



MINUTES OF THE GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION

**MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 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: Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Jacob Miller, Timothy Gilbert, Sidney Bremer, Excused: Jerry Wiezbiskie

Others Present: Ald. Bill Galvin and Ald. Craig Stevens

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the February 24, 2020, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Randall Petrouske 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 January 27, 2020, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Lisa Hanson to 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.

Chair Tim Gilbert read into record the rules and procedures for the public Hearings.

1. (ZP 20-02) Public Hearing on the request to amend the existing Planned Unit Development (PUD) for Festival Foods/Kwik Trip to allow for the increase in height for an existing billboard located at 2400 University Avenue, submitted by Renee St. Laurent, Lamar Advertising (Ald. C. Stevens, District 5).

Chair Tim Gilbert opened the public hearing regarding the request to to amend the existing Planned Unit Development (PUD) for Festival Foods/Kwik Trip to allow for the increase in height for an existing billboard located at 2400 University Avenue.

Chair Tim Gilbert asked three times if there was anyone else who wished to speak on this request. There were none.

Chair Tim Gilbert closed the public hearing.

2. (ZP 20-02) Consideration with possible action on the request to amend the existing Planned Unit Development (PUD) for Festival Foods/Kwik Trip to allow for the increase in height for an existing billboard located at 2400 University Avenue, submitted by Renee St. Laurent, Lamar Advertising (Ald. C. Stevens, District 5).

Moved by Lisa Hanson, seconded by Randall Petrouske 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 Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Sidney Bremer 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 Randall Petrouske to deny the request to amend the existing Planned Unit Development (PUD) for Festival Foods/Kwik Trip to allow for the increase in height for an existing billboard located at 2400 University Avenue. Motion carried.

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

3. (ZP 20-03) Public Hearing on the request to rezone the easterly portion of 1860 West Mason Street from General Commercial (C1) to Highway Commercial (C2), submitted by Matt Mrochinski, Excel Engineering (Ald. J. VanderLeest, District 11).

Chair Tim Gilbert opened the public hearing regarding the request to rezone the easterly portion of 1860 West Mason Street from General Commercial (C1) to Highway Commercial (C2).

Chair Tim Gilbert asked three times if there was anyone who wished to speak on this request. There were no speakers for this public hearing.
Chair Tim Gilbert closed the public hearing.

4. (ZP 20-03) Consideration with possible action on the request to rezone the easterly portion of 1860 West Mason Street from General Commercial (C1) to Highway Commercial (C2), submitted by Matt Mrochinski, Excel Engineering (Ald. J. Vander Leest, District 11).

Moved by Jacob Miller, seconded by Randall Petrouske to to rezone the easterly portion of 1860 West Mason Street from General Commercial (C1) to Highway Commercial (C2). Motion carried.
Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

5. (ZP 20-04) Public Hearing on the request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to establish a live-work use within a Low Density Residential (R1) district at 815-827 South Monroe Avenue, submitted by Mimi and Chad Schroeder, petitioner (Ald. B. Galvin, District 4).

Chair Tim Gilbert opened the public hearing regarding the request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to establish a live-work use within a Low Density Residential (R1) district at 815-827 South Monroe Avenue.

Chair Tim Gilbert asked three times if there was anyone else who wished to speak on this request. There were none.
Chair Tim Gilbert closed the public hearing.

6. (ZP 20-04) Consideration with possible action on the request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to establish a live-work use within a Low Density Residential (R1) district at 815-827 South Monroe Avenue, submitted by Mimi and Chad Schroeder, petitioner (Ald. B. Galvin, District 4).

Moved by Lisa Hanson, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax 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 Sidney Bremer, 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 Sid Bremer, seconded by Lisa Hanson to approve the request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to establish a live-work use within a Low Density Residential (R1) district at 815-827 South Monroe Avenue, consisting of a photography studio and photography studio owner's residence. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Ald. Veronica

Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

E. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Director's Report.

Kevin Vonck presented the Director's Report.

2. Date of next meeting: Monday, March 23, 2020.

F. ADJOURNMENT.

Chair Tim Gilbert adjourned the meeting.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- **Good evening, welcome to the Monday, February 24th meeting of the Green Bay town commission. Role call of members, Tim Gilbert, chair is present. Sid Bremer, vice chair?**
- **[Bremer] Present.**
- **[Gilbert] Alder Veronica Corpus-Dax?**
- **[Corpus-Dax] Present.**
- **[Gilbert] Commissioner Lisa Hanson?**
- **[Hanson] Present.**
- **[Gilbert] Commissioner Jacob Miller?**
- **[Miller] Present.**
- **[Gilbert] Commissioner Randall Petrouske?**
- **[Petrouske] Present.**
- **[Gilbert] And Commissioner Jared Espesky is absent. Next item, approval of the agenda. Let's go to February 24th, 2020 reading of the Green Bay confirmation.**
- **[Bremer] I move approval.**

- [Petrouske] Second.

- [Gilbert] We have a motion to approval by Commissioner Bremer, second by Commissioner Petrouske. All those in favor say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- [Gilbert] Opposed? Agenda is approved. Next item, approval of the minutes from the January 27th 2020 meeting of the Green Bay Town Commission.

- [Corpus-Dax] Motion to approve.

- [Hanson] Second.

- [Gilbert] Who approved? Motion by Alder Veronica Corpus-Dax, second by Commissioner Hanson to approve the minutes. All in favor say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- [Gilbert] Opposed? The minutes are approved. Next item, regular business. We will have a series of public hearings tonight before each agenda item. And these public hearings have been properly posted and public notifications have been published in the Green Bay Press Gazette. The Plan Commission has been drafted and hearing public comments on the subject agenda items. We invite your comments and ask that after your name has been called you state your address whether you represent a group or association and whether you favor, oppose, or are only providing information in this matter and your comments and concerns. We also ask that you confine your testimony to facts related to the proposal at hand and try to avoid repetitive testimony. You must be recognized by the Plan Commission in order 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 the request to amend the existing planned unit development for Festival Foods Quiktrip to allow for the increase in height for an existing billboard located at 2400 University Avenue, submitted by Renee St. Laurent Lamar advertising.

