



MINUTES OF THE GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION

MONDAY, APRIL 13, 2020, 6:00 PM

Telephonic Meeting

public may also view at

www.youtube.com/CityOfGreenBay

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

I. Please find information to join this meeting via "zoom meeting" along with instructions.

B. 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, Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer,

Excused: Timothy Gilbert, Jerry Wiezbiskie

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the April 13, 2020, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

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

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the February 24, 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, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

Vice-Chair Sidney Bremer read into record the instructions and procedure for the Public Hearings.

I. (ZP 20-05) Public Hearing on the request to create a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for the American Foods/Green Bay Dressed Beef campus, 544 Acme Street, submitted by Robert Mach, Mach IV Engineering, on behalf of American Foods/Green Bay Dressed Beef, property owner (Ald. C. Stevens, District 5).

Vice-Chair Sidney Bremer opened the Public Hearing regarding the request to create a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for the American Foods/Green Bay Dressed Beef campus, 544 Acme Street, submitted by Robert Mach, Mach IV Engineering, on behalf of American Foods/Green Bay Dressed Beef.

Vice-Chair Sidney Bremer asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak. Hearing/seeing no one, the public hearing was closed.

2. (ZP 20-05) Consideration with possible action on the request to create a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for the American Foods/Green Bay Dressed Beef campus, 544 Acme Street, submitted by Robert Mach, Mach IV Engineering on behalf of American Foods/Green Bay Dressed Beef, property owner (Ald. C. Stevens, District 5).

Moved by Lisa Hanson, seconded by Randall Petrouske to approve the request to create a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for the American Foods/Green Bay Dressed Beef campus, 544 Acme Street, subject to the draft Planned Unit Development (PUD). Motion carried.

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

3. (ZP 20-06) Public Hearing on a request to rezone 420 Maryhill Drive from Low Density Residential (RI) to Public/Institutional (PI), submitted by Ryan Erdmann, Point of Beginning, Inc., on behalf of Premonstratensian Fathers, property owner (Ald. C. Wery, District 8).

Vice-Chair Sidney Bremer opened the Public Hearing regarding the request to rezone 420 Maryhill Drive from Low Density Residential (RI) to Public/Institutional (PI).

Vice-Chair Sidney Bremer asked three times if there was anyone who wished to speak.
Hearing/seeing none, the public hearing was closed.

4. (ZP 20-06) Consideration with possible action on a request to rezone 420 Maryhill Drive from Low Density Residential (R I) to Public/Institutional (PI), submitted by Ryan Erdmann, Point of Beginning, Inc., on behalf of Premonstratensian Fathers, property owner (Ald. C. Wery, District 8).

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, 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, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None,
Abstain- None

Moved by Lisa Hanson, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve the request to rezone 420 Maryhill Drive from Low Density Residential (R I) to Public/Institutional (PI). Motion carried.

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

5. (ZP 20-08) Public Hearing on a request to rezone areas of the 2900 Block of Sitka Street from Low-Density Residential (R-1) to Medium-Density Residential (R-2) and Conservancy District (CON), submitted by Joel Ehrurth, Mach IV Engineering & Surveying LLC, on behalf of Green Viper Inc, property owner (Ald. V. Corpus-Dax, District 2).

Vice-Chair Sidney Bremer opened the Public Hearing regarding the request to rezone areas of the 2900 Block of Sitka Street from Low-Density Residential (R-1) to Medium-Density Residential (R-2) and Conservancy District (CON).

Vice-Chair Sidney Bremer asked three times if there was anyone else who wished to speak.
Hearing/seeing none, the public hearing was closed.

6. (ZP 20-08) Consideration with possible action on the request to rezone areas of the 2900 Block of Sitka Street from Low-Density Residential (R-1) to Medium-Density Residential (R-2) and Conservancy District (CON), submitted by Joel Ehrurth, Mach IV Engineering & Surveying LLC, on behalf of Green Viper Inc, property owner (Ald. V. Corpus-Dax, District 2).

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, 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, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Lisa Hanson, seconded by Jacob Miller to approve the request to rezone areas of the 2900 Block of Sitka Street from Low-Density Residential (R-1) to Medium-Density Residential (R-2) and Conservancy District (CON). Motion carried.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Director's Report.

Kevin Vonck presented the Director's Report.

