item regular business. Item one consideration with possible action and then request to amend the city's conference the plan for the property located 2607 Nickel Drive from commercial to all destiny residential submitted by Robert Mark on behalf of Chinaco Glory LLC company.

Speaker 3: Name this chair. This is a request for a comprehensive plan amendment for a commercial to low density residential. I just want to clarify the title hanging there has a CI and RI. Those should not be included. It should be just commercial too low density residential. Those will appear later as part of the it's own petition. This is the future land use change amendment. Then effects 2607, Nikolay Drive not properties highlighted in red here along Nikolay in the bay. You got the GV to the east. This is Harry Manly of single family homes along the Bay. Of course, there's University and let's mess up here.

There was a previous comprehensive plan to manage change in this area. There's also been some redesign that was to accommodate a bed and breakfast development that never occurred here. This is the former content restaurant site. That building was raised. The current owner has tried to get that bed and breakfast up and running but that that failed. That did not work. What's happened since is that there is a new prospective buyer who hopes to purchase the property and get a result for a single family home.

Current zoning are also still remains at CI. The process here is to abandon comprehensive plan to low density residential, that would free up them take the application and follow up with the zoning and change to low density RI. That's item later in the agenda. We've gone through the notification process for the past of the amendments. There are some criteria listed within your agenda tonight. We're supporting request from commercial to low density residential as a future.

Speaker 4: Thank you, commissioner of justice.

Speaker 5: I'm interested to know is somebody's actually purchased this property now and who's actually applying for the change?

Speaker 3: Bob Mark in my form is the applicant. After the current property owner, I don't know if it's been made public that who the prospective buyer is at this point for trading. I suspect you're doing due diligence to get the necessary zoning in place to a particular transaction. That's just speculation.

Speaker 5: Is that normal circumstance that you approve a rezoning to someone who is not really the owner of the property?

Speaker 3: Well, it's to the current donor of the property. I think the future automatic different intend of use for the property, but certainly, it's to the current property.

Speaker 5: there are now taken as down zoning of the property. We're taking a chance from going to the commercial to a residential district.

Speaker 1: We're resuming us with the current owner who has basically title of [unintelligible 00:14:55] for the property, because he's actually applying for. Yes

Speaker 1: This again is the comprehensive plan. This is the first step and unravelling the agenda will be the actual result.

Speaker 2: Okay. I figured that it got the CS. I was trying to time heals off.

Speaker 3: Move to approach.

Speaker 4: I second.

Speaker 5: Where the motion by Commissioner Jensen and second by Commissioner McCloskey to approve the action. Is there any other discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing now, I would ask you to cast your votes.

[silence]

Speaker 3: Approve being anonymously.

Speaker 5: Okay, thank you. Next item, consideration with possible action and a request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for various programs located in the shipyard neighborhood submitted by the community and economic development.

Speaker 6: Thank you. As I'm sure some of you probably heard where we are developing a project of the shipment. With that our department, development departments within city hall been taking a really good close look at this neighborhood wanting to make sure that we're doing a lot of investment into the existing neighborhood, versus letting people come in and modify the waste we don't find appropriate. There's been financial investments throughout the city hall. Our team also made a shipyard investment plan. With that, these are the boundaries that were determined to be the shipyard neighborhood.

This is generally founded by walnut, Ashland, I think that's fifth or sixth street on the far end and then the river. The shipyard proper will be in this area here and addresses such as consider the shipyard neighborhood. With that investment strategy, this will see an internal document for us to guide. How to invest money? Where to put that investment is? What kind of strategies we want to use for this neighborhood became very clear that some of the plans in this area, some of our master plan documents really conflict with one another. The ones that did have the same things weren't reflected in our system comprehensive plan. We opted to do a mass overhaul of the comp plan and the zoning in this area.

Start with the comp plan changes. This looks a little different from the normal last few years, but there's so much data here. There's about 350 parcels. It's taken a while to do this. As you can see, now, this isn't very cohesive. There are some chunks that lower me basically to say the downtown, the high intensity retail office down in this area. There are also pockets of higher density housings and things that jump in and out that don't really match with what exists there currently and what we would like to see for the future. For the major changes, we're really just kind of cleaning up the boundaries of what already exists.