- [Paul] Thank you Mr. Chair. This is a request for, first public hearing as a request to amend an existing planning and development in the 2400 block of University Avenue. We kind of refer to it as a Quiktrip Festival Foods, P of E. This in Suffolk parcel here, this is the relocated billboard in question. Again, this is University Avenue, para heavy commercial corridor. Festival foods, Quiktrip, and the newly constructed Burger King is in this corridor. City's comprehensive plan recommends commercial uses in this particular area again, as part of the redevelopment plan for University Avenue, this is considered Catalyst Site number two or The Triangle, and that's pretty much built out at this point for the most part. Zoning for the area, again, this was planned unit development. It's kind of difficult to see but there's kind of a border around these properties here that's part of the planned unit development that was developed in 2016. Stepping back in time a little bit to 2014 this is how it used to look, believe it or not. This is the old University Avenue here. Clement street and Fred street, both of those were rerouted to make way for the Festival and for the Quiktrip to go in there. At that time there was an existing billboard, located along Sturgeon Bay Road. And that was not included as part of the original PUD. It was added by the council later at the council meeting, so it was not within, staff had saw, the Plan Commission saw it was part of that original ordinance. So the language is added later. But it was added later to relocate that sign up near this portion of Fred and Neil with University Avenue. This is a site plan from that era, so to speak. This is the Festival Foods site, here. Relocated Clement Street and the Quiktrip site here. And this is where the billboard is currently located

up on that northwest corner of the site. These are some of my recent images from the past week or so. This is looking eastbound traffic. This is the new Burger King that was constructed. This is the billboard in question here. And this is looking westbound. And this is again, here is the Quiktrip site and the River Canyon subject billboard in question. So the request before you is to increase the height of that from 30 feet to 45 feet.

- [Gilbert] Okay, thank you. Does anybody wish to speak on this matter?

- [Renee] I would.

- [Gilbert] Yes ma'am.

- [Renee] I'm Renee St. Laurent and I'm from Lamar Advertising and of course I'm in favor. And I do have a little bit of information. The same site plan is in this packet along with a couple of pictures and just a little history on the billboard itself. I have eight of these, can I just pass. Give them to you, have them passed on? So we have a long-term lease with the prior owner. Which he was, he sold the property then to a development company. The development company came to us along with Quiktrip to move the sign and to sign a new lease. Which we did. So we were cooperating with them, we could've held on to what we had. Because it had like until 2029. But we cooperated, moved the sign and then little did we know just recently, Burger King built a two-story building. So the west faces are blocked. We can't sell them. We would like to raise it. It's actually now only 12 feet that we need to raise the sign in order to see the west face. Does anyone have any questions?

- [Gilbert] This is just a public hearing, so.

- [Renee] Okay.

- [Gilbert] So you'll make a comment and then the next item on the agenda will be the actual request.

- [Renee] Perfect. Thank you.

- [Gilbert] Thank you. Would anybody else like to speak on this? Are there any other speakers on this? Would anyone else like to speak? This public hearing is closed. Next item on the agenda is number two, the consideration with possible actions on the request to amend the existing planned unit development for Festival Foods Quiktrip to allow for the increase in height to an existing billboard located at 2400 University Avenue, submitted by Renee St. Laurent, Lamar Advertising.

- [Paul] Thank you Mr. Chair. So again as part of the PUD, one of the goals was to minimize the signage in that corridor and to control the signage so to speak. Again there's requirements that were added were beyond the planned commission scope at that time. The increase in the height we believe infringes on the airspace or the visual space of that corridor. Principle structures can only be 35-feet in that particular corridor and there's some that exceed those requirements, so. It's a sign clutter issue, it's an aesthetic issue, and our staff is recommending denial of the opposed amendment as proposed.

- [Gilbert] Thank you. Yes, Commissioner Bremer.

- [Bremer] Paul, a question in your report. It states based on research at that time the former billboard was illegally installed without a sign permit. I'm not sure which billboard we're talking about or at what time?

- [Paul] The panel billboard?

- [Bremer] Pre-relocation?

- [Paul] Pre-relocation, yes. So certainly the billboard that was approved is part of the PUD, they got approvals for that it was installed correctly, met code, met all those standards, so that one that's currently there is not any issue. The relocated one is not an issue.

- [Bremer] Thank you, okay.

- [Gilbert] Any other discussion?

- [Petruske] Just a couple of clarifying questions. So how did the movement of the billboard from its original location to the current location, how was that introduced? Was that an ask of us, of the city to the billboard company or vice-versa?

- [Paul] I don't, can maybe...

- [Kevin] Sure, so part of this was we did a development agreement with the University Urban Development LLC. Is run through Larry Langer and they're the ones who did the development basically, did the assemblage of the property and then we worked through the RDA of the city to do development increment, which basically facilitated the development of Festival Foods, the Quiktrip, the out lot and then a future parcel to be endowed. Initial talks, discussion anything, Mr. Neumeyer is correct. We had some concerns about the legality of existing billboards in that area. You know one not being able to find any record of permits for them and then also some based on some deed restrictions that prohibited billboards in that area. Our initial goal was to try and get that billboard relocated somewhere else out of the corridor. I think the city is going to be investing some funds into that area and I think a substantial amount of money through that tax increment district. To create that gateway. I do not believe a billboard should be part of that. With that, there's a back and forth with the developer in I think when it came through in terms of whether that should begin or not we basically said we do not recommend having that in the PUD, if you want it in, you need to ask council. And they asked council and council at the time put it in. And so I think in discussing in terms of one, to think at least in terms of a staff perspective, and development authority perspective, we did not want to have billboards in there in the first place. Again there's a process and you can ask and the developer asked for it, the council put it in. With that I think now, one of our concerns is that Mr. Neumeyer said, you know building rights in that area are limited to 35 feet. And so to push something above and beyond that to me it makes the billboard the most prominent thing in that area and then when we talked about you know having a gateway entrance to the city the goal was to have the gateway be these buildings. You know getting rid of the blight that existed before. And this would go against initially what we had talked about in that development agreement. So that's kind of a short story there's a long tangents I could go on about it. But in general that's how the move and everything happened and how it came to be where we're at today.

- [Gilbert] Thank you. Is there any further discussion?

- [Hanson] Move to open the floor.

- [Petruske] Second.

- [Gilbert] We have a move by Commissioner Hanson, second by Commissioner Petruske to open the floor for further comment, all in favor say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- [Gilbert] Opposed? Okay, does anybody wish to speak?