2. Date of next meeting: Monday, April 27, 2020.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

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

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Bang, bang of the gavel. I'd like to call the meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission for April 13, 2020, to order by Zoom. And the first item on the agenda is our roll call. Tim Gilbert, chair, is excused. Sid Bremer, vice-chair, is . And I will be acting on behalf of Tim Gilbert. Alder Veronica Corpus-Dax.

- [Veronica] Present.

- [Chair] Commissioner Lisa Hanson.

- [Lisa] Present.

- [Chair] Commissioner Jacob Miller.

- [Jacob] Present.

- [Chair] Commissioner Randall Petrouske.

- [Randall] Present.

- [Chair] And Commissioner Jerry Wizbiskie is also excused. Our next item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. May I have a motion for that.

- This is Veronica, so moved.

- Seconded, Hanson.

- [Chair] And Lisa seconds it. All those in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- [Disembodied Male Voice] Aye.

- Any opposed? Okay, the agenda is approved. May I have a motion to approve the minutes of the February 24th, 2020, meeting of the Plan Commission?

- This is Veronica, so moved.

- Seconded, Lisa Hanson.

- And second from Commissioner Hanson. Any objections to that approval? Then the minutes stand approved as distributed. And we will proceed to our regular business. The first item under regular business is the public hearing on the request to create a planned unit development for the American Foods Green Bay Dressed Beef Campus at 544 Acme Street, submitted by Robert Mack of Mach IV Engineering on behalf of American Foods Green Bay Dressed Beef, property owner. I'd want to make a point here that we will be holding a public hearing for purposes of hearing from the public. And it will be immediately be followed by the second item on our agenda which is possible action on this point, on this item. But I would ask first of all Paul Neumeyer to introduce us to the item.

- [Paul] Thank you Mrs. Chair. This is Paul Neumeyer. I'm the zoning administrator for the city. I'll give a brief overview of the request. And then I'll turn it back to the chair. So Kevin, if you wanna advance the first screen. So this is an aerial photo from 2017. The property is highlighted in red. This is the American Foods campus. The request is to create a planned unit development to PED for this property. And the boundary would be highlighted in red. So looking at the aerial photo, north is up on this. University Avenue is running east and west or left to right, and North Henry is running north and south, as kind of points of reference. This photo is again from 2017. So I'm not sure how well you can see it, but there are several homes shown on the photo that are just west of North Henry Street. Those properties were acquired by American Foods and have since been razed. And they've also required properties along Lawrence Street and have removed those as well. So this is all part of the potential expansion that they'd like to do for the campus. University Avenue is a commercial corridor, as you might know, a lot of commercial uses. North Henry Street has mainly single family uses on the east side of the property, and again, formerly had some single family uses on the west side. So we can move to the next slide which should be the comprehensive plan. We can also point out to that earlier this year and the end of January the commission saw a request to vacate and partially close both Lawrence and Acme. And those have been completed at this time. So this slide shows or represents the city's

comprehensive plan, again on a commercial corridor along University Avenue, kind of a mix of uses east of North Henry. And then in 2015 we went through both the Plan Commission and council to do a comprehensive plan amendment to take, I'd say, almost all of the campus of American Foods end to an industrial land use. And that was really the first step. This is the second step about five years later that they're picking up to do the expansion. So sorry this proposed request is consistent with the city's comprehensive plan as well as the University Avenue redevelopment plan. So we can move to the next slide which should be our zoning slide, a little too quick on that one. There are a variety of zonings on the property. There is general industrial. And for the heart of the campus, I guess I'll call it, there's some light industrial up along University Avenue. And then there's a band of very densely residential that's just west of North Henry Street. And that's where those homes used to be and have since been removed. So one of the objectives of the request is to clean up the zoning or unify the zoning for the campus. So that will certainly be accomplished, part of the PUD overlay. So we can move to the next slide. I've got two more slides. And these are also part of the exhibit for the plan unit development. This is a site plan that was provided by the applicant, and we've kinda turned the view a little bit here. So now University is running kind of north, south, or it's still running east, west, but it's running from top to bottom, I should say. And North Henry is running from left to right. One of the main reasons for the request is for a major plant expansion, adding a barn as they call it, for American Foods. And that would be where the former homes were just west of North Henry Street in that area there. There are some other improvements that they are making on the campus, that includes the parking, waste water treatment, and some other improvements that will improve the infrastructure and daily operations on the campus. Another big issue has been the transition on North Henry Street, because we do have single family homes east across North Henry Street. The next exhibit Kevin will show some details about a transitional yard that American Foods has worked with the property owners to kinda create that separation. So there's several images on this one slide here. And in the upper right hand corner that kinda represents the site plan we were just looking at. The other images in the upper left show a cross section with some fencing and landscaping and the proposed bill. The billing is about, I believe, 45 feet off of the North Henry Street right of way. There's about a 22 foot set back is a transition. I do think there was a typo in my report. It's not a 60 foot barn. It's more like a 20 foot . I apologize for that. But again the other images show some separation there with an eight foot fence. And no landscaping that'll be going at that area to create that transition. As I mentioned before there is a planned unit development that is attached within your agenda. And these are just two of the exhibits from that. The applicant did conduct on two separate occasions two neighborhood meetings back in late January. I think those were very productive meetings. They may be able to speak to that in greater detail. We have received some comments from neighbors, questions about odor. And I think, yeah, we were able to respond to them with the help of American Foods on that one. So at this point I'll turn it back to the chair unless there's any other questions.