As you can see here, this low to medium density residential along Ashlyn area. That most certainly is the same required for a little bit higher density around Mason Street. Beyond that, it's basically just reflecting what's already there. We have some singles and twos some old size and all that can be represented with these classifications. One of the other changes you'll see right here, this had the meaning of identity residential. This is the struggle on Broadway and then right next to the whole piles, which is basically that commercial will be commercial, we propose it to the commercial. That's reflected here as well. With the addition of adding some of this along Fourth Street, the city owns a lot of property here the agreement by [unintelligible 00:18:28] garage there that already has a kind of semi commercial field. We think that's the best use for that area.

The only other major changes that happen would be some of this in here. This is kind of messy, it had some industrial zoning. It has some like really chaotic land uses on it. We just decided to clean it up and just extend that downtown and then do some medium intensity housing office retail to capture that Beauvoir feel that kind of exists there, that office residential. With the changes are proposed here will be reflected in the zone in action, which is next to down on the agenda to make sure that there's more of a piece of plan is looking at like where the residential is permitted. Where it should be permitted? what types of residential uses?

Really, trying to make sure that the existing homeowners are represented here. We don't want to be shooting anybody out. We want people to invest in the properties that already exists. The future of land use changes. Then also those only changes reflect that as part of our investment strategy.

Speaker 5: Okay. Thank you. Is there any question on this?

Speaker 7: I have a question just, I know somebody in the audience too. I also own a property in the 200 block of South Maple. I feel awful for I thought it was already zoned R2. For it to go to R2 is not a big deal, but

so it was office residential. Now it's R2 which my understanding of R2 can be a two, three, four family property, correct? For R2?

Speaker 3: Two family and

Speaker 1: Two family and-

Speaker 2: I guess a CUP from multi.

Speaker 1: Yes, for three and four unit it's a CUP. One and twos are permitted by writing.

Speaker 2: R2, one and two is permitted but three or four would have to be a CUP, which is what the changes we to this CUP.

Speaker 1: Right, the four would be the max. We couldn't go any higher than that.

Speaker 2: Because of properties are fairly smaller anyway.

Speaker 3: Yes, you had to meet all the dimensional regulations as well.

Speaker 2: Right. I just remember at one point I asked the question, if my burn down would I be able to build it up as a three family again? It's all up R2 is a probably, but-

Speaker 4: That's a different issue as well. If there a natural disaster, you can rebuild the same footprint and use within a year.

Speaker 5: Are there any other case as of right now? It would be glad to put it in.

Speaker 2: Right, any property would be grandfathered in. again that's specific for the resolving the comp plan. It's just a many of the speech around are all this here. I'm sorry.

Speaker 3: Thank you.

Speaker 4: Any further discussion from the commissioners.

Speaker 6: Just a little bit more information, the biggest changes are R2, that is the-

Speaker 2: First the zoning.

Speaker 6: There's always a number of property that are being shifted to R2. What was the general reason for that? What can you tell me to understand?

Speaker 2: Mostly to reflect what's existing on the ground, there's a lot of singles and a lot of doubles. The art to capture is both of those as a permitted use versus the OR you'd have to get the conditional use permit for the single. To go R1, you'd have to get it for the double. That doesn't really make much sense for what's existing and what people have been investing and already in that neighborhood. The R2 just captures all the things that are allowed. The things that we would like as a conditional use. The majority, when you get to the zone, you'll see the majority of the top virtual industry mostly are R2.

Speaker 6: It avoid a lot of bureaucratic castle.

Speaker 2: Yes, plus applications of rooms. I have some data for the zoning portion of this live properties be going into compliance, which is really our ultimate goal here.

Speaker 6: Good. Thank you.

Speaker 7: Just reminder, we're talking about comprehensive plan versus zoning, which in this type of on word.

[laughter]

Speaker 2: It's very tricky. I feel flattered. It's really hard to understand.

Speaker 3: Thank you. Most of the opening is that we have a second. There is a motion by commissioner Jensen, and second by Commissioner McCluskey to open the forum for public comment. On favor say I. oppose? There's anybody who wish to speak on this? Keep in mind that this is strictly of comprehensive plan and not for the part of that.