- [Renee] Yes. First of all the illegally placed billboard prior is news to me, we have not heard that through Lamar or Next Media or Ord. I don't have all the records with me right now, I can probably produce permits. So that I shouldn't, I don't think should be taken into consideration. If it was illegal, we would've gotten a notice to take it down, which we've never gotten any feedback from the city on that. We were asked to move the sign. We moved the sign in order to comply with the new reconstruction of the area. And now because we moved the sign we are completely blocked on one side. So and the height of the sign right now is at 30 feet, we're asking for 12. We'd only be seven feet higher than the 35 feet recommended height for a billboard.

- [Gilbert] Thank you. Was there any notification?

- [Paul] There was, sure. 200 foot notice, failed to mention that there is some correspondence from the Alderman that we received today that's also within your packet.

- [Petrouske] Anybody else who wishes to speak?

- [Gilbert] I don't think so. Is there anybody else that wishes to speak on this? Okay. I'll close the floor.

- [Hanson] Motion to support.

- [Corpus-Dax] Second.

- [Gilbert] We have a motion to close the floor, supported by Commissioner Hanson, second by Alder Corpus-Dax all those in favor say aye?

- [Board] Aye.

- [Gilbert] Opposed? We are back. Is there any further?

- [Hanson] Question for staff. So the permit was received, or was accepted in May of 2016 for the new sign, was that the sign in the exact location it is now, or did we ask them to move it since 2016?

- [Paul] You know, I think it was a one-time you know, sign was to be relocated, they applied for that permit, it was installed.

- [Hanson] And the relocation was?

- [Paul] They did not suggest it be moved any further.

- [Hanson] So the relocation was the 2016.

- [Paul] That's correct, yes.

- [Gilbert] Anybody else?

- [Miller] Just a question on the report. I notice the West DOT part in there, is there any considerations for it being a state highway that we have to consider here? Besides just their approval?

- [Paul] I think the original sign had to receive approval from the DOT.

- [Petruske] Do we have to get it again?

- [Kevin] So I pulled up just a little more context add a thing a little bit. So according to our records, city issued a signed permit in 1986 for a billboard. And then on or around 1997 the permit was reissued for relocating the sign, 12 feet they moved it. Then the state of Wisconsin also issued a permit for the sign in 1986. But when the DOT when they did the interchange they sold a remnant parcel. Which the owners located it, and that's where the deed restriction came in, saying that that billboard could not be there. That's like the illegal part of it that it shouldn't have been there. That's where we got into for whatever reason, DOT or the city chose not to go down the road and try and force it, get it removed, but that was 20 years ago. And so with that part of the relocation involved DOT approval. I think there was some concern because when it got relocated we were concerned that it might be too close. There's a billboard a little further to the west I think near the associated bank parking lot. And we're just concerned about spacing. And DOT would say no, and too close. And one more thing, just part of the notes, but one of the things that we talked about is saying look, we felt that they were far enough apart and DOT consented to that. You know so in terms of changing that there may be some DOT approval that we'd have to go through again. But the DOT, to answer Commissioner Hanson's question, approved everything on this site plan since 2016. Had some valid reason for saying kind of stick with the original plan for this.

- [Gilbert] Any further discussion?

- [Petruske] I guess what I'm concerned about here, I certainly agree with the concept. In the planned unit development program to the lower signage because it's important to have our corridors be uniform and stick to the plan. What I'm concerned about here is it feels a little bit like bad faith to me to ask the billboard company to move the sign and then permit a building to be built right next door that completely covers up the sign. I would say that it's pretty hard to argue that the eastern facing portion of the billboard isn't rendered completely useless and without value by the Burger King development. It feels to me a little bit like bad faith to ask them to move the sign, they move the sign, and then, we didn't do that obviously, but the council decided to do that. Approve them moving their sign there, and then also approve a building to be built immediately next door that renders it financially no longer viable. That's the hangup that I have on this.

- [Hanson] Yeah, that there's financial hardship because yeah, the idea was that we didn't want billboards there but there's a billboard there and it's permitted. And now they can't sell half of that sign.

- [Kevin] I mean, just to in response that is something that we had discussed in terms of when we were doing the original development agreement. I know we did discuss the developer had a chance to purchase that property and also in terms of like the zoning code I know we went through a variance process but in terms of the height that would be allowed on that parcel that has not changed at all since the original you know approvals of this. So in terms of kind of knowing what you're getting into you know the developer was well aware. And in terms of what height visibilities might be on that parcel, in terms of the communications between the developer and the sign company, we were not a part of those in terms of that type of lease

agreement, but just to be fair I think to us, you know those pieces had not changed since that original approval.

- [Gilbert] Sure. Yes, Commissioner Miller.

- [Miller] Just a quick question, what's the height restriction in the PUD, is it 30 overall? Or is it 30 just for that?

- [Paul] For the billboards, 30 feet overall.

- [Miller] Because Festival doesn't go much higher than that.

- [Paul] The principle building doesn't go much higher I don't think, some of them can and might go higher.

- [Gilbert] Yes Commissioner Bremer?

- [Bremer] This is a difficult situation. And I think it involves a couple of points at which it's unfortunate that things didn't happen. And the main one I would look to is that it's unfortunate that Burger King was not asked to set themselves back further. But they are within the 15 foot required set back. So everybody has gone according to law. And I agree with our presenter that the earlier situation and any illegality around that is not pertinent here at all. But I'm still stuck with the fact that the PUD from the beginning had the commercial gateway idea about it and that's been a major part of many of the changes that we've made over on the exterior boundaries of the northeast side of Green Bay, and for that reason I will support the staff's recommendation that this request be denied. I do think it creates clutter. And if you could read the billboard there would be even more clutter there. And if it were higher there would certainly be more clutter there, so we would be exacerbating that particular problem.

- [Hanson] Correct me if I'm wrong I mean as far as that Burger King, I mean that's a pretty small area they wouldn't have been able to set it back because of the property immediately south of it. So I think that that was that's probably part of it too. Was this something that was discussed? Were you guys aware when the building was going up like you know what I think this is going to block that side a little bit or was it something that nobody really was aware of.

- [Paul] Yeah, they had their own site constraints. It was a very small lot to begin with. And I think that their proposal always had that building on that side. It didn't really dawn on me, I wasn't thinking about the billboard, I was thinking about the Burger King, so that's the result of their building placement.

- [Hanson] But the lot that the sign is on is a fairly sizable, it's a lot bigger than the Burger King lot correct? As according to the map you've got.

