



## **MINUTES OF THE GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION**

**MONDAY, JANUARY 27, 2020, 6:00 PM  
CITY HALL, ROOM 604 - THE HARRY MAIER ROOM**

### **A. ROLL CALL.**

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

Present: Timothy Gilbert, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, Sidney Bremer, Jacob Miller, Excused: Jerry Wiezbiskie

Others Present: Ald. Barb Dorff

### **B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.**

I. Approval of the agenda for the January 27, 2020, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

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

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

### **C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.**

I. Approval of the minutes from the December 16, 2019, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Lisa Hanson approve the minutes. Motion carried.

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

#### **D. REGULAR BUSINESS.**

1. Consideration with possible action regarding a communication from Ald. C. Wery regarding an appeal by Mike and Karen Alberts, 1801 S. Ridge, to the designation and approved uses of their parcels 1-1423-A and 1-1423-A-9 on Ridge Road.

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Lisa Hanson to receive and place on file a communication from Ald. Chris Wery regarding an appeal by Mike and Karen Alberts, 1801 S. Ridge, to the designation and approved uses of their parcels 1-1423-A and 1-1423-A-9 on Ridge Road. Motion carried.

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

2. (ZP 19-30) Consideration with possible action on the request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to establish a two-family dwelling within an Office/Residential (OR) district at 1132-1134 East Walnut Street, submitted by John Tony Salas, property owner (Ald. B. Galvin, District 4).

Moved by Randall Petrouske, seconded by Jacob Miller to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

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

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

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

Moved by Randall Petrouske, seconded by Sidney Bremer to re-open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

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

Moved by Randall Petrouske, seconded by Lisa Hanson to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

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

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Lisa Hanson to approve the request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to establish a two-family dwelling within an Office/Residential (OR) district at 1132-1134 East Walnut Street, subject to:

a. Compliance with all other regulations of the Green Bay Municipal Code not covered under the

Conditional Use Permit.

b. Compliance with all pending violations.

Motion carried.

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

3. (ZP 20-01) Consideration with possible action on a request to create a Planned Unit Development (PUD) regulating signage at 1601-1603 North Quincy Street, submitted by Matt Szymanski, Green Bay Packaging (Ald. K. Lefebvre).

Moved by Lisa Hanson, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve the creation of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) regulating signage at 1601-1603 North Quincy Street, subject to the draft Planned Unit Development District (PUD) Ordinance. Motion carried.

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

4. (SV 20-01) Consideration with possible action on a request to close and vacate portions of Acme Street and Lawrence Street, submitted by Bob Mach, Mach IV Engineering (Ald. C. Stevens, District 5).

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded Lisa Hanson by to open the floor for discussion.

Motion carried.

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

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

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

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Lisa Hanson to close and vacate portions of Acme Street and Lawrence Street, subject to:

- a. A closure agreement is required for both Acme Street and Lawrence Street detailing maintenance of and access to this right-of-way.
- b. Access to parcel 21-2267 must be allowed and detailed in the closure agreement for Acme Street.
- c. Access to parcel 21-2263-6 must be allowed and detailed in the closure agreement for Lawrence Street.
- d. Proof of ownership of parcel 21-2263-5 is required prior to execution of the vacation or closure. If proof is not provided, access to this parcel must be allowed and detailed in the closure agreement for Lawrence Street. The vacation will be denied if proof of ownership is not provided.
- e. Proof of ownership of parcel 21-2263-4 is required prior to execution of the vacation. The vacation will be denied if proof of ownership is not provided.
- f. AT&T shall be granted easements for all existing facilities.
- g. Sanitary Sewer within Acme Street becomes privately owned and maintained (as is, where is) to

the sanitary manhole within University Avenue.

h. Storm Sewer within Acme Street from the storm manhole within University Avenue and includes all the storm sewer within Parcel 21-1200 to the existing manhole within the Henry Street / Basten Street intersection to become Privately owned and maintained (as is, where is).

i. To allow storm water from University Avenue and Parcels 21-2267 and 21-2013 to be collected, connected to and flow through the storm sewer within proposed Vacated and Closed Acme Street described in #2 above.

j. Allow uninterrupted ingress and egress across "Closed" portion of Acme Street to parcel number 21-2267.

k. Owner of adjacent parcel 21-2100 (Green Bay Dressed Beef, LLC) to be responsible for all costs to maintain the Vacated and Closed Acme Street, including but not limited to curb & gutter repair, pavement repair and snow removal.

l. Sanitary Sewer within Lawrence Street becomes privately owned and maintained (as is, where is) to the sanitary manhole within University Avenue.

m. Storm Sewer within Lawrence Street from the storm manhole within University Avenue to the intersection storm manhole that receives the storm water/sewer from Acme Street to become Privately owned and maintained (as is, where is).

n. To allow the storm water from University Avenue and Parcel 21-2263-6 to be collected, connected to and flow through the storm sewer within proposed Vacated and Closed Lawrence Street.

o. Owner of adjacent parcel 21-2100 (Green Bay Dressed Beef, LLC) shall maintain an adequately sized storm sewer system, not less than what is present at the time of the proposed Vacation and Closure of Acme Street and Lawrence Street that will provide storm sewer service to prevent street flooding no worse than what is presently observed.

p. Owner of adjacent parcel 21-2100 shall work with the Department of Public works to provide a clear route through the property from Acme Street to Henry Street such that an appropriately sized storm sewer could be constructed in the future. This shall be agreed upon prior to approval of a site plan.

q. Allow uninterrupted ingress and egress across "Closed" portion of Lawrence Street to parcel number 21-2263-6.

r. Owner of adjacent parcel 21-2100 (Green Bay Dressed Beef, LLC) to be responsible for all costs to maintain the Vacated and Closed Lawrence Street, including but not limited to curb & gutter repair, pavement repair and snow removal.

Motion carried.

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

5. (Site Plan #2207-Amended) Consideration and possible action on a request of the Zoning Administrator to review the site plan and landscape plan for the expanded Kwik Trip parcel located at 3525 Humboldt Road (Ald. B. Dorff, District 1).

Moved by Randall Petrouske, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve the site plan and landscape plan for the expanded Kwik Trip parcel located at 3525 Humboldt Road, subject to the standards found in ZO 25-04 and standard site plan review. Motion carried.

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

6. (PP 20-01) Discussion with possible action on hosting Public Hearings at Plan Commission meetings.

Moved by Randall Petrouske, seconded by Sidney Bremer to approve hosting public hearings at Plan Commission meetings. Motion carried.

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

7. Discussion with possible action on the 2020 Green Bay Plan Commission meeting schedule.

Moved by Randall Petrouske, seconded by Sidney Bremer to approve the 2020 Green Bay Plan Commission meeting schedule. Motion carried.

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

## **E. INFORMATIONAL.**

I. Director's Report.

Kevin Vonck presented the Director's Report.

2. Date of next meeting: Monday, February 24, 2020

## **F. ADJOURNMENT.**

Moved by Lisa Hanson, seconded by Randall Petrouske to adjourn. Motion carried.

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

## **VERBATIM MINUTES**

- We good? It is good?

- Okay.

- Okay.