Speaker 4: Sorry, we need to publish [unintelligible 00:22:46] Elizabeth? I like the downtown plan but it's kind of set in concrete in some ways. If you want to go to university downtown to bring life back to the downtown. Because the downtown is dead on Sunday. Most stores are closed on Sundays. If you really want to revitalize it, you need to bring youth to the area. You bring jobs like professors. If we put a university in this area, it can really have a great deal area.

Speaker 3: Thank you. Is there anybody else that certain speak on this? Okay, thank you.

Speaker 1: We will-

Speaker 3: Yes, sir.

Speaker 7: Cephalon, I own a property 416, 424 Chlemistry. My question is, is there any other differences in taxes, tax brackets, if you're in the downtown area from whatever currently was now? If you switch is there a different tax for being downtown properties?

Speaker 2: I believe we assess on use not some classification.

Speaker 3: Correct, so the assessor they look at the property and basically look how it's being used and so it's separate from the zoning.

Speaker 7: Okay, so property taxes pretty much will change unless the use changes?

Speaker 3: Correct.

Speaker 7: Should have to come in and get some kind of-

Speaker 3: Right, maybe changing the structure and right in addition or remodel processor will come back.

Speaker 7: Sounds good. I assume there's no like downtown. All right. Thank you.

Speaker 3: Thank you. Is there anybody else who wants to speak on it. Thank you.

Speaker 8: Commissioner [unintelligible 00:24:32].

Speaker 4: Second.

Speaker 3: We have a motion by commissioner Hensen and seconded by commissioner McCluskey to [unintelligible 00:24:37] . All in favor say I.

All: I

Speaker 3: Oppose? Okay, we heard that. Are there any further discussion?

Speaker 1: A move to approve the request.

Speaker 2 and 5: Second.

Speaker 3: We have a motion by commissioner McCluskey to approve the recommendation

Speaker 1: McCaskey to approve the recommendation and second by who? Commissioner [unintelligible 00:25:05].

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: Any further discussions? Would you please cast your votes.

[silence]

Speaker 2: McCaskey

Speaker 1: Thank you. Next item. Item three, consideration with possible action on the request to rezone 2607 nucleotides, General commercial to residential. Committed by founder of March ambassadorship keynote LLC conference.

Speaker 3: Thank you Mr. Chair. This is the follow up request to number one. This is the rezoning of 2607 from general commercial CI to low density residential RI, based on the action of item number one. Again, this is the property in question. There was a former rezoning in this area that did clean up some zoning back in 2015. This property was left because at that time, there was plans for that bed and breakfast. Since that time,

that project has failed, and now they're moving out with the different projects. Statue is notified effects of property areas, again, within that 200 foot radius. We haven't received any calls or injections from our support or anything. We are reading the approval of the request to resolve 2607.

Speaker 1: Thank you.

Speaker 4: Move to approve.

Speaker 5: Second.

Speaker 1: Will the motion by Commissioner Hampson, and seconded by commissioners McCaskey to approve the recommendation. Is there any further discussion? Then we're done. I ask you that you cast your vote.

[silence]

Speaker 2: Unanimously approved.

Speaker 1: Thank you. Please keep in mind that these recommendations will be going to the city council meeting next Tuesday, I believe. That will be the final recommendation. If you want to meet and attend knows forward two ones. The next item, is item for consideration with possible action on a request to rezone various parcels located in the shipyard neighborhood. Submitted by the partner Community and Economic Development.

Speaker 6: Thank you. Again one of my self-created maps. This is our insistence on. As you can see lots of bits and pieces of different types of zoning. Most notably we have a very heavy OR districts that is just absolutely or just in some fashion. The R1 District here apparently here are three events in Ramakrishnan OR within this area, outside of Mason street. With the change that we're proposing we are getting rid of all the industrial that is in this pocket here.

It's a really appropriate use considering its proximity to the neighborhood and also to the shipyard. We are retaining the white industrial that is gets the waterway. You can save the shipyard and Scott industrial feel to it anyway. These are good users and tenants. We're hoping that we do make some facade improvements, but ultimately they are pretty uses on the waterway so those are being retained. The D1 district has been expanded to cover those industrial pockets work higher. That's mostly don't expansion of the that D1 district. The OR district up here is becoming an R2 districts.