- [Paul] Yes.

- [Hanson] Okay. So it's not like it was just a sliver of land that if we deny the request that they can't do something else with it. You know, not a sign probably, but it's still a usable plot of land.

- [Paul] Right, I think it was pushed to the far northwest just for obvious reasons because there's a new tenant coming in, a new owner I think that was to not obstruct their signage as well and their visibility, so.

- [Gilbert] Is there any further discussion? Yes, Commissioner Miller.

- [Miller] Just going to echo a little bit of what Sid said on it. You know we were all here when we put the PUD through in 2016 and we did not include the billboard as part of that, consulted it after. I have a hard time going back on that stance just because it now exists. As I think we all still have the same thought we did when we put the PUD through to council. So I have a hard time going back on that at this point just because council threw it in after. So I would just stick with the same stance that we had before and say, you know denial in this case. Even though it is still there.

- [Gilbert] Thank you. Any further discussion?

- [Petrouske] Is there, I have a question for staff. Is there a less comprehensive approach we could take that doesn't amend the entire PUD that's something more akin to a conditional use permit? That would allow variation for this particular sign? As opposed to changing the entire PUD?

- [Paul] I don't think it's about any sort of relocation, I think it's simple conventional issue. The max height is 30 feet, didn't want to go now 12 feet higher than that. So there's no uniqueness beyond that, I would guess. I think it's rather straightforward.

- [Petrouske] I guess that's not what I'm asking. Rather than amend the entire PUD for all the properties covered, is there a way we could carve out something more specific to this sign?

- [Paul] Well I think we're kind of doing that in essence I guess. We're just looking at just that sign section of the ordinance. So, I don't know how much --

- [Petrouske] I see, I see what you're saying. So the ordinance was drafted, or the amendment put in by the council is mindful of a specific sign.

- [Paul] Right. And that's kind of reflected in the report. There's a series of conditions that were in and based on dimensional requirements that the council added and we're reacting to just one of those requirements.

- [Petrouske] I guess what I'm inclined to do even though I think that it's not, I mean it's certainly created a hardship for this for Lamar as if the council decided they were going to change this to allow the sign I think it's gotta be for them to come up with a way to fix it. And we should stand with the staff and their recommendation, so I'm inclined to vote in favor of the staff's recommendation too.

- [Gilbert] Any further discussion? If not the chair will recommend to take a motion.

- [Bremer] To take a vote? Oh, okay, I move that we approve the staff's recommendation that we deny this request.

- [Petrouske] Second it.

- [Gilbert] Okay, so we have a motion by Commissioner Bremer second by Commissioner Petrouske to approve the recommendation which is denial of the request. Any further discussion? Okay, the chair would ask if you have to vote.

- [Bremer] The way this stated though, is problematic.

- [Hanson] Yes is agree.

- **[Bremer]** To allow for the increase in height or the existing billboard. My motion is to deny the request.
- **[Corpus-Dax]** Correct, that's what you're voting on.
- **[Bremer]** Okay, good. I got a little worried.
- **[Corpus-Dax]** Yes is agree, no is no, yes.
- **[Bremer]** Yes is yes, no is no, okay.
- **[Corpus-Dax]** Unanimously for deny.
- **[Gilbert]** Miss, all these items will come up before the city council on March 3rd, correct?
- **[Renee]** Thank you.
- **[Gilbert]** Okay, item three. Public hearing on the request to rezone the easterly portion of 1860 West Mason street. From general commercial to highway commercial, submitted by Matt Perchinsky, Excel Engineering.
- **[Paul]** Thank you Mr. Chair. This public hearing is in regards to a request for rezoning of property 1860 West Mason street. This is West Mason here at the intersection with Taylor street and I-41. The property's on the northeast corner of Mason and Taylor, it's had a long history of being a restaurant, and its future use will be a restaurant. It's a commercial area, a Pizza Hut across the corner across the way. Home Depot up to the north, a daycare and some multi-families to the south from there. Plan recommends commercial in that particular area, residential to the south. The zoning for the current area has kind of a split zoning on this property. It has a highway commercial zoning on the corner and the eastern half is C1 or general commercial. So the request here is to take this C1 portion to C2 to make it all uniform. And this is an image of the property. As it stands, more recently. As a former restaurant.
- **[Gilbert]** Thank you. Is there anybody that wishes to speak on this? Does anybody wish to speak on this item? Are there any people wishing to speak? Okay, let the record show that nobody stepped forward. And this public hearing is closed. Item four, is the same thing. Consideration with possible action on the request to rezone the easterly portion of 1860 West Mason street from general commercial to highway commercial submitted by Matt Perchinsky of Excel Engineering.
- **[Paul]** Really just a cleanup zoning. And staff recommends approval of the stats proposed.
- **[Gilbert]** Okay, thank you.
- **[Petrouske]** Move to approve?
- **[Miller]** Second.
- **[Bremer]** I do have a question for staff. My one concern about this given the audity of the triangular lot was where the entrance and exit drives would be for the drive-thru because that is the primary difference between general commercial and highway commercial.

- [Paul] We haven't seen a site plan yet but we would expect one from fairly shortly. I don't want to spend change a lot. There are existing driveways. Freidroke here, I don't think there's anything --

- [Gilbert] There is, there is on there.

- [Paul] I'm not sure how that's going to be handled in the future, but certainly nothing on Mason Street. We'll work with the developer on that. And see what they propose. But we'll make sure it's code.

- [Bremer] Okay, thank you.

- [Gilbert] And I believe there have been drive-thrus on that property with other businesses and as far as I know it hasn't been an issue.

- [Paul] Right.

- [Bremer] Good.

- [Gilbert] Dating back to A&W and others.

- [Bremer] That's pretty drive-thru-ey. Okay, next.

- [Gilbert] Okay, we had a motion by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Petrouske to approve the recommendation. Is there any further discussion? There are none. The chair would ask you to cast your vote.

- [Corpus-Dax] Unanimously approved.

- [Gilbert] Thank you. Okay, next item. Public hearing on the request for a conditional use permit to establish a life-work use within a low density residential district at 1815-1827 South Monroe Avenue. Submitted by Mimi and Chad Shroeder, petitioner.

- [Bremer] We do have a problem with the English language there, I think that's a live-work use, yep.

- [Gilbert] Okay.