- Good evening. Welcome to the Monday, January 27th, 2020 meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission. First item on the agenda is roll call. Tim Gilbert, Chair, present. Sid Bremer, Vice Chair.

- Present.
- Veronica, Alder, Veronica Corpus-Dax.
- Present.
- Commissioner Lisa Hanson.
- Present.
- Commissioner Jacob Miller.
- Present.
- Commissioner Randall Petrouske.
- Present.
- And Commissioner Jerry Wiezbiskie is excused. Item B, approval of the agenda for the January 27th, 2020 meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.
- Move approval.
- Second.
- We have a motion by Commissioner Bremer, a second by Commissioner Hanson to approve the agenda. All in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed? The agenda is approved. Next item, approval of the minutes from the December 16th 2019 meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.
- So moved.
- Second.
- We have a motion by Alder Corpus-Dax, a second by Commissioner Hanson to approve the minutes. All in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed? The minutes are approved.
- Next item, regular business. Item one, consideration of possible action regarding a communication from Alder Chris Wery regarding an appeal by Mike and Karen Alberts, 1801 South Ridge Road, to the designation and approved uses of their parcels I-1423-A and I-1423-A-9 on Ridge Road.
- Hey Mr. Chair, I have to start with an apology. We had a report prepared, but it didn't make it to Civic Clerk for some reason, or it got kicked out. So what you have before you is just a real brief synopsis of that. There's no further action for the Plan Commission to take. So we're recommending that this be received and placed on file.

- So moved.
- Thank you.
- Second.
- With a motion by Commissioner Bremer, a second by Commissioner Hanson to receive and place on file. Any further discussion? Hearing none, the recommendation is to receive and place on file. If there's no objections?
- Yeah, I think you had a motion and second, so just take a vote on it.
- Okay.
- Take a voice vote.
- All those in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed?
- Thank you.
- See, we can still use our voices. That's a good sign .
- Item two, consideration with possible action on a request to authorize a conditional use permit to establish a two family dwelling within an office residential district 1132-1134 East Walnut Street. Submitted by John Tony Salas, property owner.
- Thank you Mr. Chair. This is a request for a conditional use permit in an office residential district at 1132 to 1134 East Walnut Street. And that property is highlighted in red here. South of East Walnut Street between Clay and Roosevelt there is a mixture of land uses here. We've got some single family and two families, it's also adjacent to a multi-family development as well. A comprehensive plan for that area recommends low-density residential. The existing zoning is office residential, so therefore it needs that conditional use permit to operate. And this is an image of the property right here. It was originally built we believe as a two-family use, and has operated for several years as such. However, one of the units had gone vacant for more than a year, and kinda lost it's non-conforming status. The property is under new ownership. Unfortunately the new owners have inherited some issues from the city, inspection issues, that they're currently working through at this point. But they need the conditional use permit to establish that second unit on the, second level of it. And again, basically comprehensive plan county plan recommends low density residential here, so certainly the conditional use permit is in keeping with the wishes of the county plan. So that's very consistent. We did not find affected property owners. We only had one call on this one. We had no objections to this request, so the staff is recommending approval of the request with two conditions. Meeting the basic recommendations of the city code not covered under the conditional use permit. And then those violations that are outstanding would have to be complied with. And again, they're working with our inspectors at this point on those violations.
- I have something to say, well, whenever I get a chance, okay.
- Okay, thank you.
- Yep. Is there any discussion about that?

- Move to open the floor.
- Second.
- We have a motion by Commissioner Petrouske, a second by Commissioner Miller to open the floor for public speaking. All those in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed?
- Does anybody wish to speak on this? Will you please come up to the podium? State your name and address for the record, please.
- My name is Teresa Vanaduveau. What kind of address do you want?
- Just your home address.
- Okay, it's in Suamico.
- Okay, that's fine.
- Okay. 2568 Longtail Beach Lane, Suamico.
- Okay, thank you.
- Okay, because I'm like, what am I gonna do with this, so. I have actually, when he said no one called, I thought the time to speak would be tonight. I have a problem with this because that property has been a problem forever as far as, well obviously apparently with the city, but as far as the clientele that lives there. So, if they need permission to have it go back to a two family, I'm against that. Because it's easier to have a problem with just one tenant next door as opposed to two.
- Okay.
- So I guess that's it. But I mean, I would say police records, I can't even imagine how many times I've had to call regarding that situation. Well, obviously the same with the property that I think the city took over at one point, the green house across the street, same situation, so constant problems, that's why I'm looking to leave it as a single family.
- Thank you.
- I'm assuming then that you are owner of this property or?
- No, I'm not the owner of the property. Apparently there's a new owner of the property.
- I'm that owner.
- I'm not the owner of the property.
- Can you explain your association with it?
- I own the property next door.

- Thank you, I appreciate it.
- That's why, and have for, I don't know, I'm gonna go with 15 to 18 years, I don't know how long, but constant problem. Like I say, I think it's the city that bought the green house across the street. Thank you, because I've had to call the police on that property a lot. So that's--
- Thank you.
- So would anybody else like to speak on this item? Okay, thank you. Motion to close?
- Motion to close the floor.
- Second.
- We have a motion by Commissioner Hanson and a second by Alder Corpus-Dax to close the floor.
- All in favor?
- Aye.
- Okay. And I do have a question for staff.
- Yes.
- Is the property since it lost it's bread and butter clause, and assuming the property is 100% vacant right now?
- No, I believe one unit is occupied by the current owner.
- Okay.
- Now that raises a question for me, and you. So it is still constructed as two units?
- Yes. We believe, that just from it's appearance, it appears to be constructed as a two family. Only one of those units is occupied.
- This talks about compliance with all pending violations. I assume, that, are these violations having to do with the nature of the house? Or what kinds of violations are concerned?
- Yeah, I didn't provide any great detail to the Plan Commission, just that there are violations. There are habitable issues that have to be rectified. They're working again with inspectors on those issues.
- And compliance means satisfaction of those conditions of the violations?
- Right. Ultimately there's a complaint on the property. Working with the inspectors they've been able to close out that complaint and be able to move on and satisfy that condition.
- And Arthur Cardot who is in fact working on that?
- I believe so, yes.
- Thank you.
- Did I glean from what you just said that it's currently owner occupied?

- Yes.
- Do you know when the current owner took possession of the property, approximately?
- I do not. I believe the applicant is here, you can ask them directly.
- Okay. I guess we would have to reopen the floor for that?
- You'd have to, yes.
- I move to reopen the floor.
- Second.
- Okay, we have a motion by Commissioner Petrouske, a second by Commissioner Bremer to reopen the floor. All in favor?
- Aye.
- Opposed?
- Sir, would you come up to the podium please?
- Yes.
- State your name and address for the record?
- Yes.
- My name is John Tony Salas, and I live in 1134 East Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.
- Thank you. And you own the property as well as reside there, is that correct?
- Yes.
- And how long have you owned the property?
- Three months, about.
- Three months?
- Yes.
- And how long have you resided in the property?
- It doesn't help, probably now, it's just I don't speak English very fluent, and I am learning. Somebody here can trust?
- I would be willing to help him.
- Yeah, can somebody help me with this?