Then if you remember from the map we had this is at medium intensity versus the low medium. That's where that OR is being reflected. Clinton may become a more secure corner once the shipyard is here. We want to be sure that's got a little bit more flexibility if any commercial users want to go into that area. Then again, with the expansion of that C1 district This is all basically commercial anyway, this is a good area to have some more expansion, especially against that ramp there for East Mason Street. We want to make sure that was reflected with resolving. The paying stars that are noted are the only four properties that are being negatively impacted, which basically means they're grandfathered in with their existing users. With those there are a single family, two family and a two multi. With that they would be able to retain again unless the last with the use of

Speaker 1: The last within the use of 12 months or if they want to expand those uses, the lots are too small to really do any expansion. I imagine be if they laugh and their uses. Beyond that, almost everything is in the positive. Of the total 346 parcels, 40% of them are being brought into compliance. Right now they're either not permitted or conditional by our existing zoning. We're bringing them into compliance. 56 of them are having no change. Either they're going from a permitted zoning use to another committed use a conditional use to another conditional or we just haven't recommended to change for them. Then 3.5% are going from a permitted to a conditional use. Within 99% of the users that are existing in here are allowed by our code

either through conditional or just being permitted. It is that 1%, those four properties that have the grandfathering system, have not heard from any of those property owners. I don't know if they're present, but of the uses there. Again, the parcels aren't large enough to really do an expansion. We thought it was to the best benefit, especially because they're pocketed within some of our recommendations, and we don't want to have that pocket situation anymore. We'd like the larger districts. With that we're recommending approval. I don't know if there are any other questions. I know that the rezoning can be really tough because it impacts so many people so we sent out like a seven page letter. I tried to detail it, but it can be really convoluted. I want to make sure that if there are any questions, they're all expressed.

Speaker 2: That's going to become that little waterway that's just given up as part of the fox River.

Speaker 1: Yes. That's part of the shipyard. I don't know what we have as public information yet but some of the conceptual designs have had that be part of the actual shipyard area. Breakthrough fields will be located here. This is the shipyard area.

Speaker 2: That's quite possible. They all meaning will be sub-

Speaker 1: Sub means systems.

Speaker 2: Oh, that's great.

Speaker 1: The part of that larger project area.

Speaker 2: I think I would out Dd2 on these letter.

[laughter]

Speaker 1: Okay, that's only on the downtown area.

Speaker 2: Yes. Great. Question back here.

Speaker 3: Are you able ask questions. I'm interested in that.

Speaker 4: [unintelligible 00:32:02] have been questioning just mentioned the letter my compliments I thought it was a very formative letter. Also just for the welcoming as far as people [inaudible 00:32:12] questions.

Speaker 5: Moved over on the floor.

Speaker 2: Second.

Speaker 3: We have a motion by commissioner McCluskey and seconded by commissioner [unintelligible 00:32:23] to open the floor for public comment. On favor say I.

Participants: I

Speaker 3: Opposed? Okay, Would anybody like to speak on this?

Speaker 1: Yes.

Speaker 3: Again, please give your name and address.

Seth: Seth Lense, I own 416, the 424 Clean street. You said the start areas are the negative impact, correctly?

Speaker 2: The Southland parcels have [unintelligible 00:32:49].

Seth: All right, so does all the other parcels don't get the grandfathered too? Because I actually only one of the light industrials, it's getting changed. If it's not started and not grandfathered in?

Speaker 2: No, that just means that whatever is existing there is still a lot of us. We've made all these recommendations based on what's existing on the parcel. If you had something that was either vacant storage, something that was already allowed in whatever district it's going to, then it has no change, really. Because if it was a permitted use that's going to be permitted, that it's still alive. It's already going to conditional.

Seth: All right. So the star zone later is going to be the negative ones, but everybody [crosstalk]

Speaker 2: Yes, if they wants to expand that. That would be other uses to be allowed within that.

Seth: All right, thank you for clarifying that part. Thank you.

Speaker 2: Thank you.

Speaker 4: Thank you. Property at 200 South Maple which would be here, is the four you know that I was referring to. Right now, or in the letter, it's going from OR to an R2. I mean, is there something-- I mean, I don't see any that sort of grandfather down.