- [Chad] Yes, this is the consideration, or this is the public hearing for a request for a conditional use permit for that live-work use at 815-827 South Monroe. So you can kind of see the sites here. I can't see them but you can see them. So there's two lots that are lined in red. That's the south bend road, St. James park. This is First Evangelicals Center I think, Lutheran Church right up here. So, there's an existing home on site. It's very large, it's a 4,000 square foot home. Built in the early 20's. It's what's called a Tudor revival home. It is in the national register of historic places to the district, so it is regulated by our landmarks commission. The second site, oh it has a two stall garage in the back and about three or four parking stalls surface behind the home itself. The lot to the south is a vacant lot. It is landscaped, it really acts as a side yard for this home, they've been, they're separate lots, they've been together probably since the 20's I'm guessing. I'm not sure, but, so here's kind of closeup where you can see the garage entrance goes off onto Monroe here, parking is in the back. Large structure here and then the yard. Which has a fence around it. Future land use plan for this area shows all low-density residential. It does show some semi-public for the church and some parks for the park area, of course. And the zoning is very simple, low-density residential zoning RI. And then the park is public institutional.

So this is kind of a picture of the front. A lot of trees, so it's difficult to see. But this is looking south down Monroe. And then here's an old closeup pictures of the home itself. Again, it's about 4,000 square feet. The lots together are about 36,000 square feet. Look forward, this is the southern lot. Which is vacant, or unused, yard area. You can kind of see it there. The petitioner in their packet had explained they don't plan to do anything with the house but they plan to landscape the southern lot and these are some examples that are in your packet as well. I just kind of threw them on there so you can take a look. So kind of go back to this picture. So again, the home is on the registered historical places, any changes to the home itself, physical structure of the home, exterior, would have to go through landmarks commission. The petitioner does have a description of the use in the packets, so it would be a live-work unit. Be running a photography studio out of the home and also living in the home, the owners would have to live in the home as well. They would at first have no employees. Potentially one to two after they're established. Code would allow them to have that. Up to two employees. It'd be hours of operation would be Monday through Friday, nine to six by appointment only. Potential for Saturday. So this is really the kind of classic live-work scenario our zoning code and single families zoning district but they are one that allows live-work units through a conditional use permit. And it would allow a lot of this type of use, office uses, educational uses, you know, no manufacturing or retail per se. And so they are requesting to utilize this parcel and the home for their home and photography studio.

- [Gilbert] Thank you. Does anybody wish to speak on this issue? Yes sir?

- [Daniel] I had questions on it.

- [Gilbert] Can you come up to the podium. State your name and address.

- [Daniel] My name is Daniel Kiernan, I live at 816 South Madison, I'm on the other end of Congress. I was curious about the live-work situation and how narrow is it. Will there be questions such as will there be any signage allowed? Is one that comes very quickly.

- [Gilbert] Okay.

- [Chad] Signage is allowed but only as a residential. It's a one square foot sign.

- [Daniel] Okay.

- [Chad] So it wouldn't be much different than a nameplate or a number plate that you'd have on a regular house.

- [Daniel] And the reason I ask that, is I live at 816 South Madison, I have lived there since 1993. Aster Park is a historical landmark neighborhood. This neighborhood survives by creative reuse and I'm hoping that this ensures that that's what this is. It also dies by creative reuse when it's not done properly. Good examples, you know, when they wanted to put the left turn lane right on Corliar and Monroe and take out two historic front yards. They wanted to, it comes by nibbles. I mean the Aster house on Monroe also affects those houses. The one to the north, excuse me to the south is a longterm rental and the one just to the north, just you know got rehabbed into a useful residence. So it has very much any creative use has to very much respect the neighborhood or we lose the neighborhood. It's a place where you know people have to live very restricted because of the landmark status and that's what I'm looking for this council would ensure to that. Because we live or die by the nibbles. And the other part of that is, this also very clearly this is the only creative reuse without council approval that can be made, correct?

- [Miller] This does require council approval.

- [Daniel] I mean it can't convert to anything else without approval from your staff and this, because that's critical too, because once something, whenever commercial and residential bought up, residential always loses. I mean that's why people buy properties and flip it to a gas station because it's worth more, and then the houses next to it, I'm not saying this is anything like that, but I am asking very strongly to make sure that that is the case. That the neighbors near and far very much have a very strong residential sense. And it sounds like I missed your name.

- [Chad] I'm Chad.

- [Daniel] They want to improve it, not diminish it, and that's what I'm here to ensure. That it's a very narrowly defined. Will there be more parking allowed?

- [Gilbert] We'll ask that, when we get to the next item, which is the actual request.

- [Daniel] Okay, very good. So, that's my request, and I appreciate your time.

- [Gilbert] Thank you. Does anybody else wish to speak on this? Yes ma'am?

- [Jill] My name is Jill Hogan, and I live directly the neighbor. There's a fence that separates us, we're right back.

- [Gilbert] Okay.

- [Jill] I guess my concern is we've lived there for going on five years now, and knew the previous owner and stuff that when we got this and heard what it was going to be is and correct my wording, I heard someone at the end of six hear or say something about it, that it restricts the use of retail. I guess I don't understand the difference between what they would be doing because they're essentially selling a product, which to me is retail. So does this open up if the next house down wants to open their home and have part of it be a tattoo parlor, and then if somebody in the back of there wants to open a cake shop, like what are the limitations for where it ends. And being in the historic district, I thought our homes were, it was ensured the integrity of our neighborhood and our homes and not to change it into businesses, I guess. That was my understanding of part of what the historic district was about. And then I can certainly understand pictures, a big day would be Saturday. I'm thinking what the business of, so we're in our backyard in our fire-pit burning leaves and it's blowing smoke over there, who does what, you know? Nobody wants to be a bad neighbor, but I just wonder if it opens it up to a lot of other things and that's a concern for mine. If they develop there are they going to have lights that are lighting up the area and could infringe on people trying to go sleep, I don't know. I mean, I just don't know because we haven't seen it and it's too late to say something after it's done for us, so that's just my concern.

- [Gilbert] Would anybody else like to speak on this? Yes ma'am.