- Do you need me to come up, or can I do?
- Yeah, we probably should put a name on him, that we have some record.
- My name is David Rodriguez, 2521 Manitowoc Road.
- Okay.
- Thank you.
- Thank you.
- And you can go up there with him.
- And we don't know each other.
- Even better.
- Can you restate the question that you want answered?
- Sure, how long has he lived in the property?
- So he has lived there all three months since he purchased.
- Okay, have the police been to his property at all since he's taken possession?
- No.
- No.
- That's actually the only question I had.
- So to put it another way, have any of the violations occurred since you have owned and lived at the property?
- No.
- No.
- Gracias.
- So all the violations were pre-existing and you're attempting to rectify them?
- Yeah, he's working on fixing that since he's purchased the property.
- Thank you. Anybody else?
- This is a little bit vague of a question, but do you intend to continue to live in the property, even if we were to approve this?
- His plans are to live downstairs and rent the upstairs, if it's approved.
- Thank you.

- Thank you.
- Thank you. Thank you so much.
- Is there anybody else that wants to speak on this? Ma'am, you've already spoken.
- Right, but then you spoke, and that brings something else up.
- Okay, come on up.
- Do you want me to say my name and that again?
- No, it's not necessary.
- Okay, when you talked about, not you specifically, I don't know names or whatever, but about you believe the property was a two family by the way it looks. I would like to know, has anybody looked in it, and was it a two family? Because as we know, just because it looks like a two family now, does not mean it always was a two family.
- The city assessor has it as a two family use, I think. Looking at the image, I think the side by side duplex was a lower and an upper address. I have not been in the structure, inspectors have been in there, so it was formerly used as a two family use. Their intent here is to reestablish one of those units.
- Okay, I was just pulling up the notes from our CLIPS, the system, and the inspectors have been in it, and it is a two unit. There is a lower and an upper.
- Okay.
- So our inspectors have been through and noted that in terms of the outstanding orders, and they have to do with some of the habitability and also the COP is noted on here for having that second unit right there. So yes, it is a two unit.
- Okay.
- Thanks.
- Thank you. Thanks.
- Can I say something?
- Yes.
- I need to stand up?
- He says that when he filed for the loan to get the property it was listed as a
- Multi-home.
- Multi-home property and he had to go through some classes, I think.
- And there's separate bills for the electric and the water, go to two different ones.

- So there were liens on the property and that he's working on those, and I think some of the utilities were cut off.
- So he's just saying that he would like it to remain as a multi-home, because that was how it was listed, and that is how he purchased.
- Thank you.
- Thank you.
- And thank you Mr. Rodriguez.
- You're welcome.
- And so anybody else that wants to speak on this? Okay, thank you.
- Move to close the floor and return to normal order of business.
- We have a motion by Commissioner Petrouske, a second by Commissioner Hanson to close the floor, and return to regular order of business. All in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed? Okay.
- I mean, as far as the grandfathering laws, it's my understanding it was at one point a single family, some time ago, and it got switched to a two family, that's why it's losing?
- We didn't do the research that far back. It might be something for that as well. Again, just from the appearance of the structure and our inspectors being in there, they called it two family. It's non-conforming because it doesn't meet the zoning district that it's in. We know that one of those units was vacant for more than a year, maybe well over a year. So that's why it's kinda triggered this process. So that's why it's back before you.
- Well, and I think, and I don't know if this is something that realtors aren't aware of, but nobody ever says anything to clients when they see a unit as vacant, that, "Oh, by the way, you're going to have to go through city to get that back so that you can have that conditional use permit." And I know too, that there's no way unless you call the city directly, to know whether a house is in violation, because I've bought two properties that were in violation. One I found out two weeks after we closed, the other one because I had that experience I was able to call ahead of time and it was before. But there's like no fail-safe, so people who are buying these properties are getting stuck with these violations not knowing that they're in violation, and then not knowing that they can't use it as a two family.
- Agreed.
- Right.
- Yeah, I wish they would call us. We can give them all the information we could about the property. That's public of course.
- I'm not hearing any concerns about the structure itself and it's appropriateness either in location or in construction as a two family structure, so I move agreement with the staff's recommendation that we approve this request.

- Second.

- Yeah, I also because it apparently has been a two family in the past, and they're just looking to reestablish that, and also the fact that the owner's gonna be on-site, occupying that, it's a huge advantage. So I also am going to support this recommendation. I guess that was a motion to that.

- That was a motion, did we get a second?

- I did.

- We did get that?

- Yes, good.

- Okay, so we have a motion and a second to approve the recommendation. Motion was made by Commissioner Bremer, second by Commissioner Hanson. Is there any further discussions? Hearing none, I believe I can ask you to cast your vote. Thank you. And this will go over before City Council on February 4th, I believe.

- Correct.

- Next Tuesday.

- Next Tuesday. Okay, next item on the agenda is consideration with possible action on a request to create a planned unit development regulating signage at 1601-1603 North Quincy Street, submitted by Matt Szymanski, Green Bay Packaging.

- Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is a request for a planned unit development for signage. And the reason for the request is really to allow wall signage that's in excess of our code allowances, and also at a location not permitted by code. Typically these would go through the Board of Appeals for size, however the Board of Appeals does not have the authority to grant a variance on location. So the way around that, or the avenue to address it is using the planned unit development. Additionally, there may be future planned unit developments coming for this property as well. I'm gonna get into a little bit of an explanation, so this is the way it started. So anyway, this is the property itself. It's Green Bay Packaging at 1601-1603 North Quincy, and as you've probably been reading about in the paper, a major expansion to an existing paper mill. We have the Fox River there on the west, Quincy is on the east. To the north is generally Highway I-43, to the south is the paper mills, and you get down towards downtown and the river wraps around. This is the future land use plan. You can see that the gray, the darker gray signifies a general industrial district, kinda following with this, what I like to call North Industrial Corridor. And then you see the housing kinda spilling off to the side. And the zoning also reflects that same thing. The hash-marked gray, gray and white is general industrial, then it goes to light industrial and back into the housing. Our comprehensive plan recommends industrial for this area. You know, this is in keeping with the comprehensive plan. The signage really doesn't affect the land use, so it's almost not applicable. And I would kinda get to what's going on here. So in late 2018 Green Bay Packaging made the determination to do an expansion and a rehab on their existing paper mill in the city and kind of an intensive rehab of the 72 year old paper mill. So, it's existing, you can kinda see circled up on the top the existing facility's about 160,000 square feet, and what's in the colored portion is the expansion area which has a footprint of about 480 and some change square feet, but it's multiple stories so it's really about 700, almost 800,000 square feet of an expansion. And then the two images down on the bottom kinda show what that facility would look like from the southeast and from the northwest. So, the increase in size of the facility is about 177%. And just saying all that to put into context with the request. So, as the expansion plans all came into place, the petitioners or the property owners, business owners determined they really wanted some visibility from I-43. I-43, I'll go back, this shot, so I-43 is obviously the highway to the north, it's gonna be the