Speaker 2: That's what a lot of use then. On the back of the letter that was sent to details what those allowable uses are. If you're as-- It wouldn't be considered grandfathered because the use is allowed and promoted within that district. The two family is what the R2 district is basically made for. There are no changes to OR.

Speaker 4: All right, this is forth of it. I don't understand says I'm grandfathered [laughs]

Speaker 2: Within this permitted to CUP. That means you're going from a a four family would have been permitted within OR district but the zoning change going to R2, you'd have to get CUP to reestablish that use, but it's already established. There would be nothing if you needed to expand that use. You have to go through the condition use the process.

Speaker 4: I'm going to get some term with?

Speaker 2: No.

Speaker 5: You don't get a good.

Speaker 2: We would get stop rating to what they're doing now.

Speaker 4: Why don't we leaves those R3 or whatever, would be to keep it as-- You don't have all these

Speaker 1: I don't know that's what confused me because [unintelligible 00:35:04] to me that says it's not going to be [unintelligible 00:35:07]

Speaker 2: On that letter also it tells you what the process would be so the CUP processes details in there but that would only be if you needed to reestablish use for some reason but you wouldn't need to at this point. There are no on the ground changes when it comes to zoning we don't rezone something that people have to [unintelligible 00:35:28] you put nails there.

Speaker 1: I don't understand the R2 grading.

Speaker 2: Let's look at the neighborhood in its entirety. We're looking at your neighbors we looking at our thing that's around there and then what the city [crosstalk]

Speaker 1: I understand the are but [unintelligible 00:35:45] maintain at our end.

Speaker 2: There wouldn't be that's a maintainer property.

Speaker 3: I think one of the challenges we look at with with zoning is generally we have to zone right by neighborhood and district and so this general area we would like to see things that fit within that R2 zone knowing that there may be some pieces within specific parcels that don't but in general, we would like to see those uses in the R2. That's why that parcel, your parcel, your property is included in there given that all the ones around it are. In terms of setting the bar for the neighborhood, that's why yours is included in there so we don't go through and each parcel has a single different zoning down the street, we kind of know what it is for the neighborhood.

[unintelligible 00:36:42] expressed, what it means for you now if you've been operating it legally, you can continue to do so and there's nothing you need to do. You don't see any difference. The only time that would happen is if I had it vacant for a year or wanted to expand, add on your property. Then there would be a process, but otherwise you can operate business as usual.

Speaker 1: [unintelligible 00:37:07] you got several different designations.

Speaker 2: Yes. It's very complicated [unintelligible 00:37:15] easy thing to understand especially because we're doing the comprehensive planning and the zoning. It gets very convoluted.

Speaker 1: [unintelligible 00:37:23] single address so that's why I know our designated under that address. [unintelligible 00:37:29] Basically it's the same situation.

Speaker 2: Realistically I have a three family on that block and you have a four family. Neither of them were office residential or R2 so neither of those properties fit within the existing zoning or the proposed zoning. Really what they're looking at, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, is that any future houses that go in there if their house is demolished or rebuilt that they wanted to fit that R2 zoning but we are grandfathered in as long as we keep the properties. if it was a single family that was converted to a multi-family, if you have one apartment vacant for a year, you lose your grandfathering is my understanding.

Speaker 4: Yes. It's that 12 month window that's really important up there.

Speaker 1: Okay, thank you.

Speaker 5: Thank you. Is there anybody else [unintelligible 00:38:24]

Speaker 6: That pink star on Broadway is dangerously close.

Speaker 2: It's not your property, I promise.

Speaker 6: You sure about that?

Speaker 2: Yes because you're going permitted to permitted which means the use that you have is allowed. You have the gold star.

Speaker 6: I can't see [unintelligible 00:38:42]

Speaker 1: It's in the middle there.

Speaker 2: [unintelligible 00:38:50]

Speaker 3: I neglected to turn the letter over. [crosstalk] Sorry. People don't always use two sides of the paper.

[laughter]

I'm not the pink star. [unintelligible 00:39:10]

Speaker 3: Is there anybody else that wishes to speak right now? Okay thank you.

Speaker 5: I move to close the floor.

Speaker 3: We have a motion [unintelligible 00:39:25] Okay we're back.

Speaker 1: I move to approve the recommendation.

Speaker 2: Second.