- It's Sid Bremer again. This public hearing has been properly posted and public notification has been published in the Green Bay Press Gazette. The Plan Commission is interested in hearing from the comments on the subject agenda items. We invite your comments and ask that after your name has been called you state, first of all, your address, whether you represent a group or association, whether you favor a post providing information in this matter and then your comments or concerns. We also ask that you confine your testimony to facts related to the proposal at hand and avoid repetitive testimony. You must be recognized by the Plan Commission in order to speak. And please address your comments to the Plan Commission. So who would like to speak?

- This is Kevin Vonck. I've got somebody here. So first up will be Bob Mach.

- Okay. Mr. Mach.

- Well thank you. Bob Mach, 20 60 South Schneider Court, Green Bay, Wisconsin, 54313 with Mach IV Engineering and Surveying. I'm the agent for American Foods on this project. I guess, first of all, if there's any questions from the Plan Commission, we certainly can answer those. I can talk a little bit about what we've done to address some of the neighborhood concerns. Like Paul had mentioned, we hosted two meetings in January. All the neighbors to the east and north within 400 feet were noticed of those meetings. We sent out mailings to all of them and hosted them on a Thursday evening and a Saturday afternoon at Gipper's just down the road from the plant. And we presented what our overall plans for the campus were, what we were planning on doing with this proposed barn facility, some of the changes that we were making, and basically took their input back and arrived at what we're presenting today to address some of those issues and the transitional zoning. From those meetings it turns out there were three major concerns pretty much in line with what our concerns were and what we're trying to design for. That was the aesthetics, what they're going to see from their homes and from Henry Street. The traffic patterns, addressing those and correcting some of the deficiencies that they're currently experiencing, and then addressing the odors associated with the facility and the animals and things. So from the aesthetics, can we flip to the exhibit B which is?

- Yes.

- The rendering, okay.

- Can you see it now?

- Excellent, thank you.

- [Chair] Okay, please.

- We presented a couple of different options in that first meeting, and we had a lot of involvement from the property owners immediately across the street on Henry, because they obviously were the most affected by this. And we took their input and kinda came back to what we're showing today. And what we're proposing is a barrier wall, a 22 foot dimension that Paul had mentioned earlier is. The wall isn't a straight wall along Henry. There's a couple of it. I don't know if you can pick that up in the diagram or not. But right, through that area where you see the darker colors, those are actually areas that are offset. They come out a little farther into the street, like 2 1/2 feet or so to break up that silhouette, just so we don't have this monolithic wall along Henry Street there. We don't want it looking like the penitentiary or anything like that. So we did that. We have some color accents through there. And this is going to be an insulated concrete metal panel wall which will help as also a sound barrier between a plant and the neighborhood. That wall, total height on that was, the wall itself, it's an eight foot high panel on top of a four foot foundation. So it's about 12 feet high, and when you look at the renderings you will see a few top of the building, but that will be color matched with the rest of the facility, also will have an accent, trim stripe that will match. From some of the neighborhood input, we talked about how close that wall would be to Henry Street, whether they wanted that barrier wall closer to the street to block more of the building or farther away from the street to just have a little bit more visual distancing. And across the board they wanted it farther away from the street. They also wanted to see the accent colors in that paneling which is what we developed there. And another point of input that they had was the landscaping. They wanted us to add some canopy trees instead of just evergreens in front of that wall. So we have a variety of landscaping that we're proposing. Those requirements are all laid out in the PUD document. We also included two areas for potential future public art displays that we'll basically be installing a concrete path that they can be display areas in the future or maybe service neighborhood picnic areas or whatever, but those will be areas that will be for public use. Thank