remaining connection to the paper mill in this area. From the west they would get off on Webster and go down, probably Radisson down to Quincy. And so they can plan this together to do a signage package. And the main thing was on the north side of the building which faces the highway. And this is the north side, the north of the building. So you can see it's quite large. The facade itself is about 158,000 square feet. Let me see if I have another one. So the signage they wanted to put on is sort of that Green Bay Packaging with the logo. At night it would be back lit. And that elevation is the actual size of the sign that's being proposed on the structure itself. The picture on the top is a view of the site, and that's the existing mill there from I-43, so there would be a larger structure there, but I kinda wanted to give you perspective. So their request is for a sign, a wall sign on the north facade that's a little over 5,000 square feet in area. Which sounds at first flush to be gigantic. Our sign code allows up to 200 square feet per sign, and 400 for the whole site. And also we only allow signage facades that front a right of way. So again, as I go back, the only right of way that the facility fronts is Quincy. Considerable amount of frontage, about 500 feet of frontage. But to the north is a treatment plant for one of the other paper mills. And that's about 850 feet from the highway itself. So, if you followed our regulations at 200 square feet maximum for that facade, that would be .12% of the facade area. Petitioners felt and staff did agree that that would be probably ineffectual to be visible from that vantage point which again, is a viable vantage point being that it is an access way. At 5,200 square feet, it's 5,280 square feet, it is 3.3% of that facade area, which is pretty low. So this is kind of a unique situation. The building is very, very large, not very visible from where it needs to be visible from. And so staff is supporting this planned unit development. It only addresses the signage on the building facades. Allows up to 5% of any facade. So the north and south facades are gonna be about 160,000 square feet. I think the east and west are gonna be between 20 and 30,000 square feet. One faces the river, obviously, one faces Quincy. So we don't feel that it's out of place, that it will be obtrusive or have a negative impact on the industrial area or the city as a whole. We are recommending approval, subject to the planned unit development that you have in your packet. And I guess the only other point that I would make is any of the ground signage, ground signage would follow the regular general industrial district. So you won't see any giant pole signs or anything like that. This is only for the wall signage. And with that we are recommending it.

- Thank you. Yes.

- Thank you very much, David. The image there, particularly the north elevation image makes very clear how nicely that sign fits into the shape of the building. My only concern is with precedent. Are we setting precedent of the 5% that would apply to other buildings as well? Is that reason for concern?

- Well 5% of any building facade is pretty small. So even if that was precedent setting, the Director can comment on that, I think it would be very low impact.

- Okay.

- So we did something somewhat similar for the East County Cub Foods that was going through the process remember the signage there. And really our goal was to look at what's the right portion of signage on the facade. And here, obviously right, by going by a real number it just is minuscule in terms of there's no impact. So what we looked at is the East Town Cub Foods we looked at, that was a commercial building, those facades were limited to 10 to 15% of the facade. And then in here we looked up and said, right, started crunching the numbers and saying look, even at down to 5%, it's gonna be still a pretty big number, and it does fit within those parameters. So I think in terms of that threshold, I mean, I guess I'd love to see another building this side sitting, right, from here, but in terms of the size and scale, that 5% is a very low threshold in terms of we've talked, I think one of our goals is to be rehab the sign code as a whole in terms of just having signs deemed appropriate to buildings at which they're located. And sometimes that maximum square footage doesn't always accomplish that. And so to have it proportional. And facades get bigger, okay, signs could be bigger, because they're generally more regional buildings in nature. So it's one of those things that wouldn't work out longterm. Didn't feel we wanted to hold up this particular project, and so that's why we went with I think the most conservative option we had in terms of that 5% threshold.

- Well thank you, thank you both.
- Thank you. Any further discussion?
- The building's half built now, isn't it? Or in the process?
- It's in the process of being built, yep.
- We always count how many cranes there are, usually seven to nine when we go over the bridge.
- Yeah, it's pretty impressive. But the sign takes a lot of lag time. That size of sign takes awhile to order and process and get delivery here.
- Yeah, if you would like to see kind of an example of what they're doing this building, they do have a similar type sign on the Fox plant across the street. So you can see just kind of the channel lettering and the back lighting on it, so you'll get a good example of what they're doing. And again, we're really pleased with that's what they're offering here as well.
- Thank you.
- Is anybody present that would like to speak on this item? Okay, thank you. Is there any further discussion?
- Move to approve.
- Second.
- We have a motion to approve by Commissioner Hanson, a second by Alder Corpus-Dax. Approved? Yes, sir.
- No discussion, just a comment. I will be recusing myself from this vote, since my employer does business with .
- Okay, thank you.
- Ooh, it's gonna start Friday regent's--
- No, that's gonna be in question too.
- They unanimously approved the former statement.
- Okay, thank you. Next item, consideration with possible action on a request to close and vacate portions of Acme Street and Lawrence Street, submitted by Bob Mach, Mach IV Engineering.
- Thank you. A little background on this, we've seen this before a few times. This is University Avenue and Henry. This is where Green Bay Dressed Beef is. So, in I think 2015 went through with the amendment for the properties along Henry, and now they're coming through with an expansion as to their plans in this area. So Paul will be coming through with I think a PUD or a rezoning,
- Mm-hmm, a PUD, yeah.
- At our next meeting. But they're starting some of the infrastructure stuff now. So there are a lot of conditions on this because there are a lot of moving pieces with the site plan that they've submitted. But I'm hoping that I can get through all this without missing something. So what they're proposing is a partial closure

and a partial vacation for both Acme which is here and Lawrence which is here. So their facility is down here at this parcel. So I'm gonna start over here with Acme Street. So the closure area impacts a couple different parcels. Everything that's outlined the green is what they own. So we don't have to worry about the impact there, because it's their property, they'll have access. Anything that's outlined in pink is something that is owned currently by another person. So this parcel here is addressed and has access off the University but it also has an access point off of this closure area at Acme. So we have a condition that they have to have access as part of that maintenance agreement that we're gonna have for that. I don't know that this is as big of an issue considering that they do most of their access off of University, but because it exists now we want them to be able to maintain that. And then for the vacation area, that's completely surrounded by their property, so that would be no problem. That right of way would be removed and then this would just become part of the parcel here. So Acme's a little bit more simple. But it comes over to Lawrence, the closure area has another parcel that's affected. Again, access and addressing is off of the University so this would just be part of the agreement that they have to have an access agreement with them. This parcel is owned by American Foods Group. This parcel here is in both the closure and the vacation area currently. What they're proposing is that they either have or are purchasing this property, and then they're gonna extend this property line and do some sort of a property swap with one of the owners up here. So that way they can have this straight property line across to this closure area. But right now, I mean, when I did the staff report, this was still owned by somebody else. So with the assumption that that may not change, we have conditions about both portions of this. But the closure would still be able to go through if they don't have that property proof by the time of the final reading at Council, but the vacation would not be allowed. Same with this parcel here. This was owned by somebody else, I believe that they're in the process of purchasing it, but if that doesn't go through, then we would deny this portion for vacation, because we'd be denying access to this parcel. So I think all five of my conditions are either a maintenance agreement or some sort of access agreement for the vacations and the closures, due to these parcels not being owned by Green Bay Dressed Beef. From what I understand and the speak to this is these parcels are both supposed to be picked up by the time this gets finalized, and then in that case this won't matter at all. We would just have to get the access in the closure agreements for the two large parcels on University. With that, there is a list from our Department of Public Works that they sent over Friday afternoon. It's long, and most of it details the types of utilities that we already have in place there that they want protections over that, and also some things with the stormwater over in this area that they've been working through as part of their site plan. I know that the applicant has some issues with number five on the Lawrence list for some stormwater easement, or I think it's storm. But our Department of Public Works is aware of that, those two can work through that issue together. I'm still gonna support our Department of Public Works with that condition going through at this level, and then they'll have over 40 days to figure this out before it goes to our City Council for approval. So they have plenty of time through our site plan process to work through that condition so we can change that at Council if they come to a different agreement on the width of that. Aside from that, I think I got it all. There was a lot of new pieces with the closure and the vacation in the same application, but this should get them set up to go through that process with Paul to zoning and then finally through site plan to do the expansion of this facility. So with that, recommending approval. And these were late conditions that were added which were all the Department of Public Works ones, and then AT&T said this morning that they need easements granted for their facilities as well, which should be easy enough to do. So a lot of utility information and access information.