Speaker 3: We have a motion [unintelligible 00:39:39] to approve that recommendation. Any further discussion? [unintelligible 00:39:49] cast your vote.

[silence] [background conversation]

Speaker 1: I'm afraid you'll have to install at the meeting. I'm still here looking terrible.

[crosstalk]

Speaker 1: Yes, I've got the power of neighbor here.

[crosstalk]

Speaker 2: Thank you. Because you're unanimously approved. Okay, good. Next item on the agenda. It's slightly different.

Speaker 3: Consideration of possible action on the request to authorize a conditional use permit to allow for plant expansion to exceed the maximum height limitation within the general industry of District 1919, South Broadway submitted by Tim Polwarth to a specific cooperation property warrant.

Speaker 4: We have received an email this morning from the applicants and they've asked to table this indefinitely. They're pretty off their expansion project at this time and just asked us to basically receive in place on file a request until they're ready to move forward.

Speaker 3: Okay, thank you.

Speaker 5: Move to place some files.

Speaker 3: It's all here.

Speaker 2: I think you brought to the table it. Not receiving these with files.

Speaker 5: Oh, got it. Maybe that's with circular file. Got it.

Speaker 6: Table on investment.

Speaker 2: This is it. I think table it just puts it on enough that a whole put it. You have to pick a date and because there's no date specified. I would just table it.

Speaker 2: So move.

Speaker 5: Yes, move to table.

Speaker 1: Okay, so we've got a motion by Commissioner McCluskey, seconded by Commissioner Hansen to table this item.

Speaker 2: Indefinitely.

Speaker 1: Table to kind of this. Okay, Any further discussion? I think we're done. I sure we ask the cast to vote.

Speaker 7: The vote that we're casting is the vote tabled not to vote for the current item which is further this.

Speaker 3: Correct.

Speaker 8: Unanimously approved to table the item.

Speaker 3: Thank you. Next item. Item six. Consideration with possible action. I know first repeal we recreated remain unethical. Code, Chapter 13-1700 off street party, guides and loading submitted by the Department of Community and Economic Development.

Speaker 9: Great. We are workshop. Well, we first started so this was a complete. This request is from training development. It's to repeal the entire existing chapter 13 1700, which deals with their parking drives and access and recreate it as presented in your packet. The request was originally came from over in Johnson, April, end of April or customer elimination of minimum parking requirements. Staff took a look at that, we started looking at eliminating minimum parking requirements. We looked at rehabbing the entire code. There were quite a few things in the code that were dated, didn't really follow market trends or current technology, or even contemporary practice in traffic engineering or planning.

We cleaned up a lot of that stuff. We held a workshop in June 24, for the Planning Commission. And you'll see in your packet. What you have now is a fully drafted perfect code with images and graphics and actual references and everything. A summary of changes which are handled by section on the screen, and then the existing perfect code that we have now. The colored text matches Redis, new content, blue is augmented content, or revised content. Anything that's in black is still exactly the same as it was prior. It might not be in the same space. But it's same regulation.

Since the workshop, we updated and based on all the comments we received at the workshop, some of the comments we received from public works. There was a big topic item at the workshop and that was currently. The requirement of a six inch high curve around every parking lot. You would ask staff to take a look at the cost of that. I can go through each one of the changes if you want me to. That was the big item. I'm kind of hit

that one. I just took our North parking lot, just north of this building. I did an analysis on that based on cost to current would be about 9% more. When I was saying 50 of the workshop, I was well.

[laughter]

Speaker 10: Good.

Speaker 9: Between

Speaker 1: 12% more to put curbing around the entire thing, we had a pretty extensive discussion at the meeting about the goal of curbing and what is that if it's not for stormwater is it for safety? Safety was really the main topic, partially aesthetics and long term and coming from a valuable property with the curbing was just a nicer development but if we looked at our same parking lot doing just curves around where the walkways are, it would be about between a 3% and 6% increase in cost so about half of what it would be to be the whole thing.

What we did is staff-- when we drafted we said only where they're adjacent to pedestrian walkways, again to reflect that safety, we find a lot of the larger developers they put it in any way. The city puts in curbing almost everywhere where we put it. The safety feature directs your stormwater again for aesthetics and I think in some cases it makes the life of the parking surface longer because it doesn't crack off at the edges which is very common, so we do it ourselves. I did also check with some of our neighboring communities and our sister cities in the state so not too surprising the larger communities require, the smaller ones do not.