you. So that's the main way that we handled the aesthetics of that area. The other benefit of having those barrier wall there is all of the truck docks, loading areas, everything will be completely concealed. There'll be no headlights, anything like that coming into the neighborhood. That kinda goes into our next point is the traffic patterns. So Kevin if you could slip back to the site plan sheet, we can talk a little bit about that. So presently traffic coming into the site... The full cattle trucks come in off of Lawrence Street. And they entered into loading docks for the barn. I don't know if you can make out where those are. Others there. Red cabs on the trucks right there. Those are the loading docks for the current barn.

- [Chair] Where is the current barn if you'd be so good?

- Current barn is directly south of there, the multi-colored roof and then to the west. It's kind of l-shaped.

- [Chair] Thank you.

- You can see the current barn has gabled roofs. And the current barn capacity, Ron, around 350 animals. So when they're processing they have to have a steady stream of trucks coming into the site, always replenishing that barn through the entire shift. And as a result they end up currently having quite a few vehicles. They have limited queuing space in there. They back out onto Lawrence Street. And when the trucks are in the road, when they're stuck there, sometimes they even back up into University, 'cause they're all staging off site. They have to be called to come in. If there's any delay or anything in production or they have to stop the line, all those trucks are already on the way and they're stuck on Lawrence, stuck on University, and that's where there's definitely some problems with that, with backing up traffic, order, et cetera. Cattle trucks probably the messiest and smelliest part of the process. So when we designed this, and the other part of the other process currently is gooseneck trailers come in off of Acme Street. So you have two different streets of delivered. Now with the new pattern all truck traffic, cattle, full cattle trucks, semis and goosenecks will both come in off of Lawrence Street. There will be a controlled gate there. And we'll have more capacity at the loading docks. The proposed barn, latest number is around 1,300 heads. So a lot less animals will have to be delivered during the day. So it'll mean that they can load this up during the 16 hours of off shift time where they're not processing. And then you only have to bring in the last little bit during the day. That can be spread out. It'll be three truck docks that will be able to load at, plus two separate gooseneck areas off of the north end of the barn. So those deliveries can come in separate. And then we also are planning space internally for up to six trucks to be queued inside that courtyard area, kinda wear you're seeing the trucks park south of the waste water treatment plant right now. Then all truck traffic will exit out Acme Street. So we're basically just making it a simplified circular circulation through there, taking everything away from the Henry Street neighborhood. All the truck traffic, everything will be internal and confined within that internal courtyard area. So if there is a hiccup in production or they need to queue a few trucks, all that will be inside of the facility. That will not be spilling out onto Wilks anymore. So that was a big emphasis on how the barn plan and the site plans for this were developed. Third major issue that was raised during those neighborhood meetings was odor. What are we gonna do about that? And there was a question raised to Paul about that. We responded and big part of addressing the odor or at least the perceived odor is taking care of the trucks, getting the trucks in and out of there as soon as possible, not baking them up onto the public street. So that was a big part of it. The other part that we're addressing in the design of the barn is the ventilation. So part of the handling of the animals when they come in, you wanna have a steady stream of air moving through there and are constantly ventilating it. So we're gonna draw air from the west side of the building, and there will be louvers for air intakes on the east side of the building. So we'll be pulling air into the building from the east side, from the Henry Street neighborhood side and then discharging that to the west side, basically inside of that courtyard, exactly, inside the

courtyard of the facility. So the air discharge or any orders associate will be basically discharged in the exact same location they are now, 'cause they'll be coming out right where the existing barn is. And speaking from personal experience here, once they're in the barn the barn is a very clean facility. The animals are all bedded in sawdust, not really any objectionable odors inside there. I think the biggest thing is getting them off the trucks and getting the trucks off the facility as fast as possible. So we're addressing that more with site barn issues. I think Paul mentioned we're talking about the building being masonry on the south side facing the street. All the lower clean areas facing internally. Is there anything else I'm missing here? Okay. Yeah, one of the other thing I'm going to mention is the other big push for creating this barn is getting it up to current USDA standards and for safer handling of the animals and safer conditions for the employees as well. The overall capacity of the facility isn't going to change other than slight gains just by efficiencies, but there isn't any change to the production lines which is what limits their capacity right now, so. I think that pretty much covers the points that we wanted to touch on. If there are any questions, we are certainly available to answer them. Also with me I have Bryan Heights from American Foods and Bud Shoe from Shoe Construction.