- Thank you. Any discussions?
- My hat's off to Stephanie for that. Because I really wrestled with the report.
- Yeah, it's a lot of information, a lot of numbers to all the parcels, are of course parcel numbered the same.
- Of course there's both the closure and the vacation, okay, thank you.
- The separate legal documents to get it done. We can do this.
- And those two pink properties, they don't have any issue with that? I don't want La Rosa going anywhere.

- I haven't heard, but to be fair I was out with the flu most of last week so I haven't go through all of my voicemails yet so, if there is I'll let you know. But both of these larger parcels that are addressed and accessed off of University as well, but either way they would be protected because the closure just stops it from public traffic, but it functions the exact same way as a road does. They can't do anything to that, they just have, usually they would take care of the maintenance of that at that point of the closure. The closure doesn't actually affect the other parcels necessarily, we just have to make sure that access is legally obtained in our closure agreement. So it's just the vacation ones that we're more concerned with because that actually takes away our right of way area. So the closures are easier, so these larger parcels are not impacted.

- Okay, thank you.

- Motion to open the floor. I think there's some people here that want to speak.

- Does anybody wish to speak?

- Second.

- We have a motion by Alder Corpus-Dax second by Commissioner Hanson to open the floor for the discussion. Okay, all those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed. Okay, can you come up and say your name again for the record?

- David Rodriguez, 2521 Manitowoc Road. I'm actually here with my father who is the owner of the pink parcel over here.

- The pink parcel, yes.

- So that's actually El Tapatio bakery, grocery, and restaurant. And I will just kinda correct one of the things you said. Actually most of our customers access our business through here, not through University. So it is actually quite primordial imperative that that remains open for our business. I would say like 80% of our traffic does flow through there. So any closure to that would probably create a huge bottleneck, probably a safety issue because you really can't exit and enter at the same time especially with all the snow build-up in the winter. Like right now I was just here, I was pulling in, I couldn't pull in without basically taking up the entire driveway, and which wouldn't allow somebody to pull out, which would be less than ideal, on a business day.

- Furthermore, we get deliveries that also come in and they can't swing in through University. They need to come down Acme, and then they back in a lot of times. So again, anything that would happen would really hamper our business to have it not be able to be accessed by delivery drivers and obviously customers. So we just wanted to make note of that, because that actually is very, very, very important to us.

- Stephanie, could you again explain the closure?

- Sure, with the closure, it closes mostly public traffic meaning that it's not a through street anymore. Because right now people can go into that culture-de-sac and hang out if they want to. So with the vacation they typically close the first half so that way there's less traffic going into that private area. But with the access agreement you can detail that it's for customer and delivery, and or whatever you want it to say we can have as a condition. So we can amend that here, or if you just want to work through that privately, that's between us. But to do the closure, it does close it to typically public traffic.

- But not like customers that would be coming in? And they wouldn't take ownership right of that area then?

- No, it stays a public right of way. The only thing that usually changes is that we on the city side then talk to the applicant about how they maintain it, snow plowing, that kind of stuff. That's what the closure request does is just brings less traffic to that area.

- And to follow up, they are required to maintain it in case of snow conditions for instance.

- Yes, so once the street is closed, either we still maintain it, or they will. That's determined in that closure agreement that we have conditioned here. And you can be, we will make you a part of those conversations as well. But they have to get mailed out to everyone who is adjacent to them.

- Okay, thank you.

- Okay. Does anybody else want to speak?

- Hello. Bob Mach, Mach IV Engineering, 2260 Salscheider Ct. I'm here on behalf of the applicant. We have Ryan from American Foods as well. We just wanted to touch on a couple things that Stephanie said. These two parcels were under properties, those agreed will be transferring this week to Green Bay Dressed Beef, and then that switch with Thompson will be acquiring everything on both sides north of where that line is. So by the time it gets to Council that should all be taken care of. The intent on the areas that are going to be closed, those are gonna stay exactly as they are. The Acme Street side, eventually they may do something with that cul-de-sac, and move maybe, you know where the guard location is on the south end of that cul-de-sac, that might move up to the north a little bit just to kinda square some of that fence off. But the rest of that is all going to stay the same. On the Lawrence Street side, that area south of the line won't become part of their campus as well. Stephanie mentioned the exception that I was going to ask for on the storm sewer. That was the number five off Lawrence Street. City had requested a 40 foot wide swath through there and city construction of that, and I guess I would like to, what we would prefer is a 25 foot wide, because one of the things that came up in our neighborhood meetings that we've had over the last couple days is that storm sewer that they're talking about, going to collect the storm sewer off of Lawrence and Acme, bring it through the property and connect to a location down on Henry that they had installed year ago with this intent. But one of the conditions that came up from our neighborhood meeting is we're gonna have a fairly significant wall and barrier here to separate the new facility from the neighbors across the street. So we're not gonna have the 40 feet to put that in. We'll have more like 25 which for a storm sewer should be more than enough. Then the other part is we'd like to have that constructed by our on-site contractor while they're out there, just for coordination with everything else that's going to be going on on the facility. So if we can have that, maybe that number five is something that we work out with Public Works as part of the site plan, I would certainly appreciate that so we're not bound to that 40 feet. But we do intend on having that storm sewer through there as we had discussed and proposed with Public Works.

- Thank you. Any questions? Thank you.

- Thanks.

- So then, I would ask Stephanie, does that sound okay?

- I'm fine with that.

- Good, glad to hear it.

- Only because I think that we're so early on that to have this condition as part of the vacation request, I'm not sure I think it can be done at second plan review.

- Okay.

- If it's still, maybe just remove number five as a condition and just say that it needs to be addressed at site plan so that way they have more time to work out that detail. But I don't think that it needs to be tied to the vacation. So if you guys are comfortable removing it that's okay, as long as it's determined at site plan review.
- Approve these items minus number five of the Lawrence Street part.
- I would be okay with that.
- Cool.
- Maybe with the addition of stating that this will be determined before site plan.
- Okay.
- I think that should cover all of our bases. All 17 of our condition bases.
- Easy.
- Yeah. This is not the most conditions I've had, either. had way more, so.
- Motion to close the floor?
- Second.
- Okay, we have a motion to close the floor by Commissioner Hanson, and second by Alder Corpus-Dax. All in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed.
- Then I would like to move the approval of this with the substitution of Stephanie's language for number five on the conditions.
- Second.
- We have a motion by Commissioner Bremer, and a second by Commissioner Hanson to approve the recommendation with the importance added, stated condition amendment. Any further discussion? Yes, Commissioner Miller?
- Same as last time I will be abstaining due to employer relationship with the applicant.
- Thank you.
- You're related to everybody!
- connections.
- Any further discussion? Okay, hearing none, the Chair would ask that you cast your votes.
- Did you get it?