To give you an example Oshkosh, Madison, Milwaukee, Nina all require curbing, Appleton's is a little different they require curbing, barriers, wheel stops as approved per project, so they're half-and-half but then I looked at our directly adjacent communities so [unintelligible 00:46:39] Alloway Bellevue, [unintelligible 00:46:43] Howard none of them are part of the project. Some require wing stop, some require guards and all those metal guards so when you look at a statewide or larger community require and some of the smaller ones and Meninas is much smaller than us.

They required but in our market, it's really not a major requirement right now so I wanted to throw that right at you, what the costs are and we redrafted the code to see just around the walkways obviously as a vehicle stop.

Otherwise there weren't too many changes from when we went through the draft, at the workshop one of the things they did add the owner's expense so if a facility is abandoned and it has to be removed all the way to the street I know we talked about that as well, a lot of people drive around the secret cuts going and they move along and then obviously people using them driving and parking that [unintelligible 00:47:45] it's been practice for the city not to have those removed when the driveway is removed, it needs to come on all the way to the [unintelligible 00:47:54] and close that back off.

I could go through all these if you want me to or if you just want to hit your hot spots from a workshop but I think one of the important things in your draft you have is we had our design specialist draft a bunch of images that they say speak a thousand words right? The text is center as well that those images really reflect what the regulations are and one of the goals of this plan was the reorganization.

You have all only one in two family regulations in one spot, or you're [unintelligible 00:48:29] one or two families in another spot and the generals in their own, and those now are also addressed with images as well, so it's nice somebody's got a single-family or does a single-family own a bunch of them, they can just grab that section, not really have to read through all the rest of it. I can answer any questions you want or go through if you want.

Speaker 2: I'm not going to ask you to go through [unintelligible 00:48:56] thank you very much for the care you've taken on this, it's an incredibly complex task and I appreciate the time you gave us and the help you gave us with the workshop and so I'm at fault that I did not work earlier, go through a very close reading but I only have one area where I have some concerns, and it is on page four on the number of off-street parking spaces required by various land-use and specifically I'm looking at two, one of them is the senior or elderly housing.

Where there are no visitor spaces required and that seems to be really odd for an elderly housing complex where you're actually more likely to have cars belonging to visitors than to residents.

Speaker 1: Potentially, again what we have done with our parking-

Moderator: Potential again, what we had done with our parking number is we have drastically reduced them. One of the things we have seen in a lot of communities especially downtowns but in some wholesale are drastic reduction in required parking. Now the market still has a parking demand. We may be saying and I won't use this one for an example but I'll say it's a commercial entity an office building. We require one stall per 500 square feet. They may have an internal model where it's one per 300 and they could do that. It would be the same thing with the housing elements. We're just not dictating that they need more than they need.

A bunch of different communities have them at [unintelligible 50:41:00] unit for senior. A lot of it depends if you're on a bus line. If it is a senior housing where there's shuttle services and these are all programs and senior housing. Now, this is not assisted care housing but where a lot of services are now being provided so the residence don't have to have vehicles. A hot thing, especially now with Uber, Lyft, autonomous cars are supposed to make a big impression on senior housing and also young people as well, people that are driving a lot. That reduction dropped down to one is reflected in that and that's why we went down.

Speaker 1: I understood that and I appreciate that as a general rule of thumb. Well, I guess a follow-up question. If an elderly housing development had one space per dwelling unit could the owners of the development identify some of those as visitor parking? That takes care of my concern there. I also have a specific concern under the group daycare center or preschool. Right, the adult family daycare home above that includes one drop off space. Here again, I was confused as to why there was no provision for a dropoff space particularly with preschoolers, who would be dropped off.

Moderator: Well, when you're looking at the daycare center and preschool versus the adult and family daycare. Adult family daycare that's the use that's done out of your [unintelligible 52:35:00]

Speaker 1: Fine and I'm fine with the adult family daycare-

Moderator: The drop off space is just one, okay-

Speaker 1: -but what I'm missing is the drop off space for the next one.