- [Chair] I do appreciate your willingness to answer any questions, but I think we will delay questions from the commission until our discussion and action item. And the question would be at this point, unless there's anything for clarification of what was just said by Mr. Mach. Then I would ask if there is anybody else who wishes to speak to this item.

- Madame Chair I do not see anyone else. I'm just gonna quickly unmute all just to see if anybody else is gonna speak. So bear with me one second. And you can ask again .

- Okay, is there somebody out there who wishes to speak ? Seven. Is that somebody who wishes to speak? No. Kevin I think you've unmuted someone.

- All right, I'll try it one more time. Here we go.

- You are unmuted at this point. Can you identify yourself? We can hear the kids and the chatter, but we can't hear you.

- All right, so I've got just 603 320 0987. Is that somebody who wants to speak? Do we have somebody at 603-200-987 that wishes to speak? Madame Chair to continue.

- I can't get any further. No I'm afraid we're not making contact.

- Okay. Okay, I'm gonna take that as a no.

- I think that's the best we can do. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak on this issue?

- Madame Chair I do not see any other hands. And I'm just gonna check here. Nobody on the chat wishing to speak.

- Okay. Then. Since no one further has come forward, we will close the public hearing and proceed to the next order of business which is item two on our agenda, the consideration with possible action on the request to create a planned unit development for the American Foods Green Bay Dressed Beef Campus at 544 Acme Street, submitted by Robert Mach, Mach IV Engineering on behalf of American Foods, Green Bay Dressed Beef, property owner. And I would ask first of all, Paul Neumeyer, if there's anything else that you would wish to add for us for our information, Paul.

- [Paul] I have nothing further to add except that we are recommending approval of the request that are to the plan unit development ordinance that's attached within your agenda. And if you have any questions, I can try and further address them for you.

- Thank you. And are there any questions for Paul? Then does anybody on the Plan Commission wish to ask questions as was invited for Mr. Mach? I think then we do not need to open the floor. I will entertain any discussion that you have.

- I have Commissioner Hanson.

- Move to approve.

- Motion made by Commissioner Hanson to approve. Is there a second?

- I'll second.

- Randy here, I'd second.

- Thank you Commissioner Petrouske has a second. Any further concerns or issues to be raised? Then to vote I think we might just go right down the list. Commissioner Hanson?

- In favor of my motion.

- Good, I'm glad to hear that. Alder Corups-Dax?

- Aye.

- Let's see. Commissioner Jake Miller?

- Aye as well.

- Commissioner Randy Petrouske?

- Aye.

- And I will vote aye as well. Did I miss somebody? Okay. Then Jessica I think you can show unanimous vote in favor of the recommendation of the staff. And we will move on to item number three on the agenda which is a second public hearing this time on a request to rezone 420 Maryhill Drive from low density residential to public institutional, submitted by Ryan Erdman, Point of Beginning Inc on behalf of the Pramon CM father's, property owner. Again, I will not reread the rules for an open hearing, but to remind you that this is a public hearing that has been properly posted with public notification published in the Green Bay Press Gazette and that we are interested in hearing public comments on the subject. We invite your comments and ask that after your name has been called you state your address, whether you represent a group or association, whether you favor, oppose or only providing information in this matter. Oh, but first I wonder... I believe this is Paul Neumeyer's again. Paul if you could introduce the item.

- Sure thank you Mrs. Chair. I can just give a brief overview again. This is not . Maryhill Drive. This is just part of the Notre Dame campus, just south of Western Avenue, north of West Mason Street. This is a property they've had for a little time. There was a former home on there at one point that was removed in 2013. So it's currently a vacant property. It has a low density residential zoning, R1 zoning. The request is to zone to public institutily. So that can be

absorbed into the campus to have consistent zoning. So they may be able to expand or put a different structure on that site. Moving to the next slide, just briefly go through the comprehensive plan and the zoning of the site. This is the comp plan. This currently shows a low density residential use. The blue is the public use. So even's not quote, unquote appropriate for the comp plan, it is adjacent to the campus. And we feel it is reasonably consistent to expand that zoning, that PI zoning to include this property. Moving to the next slide with the zoning. You'll kinda see that a little clear with the green being the public institutional zoning and the property just to the north, the 420 being low density. So we feel again that's an appropriate extension of that zoning to be absorbed into the campus. We have some indication that they may choose to put up maintenance garage on that site in the future. I guess we'll see once the zoning's complete what the outcome might be. And at this point I can turn it back to the chair for public comment.