- Oh, there it is.

- What are you voting?

- Yes.

- I go for yes.

- All right.

- There you go.

- Unanimously approved .

- That's great. And the recommendation has been approved. Thank you. Next item, consideration and possible action on a request of the Zoning Administrator to review the site plan and landscape plan for the expanded Kwik Trip parcel located at 3525 Humboldt Road.

- Okay Mr. Chair, this is the northeast corner of Humboldt Road and North Huron Rd. This is the site of Kwik Trip. This is Huron running north and south and Humboldt Road on the north and this side of town. So this Kwik Trip is under construction at this point. Kwik Trip acquired some property last year from the property owner to the north, and they went before the Plan Commission to do a PUD amendment last year, and that's all be completed. So now this is kinda like a second phase to the development. This is in progress and they're gonna add this drive to the north. And what that does is it gets them past the median here. This is not mountable, I'll get them to pass that north of that median. So based on the original ordinance for Eaton Heights, we'd like to bring these back to the Plan Commission just for you to see and review. So this is the site plan along with some of the landscaping that's going on. There is low density residential development here, and then a condominium development to the north. So there's quite a bit of transition here, with a six foot high impervious fence, quite a bit of landscaping going on to the north and down in this east side here. This is a different perspective, kind of twisted a little bit. In here is the intersection of Humboldt and Huron just showing that expanded drive area. That'll accommodate larger vehicles as well, so lots of vehicles to come through there. So, we are recommending approval of this request, and we just need concurrence from the Plan Commission so we can proceed with our site plan review.

- Thank you. Any questions?

- I just need to ask Paul, are you content with the plans for the planting? We were not provided a schedule of plants, so there was no way for me to tell what they have in mind, but I presume that the larger pieces are trees, and the others are shrubs?

- Correct, right.

- And it's a good, I'm asking you, is it a good mix as far as season and that kind of thing?

- I believe so. I'm not a landscape architect, but I think they're providing quite a bit of density here.

- Yeah, but you've seen a lot of these things over time.

- And Kwik Trip is very good at what they do as far as their service business but also their landscaping and the grounds. So I'm very confident in what they've proposed here, yes.

- Thank you.

- Yes.
- How did this differ from the last time we looked at it? We were pushing that entry to the north, right?
- Right. I think you saw a site plan last year at some point but it was probably just from here down. And then they acquired this piece. So this is really the only change. It's just paved inside of any sort of building exposure.
- Mm-hmm. And Alderman.
- What street does that entrance to the north connect to?
- This one here? To Huron.
- Huron, yeah.
- Okay.
- I believe they had a drive here originally, but the idea of, with acquiring this property is they can move that drive further north to get past the median. There's a non-mountable median.
- Because Celebration Church is right across.
- Across the street, yeah.
- So then, and where's the apartment complex?
- Well there's a condominium development that the Bunker family is doing up here. And there are single family homes around the bend here.
- Right, I've heard from many of them. Weeping and gnashing of teeth. They really are upset. But, what can you do? That's it, that's how it's zoned.
- This is the final step in the process so,
- That's how it's zoned. Right, so at least they're doing a lot of landscaping which is good.
- This doesn't have to go to Council, it's just a plain Commission review and concurrence from them.
- And that's fine. I'm just here looking at it for my people.
- Sure.
- Thank you.
- And if I recall, being able to do a lot of landscaping as a Bunker was one of the reasons for moving it further north in that large chunk like that so they could deal both with the drive-through needs and also with the bunkering.
- Okay, thanks.
- Thank you. Is there anybody else that wishes to speak on this? Okay, thank you.

- I would move to approve with the comment that it wouldn't be a Plan Commission meeting if we didn't have a Kwik Trip question.

- Second.

- We have a motion by Commissioner Petrouske, a second by Alder Corpus-Dax to approve the recommendation. Any further discussion? Hearing none, the Chair would ask that you cast your vote.

- All right, unanimously approved.

- Thank you. Next item. Item six, discussion with possible action on hosting Public Hearings at Plan Commission meetings.

- All right, so if you remember our discussion from a couple years back about the conditional use permits. So legislation went through the state, required that conditional use permits to have a public hearing. Public hearings require a Class Two notice, so that is being published in the paper two times, seven days prior to the public hearing. So, when that came out it took our conditional use permit process and extended it for about two to four weeks. For a lot of business owners, time is money. Became kind of a big issue for them. So we started looking at it from a staff standpoint and thought, "How can we shave this down?" State statutes allow the common council to delegate public hearings. Can either be for conditional use permits also for re-zonings and text amendments. They have to take place somewhere, but the council can delegate that to the Plan Commission, or themselves. So the first thought was, "Yes, the conditional use permits, perfect. "We can trim that off a little bit, "we can get in advance of it here at the Plan Commission." You can't publish the notices prior to Plan Commission discussing them. So it's gotta go to Plan Commission then to readings at council. But when we also looked at it we thought, "Well, geez, a lot of advantages to talking "with attorney's offices, a lot of advantage to "holding the public hearings here at the Plan Commission." And just some real easy ones, you get a staff presentation, there's generally more staff here than just the directors that you get at the council level. The agendas are smaller. The second thing is that the Plan Commission by policy notifies nearby property owners, either 200 or 400 feet away, individually. So not only would the public hearing gets published in our paper, but people are getting individual notices. And then the third major benefit is that the developers can hear the public comments, can also hear the Plan Commission discussion, take those to heart, and made adjustments before it gets to the decision making body of the council. So a lot of the concerns that may come up at a public hearing at council which can't be addressed, again, sometimes it kicks back to the Plan Commission, sometimes it's tabled. They would have the ability to address some of those before it got to council. Obviously council's gonna hear what any of those comments are, they're gonna be in the minutes, any Alder person can attend. So those are really kind of the major benefits of holding it here first. And I just threw these two timeframes up to show you the difference for a conditional use permit. The other thing that kinda threw a wrench into this is that the council changed the schedule this year. So their meetings went not quite to half, but shrunk down considerably. So that even extended the two to four weeks in some cases you know, two months. So that becomes real problematic for some people. But this is just for a conditional use permit. The timeline for re-zones or text amendments is exactly the same because an ordinance has to have two readings at council. A conditional use permit is a resolution, it just needs to go to council once. So, on the left is our current process, and if you kinda follow it all down it's got all the little steps in it and neighborhood meeting, Plan Commission meeting, you'll see that publish the public notice comes after the Plan Commission and so if you applied on February 3rd, you wouldn't get your CUP approved until April 1st. With the change in the process, so you'll notice now the publishing starts after the application comes in. Sometimes there's a neighborhood meeting, sometimes there's not, but it happens before we send out the letters. As the first entry we would send out the letters then you'd get a second entry after that into the paper. Then it would go to the Plan Commission, and then it can just go right to two Council meetings. So in this example I just used the next available application date. You're shaving almost a month off of the approval process, or the review process. So again, staff looked at that, I mean we're always trying to be more efficient, time is money for a developer. Sometimes time is more money than money. And so in our minds, this was a way to really kinda help with that CUP. But then we also felt that it was wise to just do all the zone changes and the text amendments as well at

the same time. So we are recommending that Plan Commission recommend to Council to shift the public hearings for those three items to the Plan Commission instead of Council. I don't have any pictures. But there is a resolution in your packet. And so we would be recommending approval of the policy change subject to the resolution, I guess.