- [Mimi] I'm Mimi Schroeder, so I'm on the one making the request. I guess to address your concerns, we started the studio back in '96 in an 1860 Victorian that we had. But we kept it very appropriate, so it wasn't, you wouldn't have known that it was a studio. We totally respect the whole Aster Park area and historic homes and when we left that city, we moved it into a commercial building that was also historic and we respected that too and kind of kept that all in check. We would not be using lights outside. And my feeling is you would feel we were more a neighbor than a business. Most of my clients would be during the daylight hours and lights outside would not be an issue. We would just not do that. We would not have much in the way

of business on Saturdays that would be an exception, not a rule. Most of it would happen Monday through Friday, and in the summer months maybe a little bit into the evening hours. Because it's obviously later in the day that the sun is out, but other than that it would not be an issue. Parking, there are two or three spots in the back. We would probably only have one car, no more than any of you would have in your driveway on any given day in the week. So it wouldn't be coming and going of ten cars at a time and that sort of a thing. We've been looking. I'm part of the disaster, fire, and east of here last spring so I've been renting space from other photographers in Green Bay for an entire year. And honestly haven't found a building that has worked for me and this just seemed like a perfect fit. It's like full circle. It's like we started out in an old Victorian home, let's wrap it up in an old Victorian home. The landscaping would be tastefully done, so we're not going to do any crazy, I'm not going to do like a graffiti wall you'd have to look at or anything like that. And again, I would really I guess restate that you would probably find us to be more of a neighbor than a business. I guess that would probably be my best way to describe that. My husband does not, he doesn't work with me in the business. But he's a huge supporter of my business. Like I said I opened up in '96 and we take care of our older homes and we take care of our yards almost to a fault. So I don't know if that helps or if I can answer other questions, am I allowed to do that?

- [Gilbert] Well we can address that next.

- [Jill] Okay, okay, thank you.

- [Gilbert] Would anybody else like to speak? Is there any other people that would like to speak?

- [Chad] The only other comment I would like to make, is we did receive an email. And we have received that and it was an email objecting.

- [Gilbert] Thank you. Would anybody else care to speak on this? Okay, I will close the public hearing portion. Item six then. Is a request, continuation of possible action and I request that additional use permit to establish a live-work-use within a low density residential district at 815-827 South Monroe Avenue submitted by Mimi and Chad Schroeder, petitioner.

- [Chad] Thank you Mr. Chair. And so if you haven't heard the recap before I guess I'm going to answer some of the questions that came up. One, other uses or future uses of the property. This conditional use would be for a live-work unit with a photography studio. So even if you were changing it to a different live-work you'd have to amend, unless it was another photograph studio you'd have to amend that CUP. Now there are things in the regular single family zoning district I think that are quasi-public. And I wouldn't call them commercial but it's not exclusive single-family homes in that district. So you know there is a potential for like a daycare is permitted by right. You know, that kind of stuff. That's the way it is everywhere in this city, for all the RI this wouldn't change that. This would allow that service business, and it's different from a retail. Retail has trucks coming, dropping off materials, customers coming and going at random times. This is a service-oriented business and it's by appointment only, so. Also limited to employees, no more than two. Lighting, I know the petitioner has stated that she's not going to add any lighting. Lighting would be regulated just like any other lighting in a single-family district or a low-density district. As would parking. So you couldn't add a giant parking lot, it's not permitted in the regular single-family district. Now, every other single-family district allows a little parking. But it's no different than the codes are today. The historic preservation regulations in the city don't regulate use, they only regulate exterior appearance. So though it's very important to have those protections for a healthy historic neighborhood and has showed in the past that that does keep the neighborhood healthy it's really on building design. Signage is very limited. For live-work communities, no more than you could have for a regular home. So you could have a nameplate on your home that says Buck residence, you know 815. It would be

the same type of thing. I don't know if they're, I think that covers all the questions but when we analyze this as staff, so we looked at what the coming and going of people, what would be the intensity of use there. You know this is a small business, a home business. There in our opinion wouldn't be more vehicles coming and going than what could come and go with a regular single-family home. Home with three or four kids, 16-year-old kids have cars, that's going to be three or four cars a day coming and going which would be no different than this live-work type business. They're not allowed to have any signage. Landmarks would have to approve any changes to the building. So we didn't see that there would be any larger impact to this than there would be in a regular residential use. Which is sort of the intent of live-work units, correct? So we did send out notices to the neighbors. We did receive the one comment. As well as the other person. And we are recommending the approval of the conditional use for a live-work unit for a photography studio and photography studio owner's residence. As they are tied together.

- [Gilbert] You have a question?

- [Hanson] A locational question. Am I right that this is two blocks south from the Aster House?

- [Chad] I think it's two or three.

- [Hanson] Does the Aster House have a similar kind of arrangement?

- [Paul] Well the Aster House I believe is a bed and breakfast, and that is a different. I believe they got a conditional use permit. But it's a different type of use. That's a full large commercial use. It's singled out differently in the code.

- [Bremer] And what the staff response to the concerns expressed here is that this permit is for this particular location and for this particular use.

- [Chad] Correct.

- [Gilbert] Commissioner Hanson?

- [Hanson] So, I guess just to reiterate what Commissioner Bremer just said. So it's a CUP specifically for a photography studio and it follows the owners, correct?

- [Chad] Well, the CUP is for the studio. So if the owner were to sell the business and it would be run as the same type of studio by the new owners who live in the home, it could continue to operate. You can't tie it to the ownership, it's tied to the use.

- [Hanson] Okay.

- [Chad] If that use were to stop for 12 months or be augmented in any way, then the CUP would be invalid and they would have to come back. But it's not tied to the ownership.

- [Hanson] And I don't know if this is a question that you could answer if Paul asked the owners. This house has been for sale for a while, are these the new owners? Are these the previous owners?

- [Paul] I believe in their application they did state that they have an offered purchase conditional on approval on this.

- [Hanson] On this, okay. Okay.