Moderator: Right, well that's going to have two spaces per three employees on a large slip plus one for seven students. That use is going to have a parking lot. It's going to be one parking stall per seven-unit space, per seven student space on capacity. That parking lot circulation will be a dropoff area so that anybody that's there visiting a sick child or picking them up. Or they're coming out and going into the building themselves there would be a dedicated parking spot there. Now that would be something we could require a dedicated dropoff space in here as well. It was just assumed that the driveway or the parking lot is going to probably act as that dropoff area. We could request an additional-- The reason why it's in there for the adult and family daycare is because it's a home site. It might be just a driveway and if you have it all parked up and let's say you're on [unintelligible 53:38:00], you can't call you and drop off a child. You can't park on the street and that's-

Speaker 1: I appreciate the inclusion effort for the adults. I'm concerned about the safety of the children at the preschool. I think I would, given your response move to append this to include plus one dropoff space.

Moderator: I can try that. I don't know if you want to take, you have more amendments. You don't have to take them while it's warm, otherwise, you'll be motioning the second.

Speaker 1: I'm making a motion I don't want to complicate things by having five things in front of us at one minute. I don't know if anybody else considers that important enough to want to second it.

[silence]

Speaker 1: Hearing no second I think it just drops to the second and thanks for your patience with me.

Moderator: Sure that's what we're here for. Is there any further discussion?

[shuffling papers]

Moderator: Is there anybody in the audience that wishes to speak on this?

[silence]

Moderator: Okay, thank you.

Speaker 1: Then move to approval.

Speaker 2: A motion to approve the recommendation by commissioner Brener, second by commissioner Lipsplitsky. Any further discussion?

Speaker 1: Okay, thank you.

Speaker 2: Move to approve.

Speaker 3: Second.

Speaker 1: Motion to approve the recommendation by Commissioner [unintelligible 00:55:10], seconded by commissioners McCluskey. Any further discussion? Okay, we're done. I ask if you got to launch.

Speaker 4: Still waiting for my vote window.

Speaker 2: Okay, here. If we turn the pop up, we can take your voice vote.

Speaker 4: Still not ready.

Speaker 2: How do you vote?

Speaker 4: I'd vote yes.

Speaker 2: All right. Unanimously approved.

Speaker 5: The six is a little bit longer. It's going to be going to the council for action, September 17. It's got a couple public hearings that are going in between that process and notices that go through.

Speaker 1: Okay. Thank you.

Speaker 6: Good job.

Speaker 1: Next, informational directors report.

Speaker 7: All right, summer schedule. Back to the line. The city council took care of number of items including CUP, forgot the court. CP for [unintelligible 00:57:00] South Broadway, which was sugar parking lots vacating Petty Wood lane. Then also at their report of the plane commission, again the other actions see initial records for the CPE for St. John's homeless shelter, graduate, Nikolay and then flagship blog CSM for his telephone were approved as presented. With that, yes, I just wanted to thank both David and Stephanie. I mean they've done a tone of work on both which is presented here tonight.

The minutes are huge, policy things. I think from the shipyard perspective, I mean, we've always talked about this re-conceptualize strip and project. You've seen the cool fun drawings but in a really neighborhood investment strategy and everything that we're doing around there. There's a ripple effect for what we're doing there. We just want to kind of prepare ourselves for change and do it in a way that you know, respects what's

there, but also works towards long term goals. Then as far as parking knows, but just putting on economic development add something that shouldn't ever become a pinch.

When I look at creating revenues, parking lot, groveling, generating the highest values on a per acre basis. Maybe a little bit personal in terms of right, trying to create development on it. I think in a way, by significantly lower in this minimums, we're going to let the market dictate a little bit more and really-- We don't want to get in the way of potential redevelopment opportunities, especially in our downtown and some of our major corridors that were kind of built pre-auto centric. Just thank them for the good work. Hopefully will Christie's for Council and some great changes resulting from it.

Speaker 1: Great. Thank you. The date of the next meeting is Monday September 9, 2019.

Speaker 8: The August 26 meeting is cancelled?

Speaker 1: That's correct.

Speaker 2: Move to adjourn.

Speaker 1: Will the motion by Commissioner Hensen and seconded by Commissioner McCluskey to adjourn this meeting. All in favor say aye.

Participants: Aye.

Speaker 1: Very good