- I wanted to add quickly that we would the street vacations and amendments would still keep the public hearings at City Council because by state statute and our code that's what's required. So everything else that would have a public hearing through Plan Commission would be here except for those two items.

- All right. Comprehensive plan amendment has a public hearing here and again at Council. So yeah these would really be the only three that could really, that could happen.

- So obviously then we would have, as a result we're gonna have more public hearings here.

- You would, yes.

- Yes, I'm sure, I'm sure. And we're kind of internal discussions right now. If we want those public hearings to be at the top of the agenda or the bottom of the agenda. There's kind of advantages both ways. The bottom of the agenda, the constituents hear the decisions and also hear your recommendations. So if there's conditions places on anything, they would be able to hear that before they gave their public testimony. If it's at the beginning, you hear their public testimony, and it might affect your decision. However, Plan Commission almost always opens the floor for discussion. So it's not the official, you know, you read the official public hearing, but you essentially are taking public comment anyway. So we're kind of thinking about where that would fall on the agenda, and I don't think it's decided yet.

- Would staff have the ability to kind of gauge. In case by case, it will be better to have it before or after?

- We could, I think we'd have the ability to adjust the, I mean, you approve the agenda at the beginning of the meeting, so, it might shift.

- So in some cases it might be better to do it before, and some cases it might be better to do it after. Depending on the situation, maybe.

- Potentially, yeah. And it's important to point out too, that if the Council wants to pull the item from their agenda for discussion, they can do it at the Council level, and even though the public hearing would happen here, the Council is the only authority to approve any of those changes. So they're not losing any of their legislative power, they're just really shifting that hearing time.

- If we had public hearing at the end, but then we have those same agenda items in the agenda, then we'd be opening the floor, would we be doing?

- We'd essentially be doing the same thing except one is official. There is not.

- I feel like the other way though isn't any better, because we've had public hearings in the beginning and so people talk, and then we're like, "Okay, well, "we'll get to the agenda item later." So it's kind of, can't really decide which is better.

- The public talks not knowing, not realizing what we'll be dealing with that later on.

- Right, because we just--

- By doing it first, that may eliminate a lot of the questions or concerns.

- And the big difference is during your discussion there can be back and forth. In public hearing you're just taking testimony.

- So yeah, I guess I could see the benefit in having it after. Because if the people talk during and asked questions and we asked questions.

- And you might have specific conditions. So you might say, "Yeah, well this conditional use, "we're recommending approval, "but it has to shut down at 10 o'clock." And somebody at the public hearing at that point might say, "Well I don't have a problem "with this done at 10." But if you have it before, they don't know that that condition is placed.

- Right.

- So they would be against it during the public hearing--

- It's almost less work. If they put it at 10, right? It's already done.

- The big thing I think is it's much more transparent and it's much more open, and the people that are here for the hearing get more notification, and they know what's going on. Council is also very official, right? And I think a lot of people when they do a hearing at the Council, may feel intimidated and it's just such a big agenda that it sometimes gets lost in the folds.

- Play the devil's advocate for a moment. Putting it afterward I think is gonna create a lot of confusion when we go to open the floor. The people are thinking they're coming here to be heard on a public hearing, and that we're gonna open the floor and ask if anyone wants to talk about this, it's gonna open the flood gates for the public hearing to be during the item itself.

- Kind of.

- We kinda do that now anyway.

- I know we do that now.

- Kinda have it now, yes. We do a public hearing already, just not--

- Public hearing beforehand, they know it's already been done.

- Right, they've already said their piece, then they can hear ideas about it. And then if there's a clarification or something like that, or a follow-up question during the open floor portion. Whereas it's a little confusing if you're not part of city machinations to have the board decide something and then you get to be heard on it.

- Right.

- Because I don't think that like your average citizen comprehends that we're not the final word on this, and we're just kind of making decisions about them and then asking for their input about the decision we've already made.

- Right. And the only thing we'd have to do, we could make it very clear that the public hearing goes to Council and, but either way, I mean, again, we're still kind of talking about that with the attorneys and everything on which would be the best way.

- It does seem to me that there are two advantages to the public. And one is the chance for kind of back and forth that occurs here that could resolve a lot of things that otherwise can't get resolved. And then secondly

with the public hearing at the end, which I think for exactly the reason you're talking about Randy, needs to be introduced in a way that says, now that you have heard what we are recommending given the earlier comments, you still have an opportunity to express either your support for or your objection to any aspect of that decision. So it gives them another crack.

- And that's all forwarded to the Council.

- It's still going before City Council.

- Yes, exactly, but I think it would require explanation. Because otherwise it sounds like exactly what you're saying. We've made our decision, now if you have anything to say, go ahead, we're not going to do anything about it, right?

- Oh sorry, go ahead. The current process where we had the public hearing at the beginning, it just feels like, "Okay, thanks," and it feels strange. Like it feels very open-ended and like, "Okay well we don't have any, "well we'll get to that I guess, you know?"

- We'll be talking about it later.

- We'll talk about it later.

- We also don't have the staff support.

- Right, we don't have that information ahead of time.

- Occasionally we have requested that before we open it up for the public hearing, but that's always been problematic it seems to me.

- I think sometimes we give a very brief description of what the project is, but not get into the minutia of it.

- In any event, I think moving the public hearings to Plan Commission meetings makes a lot of sense. Whether we ultimately decide it's better to have it before or after the agenda item, I think moving it to the day of the Plan Commission. You know, I would love to be able to save business owners weeks of process.

- Right, and with the schedule now it could be several months.

- Yeah, it just makes sense on many levels.

- How much latitude do we have as far as how the agenda process works? So for example, could we structure it if we have an agenda item that also has a public hearing attached that we could have the staff presentation first with some initial back and forth with the board, then have the public hearing, and then take the vote? That way it's kind of the best of both worlds. In other words, the people are here, they get to hear the presentation, then we can hear from them, and then make our decision and vote?

- I'm not sure. I'd have to check with the attorneys. That seems at that point to get convoluted because you're kinda doing that right now. So just when you open the floor you're taking public comment, right? But it's an actual official statute required item. That's why you do your spiel every time we have one.

- Sure.

- Not that it's a spiel but you know.

- Cheat sheet.

- It is.

- Right.

- Right.

- And there's some place that structure it they'll do instead of having, like right now at Council right now the public hearings are at the beginning of the meeting and we go through and work the agenda. It can go through instructions. You have like the public hearing as an item and then you take it up right after it. So they're paired, going through, but I think, we'd have to talk to the attorney a little bit, it is important to keep it statutorily as a separate item, because you're not required to open the floor. So when you're debating, if there's interested parties, you do not have to open it to interested parties for dispute.

- Which is why the statutes say you have to do a public hearing for these items because not everywhere else is the floor open.