- **[Gilbert]** Any further, yes, Commissioner Miller?
- **[Miller]** Just a clarification. Landmarks wouldn't have anything to do with the landscaping? Right, it would just be the structure itself?
- **[Chad]** Likely not the landscaping unless, the national registry does not have that, I believe it was like a Shakespeare garden that was actually on the register itself. They may have comment on the fencing maybe. And maybe there's, I think pillared columns at the end. Those types of elements they would have control over. But probably not trees or bushes.
- **[Corpus-Dax]** I'm on the landmarks commission and we haven't come across anything that had to do with landscaping. It's all been structural, exterior.
- **[Chad]** Yeah there are some cases where you'll have the Shakespeare garden or a something that was, that is on the register itself.
- **[Petrouske]** So this is a point of clarification I guess, allowing this conditional use, doesn't allow. It allows a different use for the property owner, but doesn't entitle them to any different parameters as it regards lighting, driveways, signage, all of those would be required to be consistent with all other residential properties.
- **[Chad]** Correct.
- **[Petrouske]** So the only thing that would really change would be what's the use inside the property.
- **[Chad]** Correct.
- **[Petrouske]** Okay.
- **[Gilbert]** Any further discussion?
- **[Daniel]** The parking question, is that specifically answered?
- **[Hanson]** Motion to open the floor.
- **[Corpus-Dax]** Second.
- **[Gilbert]** We have motion by Commissioner Hanson, seconded by Alder Corpus-Dax to open the floor. Any further discussions? All in favor say aye.
- **[Board]** Aye.
- **[Gilbert]** Opposed? Sir, if you could please go up to the podium.
- **[Daniel]** That was my other question. Is that tied to RI zoning, also.
- **[Chad]** Parking is tied to RI. I mean the low density zoning district does allow surface parking. I mean you could have surface parking in the back of your home as well. But it's limited to no more than four open stalls. So it's not a big parking lot.

- [Daniel] So there wouldn't be, I mean that second lot I think was actually, didn't Sue Thalin buy that when the residence burned down? On there? I mean does it allow for asphalt on that? Because that does change the feel of a residential neighborhood when you start getting large amounts of pavement as the code addresses I just want to make sure that the code doesn't allow for a backdoor for more.

- [Chad] Well a single family only allows one driveway per lot. Yeah, I don't, the parking would have to be behind the home, and they already have it looks like three, possibly four stalls so they wouldn't be allowed to put any more. I guess one end. One thing that is important to note, that these are two parcels still.

- [Daniel] Correct, and that is what I was worried about. So they could add another entrance there if they wanted to, or would they have to build?

- [Chad] No, they couldn't. They could not, they could sell the parcel I guess and a house could be built on it, at that point I think the CUP would have to be reinstated for just the original home. The other point I wanted to make is once you do get business in an area it also puts a compressive force on the bottom such that business can always cash flow better than residential, so you can get commercial in an area such that it can never afford to leave. And that's one reason that you're looking to do this and that Craig and Polly Legal are looking to sell this with conditional uses because it supports a higher level of price. When this house sold it was the most expensive house in Aster when it sold, I believe in 2005. The only one that's exceeded it is one on South Van Buren, which had extensive, extensive remodeling last few years. Even the castle as it's colloquially called did not sell as much as this property. That's my only other comment here. Once you approve commercial, is it gonna rule out any further use and I don't mean by code, but I mean by practical concept by a single family. Because once you get a certain compressive force in there, let's just, studio cashflow is better than my kids take money out they don't bring any in, at least not at this stage. So that's my other point that I wanted to make earlier that I'll bring up now. Because it can, I mean if that becomes a standard and then you're slowly, you're getting a different neighborhood feel. And I think the board should consider that. Because I mean the house next door, under an RI could become a conditional use and so on and so on. And at some level that is what happened downtown. I would need some historians here, I haven't been here long enough. I mean the single family's became law offices, et cetera et cetera. And we're at that Mason Street divider and if you don't preserve this neighborhood it's single family owners like myself are gonna, and this is creative reuse but the city has to be very very careful because you can creative reuse something out of existence. I mean it becomes an extension of downtown. That's what Aster Park residents are always, always pushing back against. And it, you know, it gets old after time. That's a personal opinion, it has nothing to do with tonight's meeting. But you have to be very very careful as a commission to make sure you're addressing that. And the code allows all this but you have to make sure the cumulative effect doesn't you know, topple a high quality residential neighborhood.

- [Gilbert] Thank you. Does anybody else wish to speak? Yes sir?

- [Bill] Bill Galvin, I'm the Alder for this area. But I've had some conversations with these folks that want to buy it. So, I've had most of my concerns addressed. It seems like that in essence, if this passes all said and done, a common person driving by or walking by would not know that this is anything more than a residential home. Okay? And that even what would take place during the daytime or even nighttime if they had nighttime photography again no one would notice any difference between a residential home and this home. Okay. So that's how they operate their business. Time goes by, they sell it. Someone buys it, wants to also do photography. Is there any restriction from keeping them from turning the entire home into a photography studio, where it's no longer residential. There is definitely --

- [Chad] Yeah, they're limited to, I'm not sure what the exact percentage is, but it's a small amount of a home. Thirty, thirty percent of the total gross? Square area of the unit. There's a bunch of different conditions that apply to live-work. The goal of the code is to keep the home primarily home and not, not look any different. Or operate any different than a regular home would.

- [Bill] Do we have any other homes within the Aster neighborhood area that fall under what they're applying for?

- [Corpus-Dax] We just approved one in council.

- [Bill] Where in that one, because I was part of that, the whole lower level is commercial. The whole upper level is residential. But apparently they were taking the two apartments and they're going to use it as one family dwelling. Are there any others though, I mean other than like say the Aster House, or? Do we keep track of that kind of stuff?

- [Gilbert] Well we would have them by CUPs. But yeah, I'm not aware of any that are in there. There might be some small people doing accounting out of their den or whatever.

- [Bill] An office or something like that.

- [Gilbert] They should be getting a CUP.

- [Miller] Well, they may not.

- [Bill] Better to ask for forgiveness than to ask for permission. But as to this gentleman's concern here, I mean it would be nice if there was a way of checking back to see out of all these properties how many currently do have a CUP allowing it to be used for a small business in that so we can kind of keep track that, yeah maybe we are starting to go to the point where we're granting too many of these. And it is in essence going to change the fabric of the neighborhood. As he talked about trying to resell a home like this and this home has been on the market for a while. Because these homes are hard to maintain, they're expensive to keep. The taxes aren't inexpensive at all, and so I can see where some of his concerns are. So I don't know if I need to make a formal request you know, who I would check with city staff. See if we could check and see how many of those we do have. If any.

- [Bremer] We can do that.

- [Bill] And that email, that you folks received, I mean it was, it kind of went off the rails at the end there. But if someone from staff could respond to the person that sent that email and kind of soothe her concerns, her fears, because I think everything I've heard or we've heard here tonight would address her main concerns about this. This request form permit. So she has the answers.

- [Petruske] Okay.

- [Bremer] And perhaps you would be so great as to speak to her as well, because I think having her Alder say here's what I heard and I am convinced that this is going forward in an appropriate way, will probably help.

- [Bill] Is her email included in that? Or was her contact there?

- **[Petrouske]** It is not.
- **[Bill]** Could you forward her email to me? Or check with her and see if it's okay if I reach out to her?
- **[Gilbert]** I think you were copied on the email.
- **[Bill]** Okay, then I'll get a hold of her.
- **[Gilbert]** Thank you.
- **[Chad]** I guess the only comment I would make, so there was some mention about the downtown homes being converted to offices. Most of those areas are zoned office residential. Which allows either use. This is a strict low residential district.
- **[Bremer]** And it's either type of use. That is the homes there, the buildings there can be used either as home or as offices.
- **[Chad]** Or sometimes mix.
- **[Bremer]** Or sometimes mix, but this is specifically mixed. And it's a specific proportion of the structure that can be used as a business as opposed to the home, with the home dominant. So it's a different situation than your concern with the downtown.
- **[Petrouske]** I guess to put a sharp point on that. No one under a conditional use live-work permit could just run a business and not reside in the property, correct?
- **[Chad]** Correct.
- **[Bremer]** It has to be the owner, yeah.
- **[Petrouske]** Is the floor still?
- **[Gilbert]** It's still open yes.
- **[Petrouske]** I have more questions for staff.
- **[Gilbert]** Okay. Would anybody else like to speak on this?
- **[Bremer]** Then I move we close the floor.
- **[Corpus-Dax]** Second.
- **[Gilbert]** We have a motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Alder Corpus-Dax to close the floor. All in favor say aye.
- **[Board]** Aye.
- **[Gilbert]** Opposed? Okay, we are back.
- **[Petrouske]** Now, I would just like to know what other... I don't expect an exclusive list, but what other types of businesses are permitted under a live-work CUP?

- [Chad] Well, you know the business could be a lot of personal services. So let me see, the business component of the building may include offices, small service establishments, home crafts, which are typically considered accessories to the dwelling. By appointment only associated with fine arts, crafts, or personal services. It may not include a wholesale business or manufacturing business, commercial food business, limo, auto-repair, or any type of vehicle maintenance. It's sort of our, sort of our definition. So a personal service you could be an accountant if you want to throw any other things that are in there.

- [Bremer] A massage therapist.

- [Chad] Yeah, a therapist.

- [Bremer] We recently have also confirmed.

- [Petrouske] What about a tattoo parlor?

- [Chad] That would be more a retail to use.

- [Petrouske] And retail would be strictly prohibited, correct?

- [Chad] Mm hm, under this. And anything that has a coming and going.

- [Petrouske] So pretty much anything that has open hours, open for business eight to five. Come as you are, that would be prohibited under any live-work CUP?

- [Chad] Well, I don't know if I would go that far. I mean if you were an accountant and somebody stopped in to ask you to do their taxes, they could do that. I mean they wouldn't have an appointment.

- [Petrouske] But anything that involved items for sale on regular display, coming and going would be prohibited.

- [Chad] Yeah, you wouldn't be able to do a display outside.

- [Petrouske] Okay.

- [Gilbert] Okay, thank you. Yes Commissioner Bremer?

- [Bremer] A comment that I would make and I certainly appreciate and share the concerns about the historical nature of the neighborhood and this is something that we have been very careful about over time. Old neighborhoods like this have a lot of live-work situations. This is a traditional way that people manage their homes. The doctor often lived in his home where his office was. And the people would come to his door and in and out. That was probably more common than having a doctor's office in a separate place, so this is a very appropriate, historical use that I think fits nicely into the Aster neighborhood. And I think DePier's unfortunate loss is our gain. I'll be happy to support this. It's a good use of a very handsome building. And a beautiful large backyard. And not only for the business but for your own home.

- [Gilbert] Any further discussion?

- [Petrouske] I just want to I guess, thought consistent with Commissioner Bremer's position. I think it's a nice way to integrate history with kind of the evolving emerging entrepreneur based economy that we're living in, where so many more people are living and working from home,

running their primary source of business online, I think it's a nice way to kind of bookend the past with the current times and the future. So I also will be enthusiastically supporting this.

- [Gilbert] Thank you. Any further discussion? Okay, being done the chair would dictate a motion.

- [Bremer] I move to approve the request.

- [Hanson] Second.

- [Gilbert] We have a motion by Commissioner Bremer and second by Commissioner Hanson to approve the request. Any further discussions? Hearing done, the chair would ask that you cast your vote.

- [Corpus-Dax] Unanimously approved.

- [Gilbert] Okay, thank you. It was unanimously approved. Yeah, and again that 12-0 for household on Webster. Okay, next item, informational, director's reports.

- [Director] Okay, last council meeting was February 4th. And at that meeting all the actions were compiled -- We tried it out in discussion, pairing these where we have the public hearing and then the items. I think that's a way thankfully nothing was super high stakes tonight. But they addressed the issue to the public -- I think it went pretty well tonight.

- [Bremer] And I think that's useful. And then the more specific issues come up as we go into that.

- [Director] Sure, and I think what this body and council body in general have pretty willingness to open the floor, hear from public comment. But I think you know doing it right before just in case you guys change your minds, you don't have to open the floor. So at least you guys, the public feels that they have a chance to have their voice heard before you make a decision.

- [Gilbert] Thank you. Next thing is the next meeting is Monday, March 23rd 2020. Okay, before we adjourn, I just want to ask is there we could do to streamline this whole public hearing or did we do it pretty well?

- [Chad] I think you guys did great. Excepting public hearings here and the council not include those.

- [Director] I think it's important. I would do it every time, even though it takes a little time just go after the first public hearing, read your spiel, about this is what we're doing. And I just want to remind people, come up, name address, address and then just a good reminder, every time kind of play and then just we get into this instead of back and forth, just send out the table that that's we handle things.

- [Gilbert] Okay.

- [Petrouske] I think it went well. Point of privilege before we adjourn. I just wanted to clarify when I talked about bad faith earlier, I wasn't impugning that to the staff. It might've come off a little more aggressive than I had intended it to, I was just trying to explain how I felt about the situation. Okay, just wanted to clarify that I wasn't impugning bad faith to our staff, so.

- [Paul] No offense taken.

- **[Gilbert] Okay.**
- **[Corpus-Dax] Move to adjourn.**
- **[Gilbert] We are adjourned.**