- So that's why it's good to keep it separate just so you know there's an item on there like I can speak, and I know what items I can speak on.

- But they could be paired like that even if there were two items that required a public hearing in a single meeting. I would very much support that. That has bothered me when we've had the public hearings before. Item one, item two, and then you go into the whole thing and you go back to item one and item two and by time we get to item two I'm baffled.

- Which one are you talking about?

- Yeah, you could have the item and then the public hearing right after it.

- Yeah, just so. Or visa versa.

- Or visa versa.

- After, as Randy suggested, the staff reported questions.

- And then it's no reason you couldn't provide a high level staff report as part of that public hearing piece. Offer them up during that time so at least then the public can know. But I think you still have to keep that as a separate agenda item.

- Sure.

- But yeah, the big thing is the transparency and the time, .

- I do have one other question. I think the savings in time is superb for all kinds of reasons, except of course our time.

- Yeah, hearings can go long.

- And I do think this gives the public both more transparency and more opportunity to express their concerns. But do they have an opportunity at all then in City Council to say anything?

- They could request from their elected official to have like it pulled and discussed.

- Again, it's the same. Council's not required when the item comes up. I don't know and I can ask our Alder if there's ever been a time an interested party's ever been denied a chance to speak.
- Not that I'm aware of.
- Not that I remember either.
- My five years we've always--
- Would be really hard to do.
- They don't have to, but it would be, yeah, very very surprised.
- So that does happen, it happens of course, it's not unusual for that to happen?
- Correct and usually, I mean Alders respect each other and if one wants to open the floor, they open the floor.
- That was my only concern. I couldn't remember the protocol at the other place. Veronica's other home.
- So I guess with all that being said I move to approve the proposal.
- And I would second.
- Okay, we have a motion by Commissioner Petrouske, a second by Commissioner Bremer to approve the recommendation. Is there any further discussion?
- David, would that previous screen, could you add that to the packet?
- Sure.
- That comparison, because I think that would be good for Alders to see what kind of time.
- Yes, yes, yes.
- Yeah, it's significant for the conditional uses. And like I said, I didn't go through the whole year's calendar, but this was just, I mean, it'd be the next one and yeah, you can see that.
- Okay, is there any further discussion?
- Maybe just one comment. I agree with everything everybody said, and I think that one thing that makes me feel better is we can always amend the agenda if we notice, get the feel that something needs to be changed on it. So I think it might take a couple tries for us to get exactly down, but I think overall it's a good idea. And if we need to mix things up we can do that.
- Good point.
- I agree.
- Okay, the Chair would then ask that you cast your vote. Or not.
- Right.

- All right, unanimously approved.
- Thank you. And then item seven, discussion with possible action on the 2020 Green Bay Plan Commission meeting schedule.
- We made a calendar. So we used this last year just more internally so we knew what kind of timeline we could tell people who came in for applications. But now with the Council changing their meetings we've had to change when our meetings are which is gonna be a little more inconvenient I would think, since it's not every other Monday, which you can see from this. We do have one that it falls on a Tuesday because of Memorial Day, so you might want to put that in your calendar ahead of time, make sure that you remember. But we have created this to show the format of when it will report out to City Council, and then the plethora of applications that we approve up top with how many readings it has, what kind of notification process it is. We also have an internal one that has all of our staff's mailing dates for our public hearings and for our neighborhood mailings. So this basically corresponds that we will meet the Monday prior to a City Council meeting so that we report out directly to that next Tuesday. So it would be the fastest way to get an application approved as one reading. And then if it has two, we have the second Council date there. And they have one Wednesday meeting, but most of theirs fall on Tuesdays.
- We currently meet the Monday after the Council, so we're pulling it forward to in front because of that same situation, we have less Council meetings to deal with.
- But it's also the Monday's a week prior to the City Council meeting and the language here suggests it would be the day before. And I found that a little bit confusing in that second, the red outlined space.
- To be prior.
- Oh, okay.
- Mondays a week prior to the City Council meeting, or the week prior. And similarly, and this is just for our use, right?
- The public has access to this, I don't know who's gonna use it, but--
- We never know.
- Yeah.
- The first column however, then, should say three Mondays prior to
- Plan Commission meeting.
- Yeah, Plan Commission meeting, yeah, exactly.
- Okay, we can make those adjustments.
- The goal with this is to be able to working with developers and those who might be on a timeline, I need to be in the ground by September 1st. So then when do I need to have things lined up? When do I need to actually have things in? Which means, all right, what do I need to actually talk with staff, and just for somebody to backtrack and get themselves into a pipeline.
- And again it's the scheduling because when you look at the Council dates, most of them are once a month. So if we went after the Council, now you're two months out before you're even getting to the--

- Yeah, most of them are once a month but some of them it's only two because--
- Some it's two.
- And some it's three between, and some it's six between. So my first thought was what the heck are we doing to make it so irregular? But when you say it's derived from what the Council's doing, I mean that's, they're in charge.
- We're adjusting, yeah, to try to keep things fast.
- Really good idea to let people know.
- Still Monday at six though. Not gonna mess with that too much.
- I'm still gonna have to rush to get dinner done and get here in time.
- Just gotta remember what Monday.
- So you do need a recommendation?
- Well, it's an internal policy situation. I mean, I think we, I at least want to get it on here in case you were all like, wait a second, no my whole calendar was scheduled for these Mondays and now it's--
- I live for Plan Commission.
- Right.
- So this is literally receive and place on file.
- Yeah.
- Good to know.
- And we have a copy of the Civic Clerk.
- That's the other question. Are we going to be receiving a calendar like we usually do, a chart, or is this it?
- We do have the colored calendar, it's all done.
- We are looking for approval tonight.
- We were waiting.
- But we will be getting something.
- Yep.
- Okay, okay. In case you all were screaming no way, no way, no we can't, .
- I guess move to approve the calendar?
- I guess we'll, yeah.

- Why not? Back up our staff, I'll second that.
- We have a motion to approve?
- Yes.
- By Commissioner Petrouske and a second by Commissioner Bremer. Any further discussion? Hearing none, the Chair would ask again that you cast your vote.
- I'm a yes vote. nothing?
- Oh, there was something for a second.
- It flashed for a second.
- Gotta be quicker with your fingers.
- All right, unanimously approved.
- Great, thank you.
- Okay, next up informational, Director of the Board.
- Okay, last posted meeting on January 14th, ordinance for second reading re-zoning property 2100 Nicolet Drive, 2200 Nicolet Drive from C1 to R3, that's the grassy area out in front of the apartments where they wanted to build some additional apartments. Also then a CUP was approved for 900 South Jackson Street. That was Ace Champion who was here to do the catering business and then his wife with the massage, and that was also approved. We had a Plan Commission meeting before that, so pretty light and items. So then for ease right now as far as the process before we get public hearings changed, the next two Council meetings, so items tonight will go for their first reading next Tuesday which is February 4th. And then the second reading on March 3rd.
- Okay, thank you. And the date of the next meeting for us is Monday, February 24th, 2020.
- All right. Move to adjourn.
- Second.
- We have a motion by Commissioner Hanson and a second by Commissioner Petrouske to adjourn this meeting. All in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed. We are adjourned.