- All right, chair, I think you're muted for a second.

- Yes.

- There we go.

- There, I finally got myself unmuted. I'm sorry. Is there anybody who wishes to speak on this matter? And Kevin are you seeing anybody? I am not.

- I do not see anybody. Nobody's raising a hand.

- Question as we require. Does anybody wish to speak on this matter? Does anybody wish to speak on this matter? So let the record show that no one came forward, and we can close this public hearing and move to the next item on the agenda which is consideration with possible action on the request to rezone 420 Maryhill Drive from low density residential to public institutional submitted by Ryan Erdman, Point of Beginning Inc. on behalf of the Premont May fathers property owner. Do you have anything you'd like to add for us Paul?

- I do not. This is really a cleanup, zoning, and I have nothing further except that we're recommending approval of the request as stated.

- And as I understood it from your earlier introduction we don't currently know what the property might be used for. But it would be an extension of the campus, and there is some thought of a maintenance garage as a possible use.

- That's correct.

- Okay. Does anybody on the commission have any other questions for Mr. Neumeyer? Seeing none. Is there--

- Excuse me, we have Commissioner Hanson.

- Thank you Commissioner Hanson.

- Yes, move to approve.

- I think before we do that we need to make sure that there's nobody who wishes to speak from the audience on this matter. Is there any person?

- Should we open the floor?

- That's what I had in mind.
- Okay, move to open the floor.
- Okay, we might as well do that and have a second for that. Alder Corpus-Dax says second. All those in favor? Yes.
- Aye.
- Okay. The floor is open. Is there anybody who wishes to speak? And I had not seen anyone before and still do not, so. We can do that again. Commissioner Hanson?
- Am I moving to close the floor?
- That would be lovely. And do we have a second? Okay, from Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Any opposed? Okay, then we are back in our regular order of business. Is there any discussion? Do we have a motion to approve?
- Move to approve.
- Commissioner Hanson moves to approve. A second?
- I'll second.
- From Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor please. I'll run down the roll here. Commissioner Hanson?
- Aye.
- Alder Corpus-Dax?
- Aye.
- Commissioner Petrouske? You'll have to unmute Randy. But I see him saying aye.
- Aye.
- And commissioner Miller?
- Aye.
- Okay. The vote is unanimous to approve. And we can go to the next order of business. Did I miss anything? Okay.
- Just Paul Neumeyer I think wanted to add something.

- Just wanted to point out this item as well as the previous item will be going to the Common Council next week on the 21st just as an informational item to the commission.

- And thank you, important information as well to those who have submitted the items. Then item number five on our agenda is the public hearing on a request to rezone areas of the 2900 block of Sitka Street from low density residential to medium density residential, that is R2 and conservancy district, submitted by Joel Ariff, Mach IV Engineering and Surveying LLC on behalf of Green Viper Inc., property owner. And I believe David Buck I think this is yours, if you would introduce us to this item on the agenda.

- Okay, thank you Madame Chairman. This is a request for a rezone from the R1 district to two different districts, the R2 and the conservancy district. And you can see on the map that's in front of you right now the subject parcel is outlined in red. What's being requested to be rezoned is the R2 which is called the medium density dwelling district. That's in the yellow hatch. And what's being proposed to be rezoned to conservancy is in the green stripes. And then there's a small two acre piece on the south side that would retain its R1 zoning. If you wanna go to the next slide, I can talk about the comp plan. Okay, so the comprehensive plan recommends low density residential uses, as you can see for the site itself and pretty much all of the surrounding area. And I can define that a little bit better for you. The low density residential in our comprehensive plan recommends single family, two family, and some neighborhood commercial at a density of about four to eight units per acre, recommending lot sizes between 5,000 square feet and about 13,000 square feet. So I'll just point that out that some people think low density it's much lower than what our comp plan recommends. Gonna go to the next slide Kevin. Is the existing zoning. You can see it follows the comprehensive plan, and the area's pretty much all R1 single family zoning which is that light yellow color. The reason for the rezone request, and maybe you can go to the next slide Kevin, please. Thank you. The reason for the request is to allow the subdivision of this property and then subsequent development into 22 what are called zero lot line single family development lots. So that would be 22 lots. They range anywhere in size from just about 8,000 square feet to about 13,000 square feet. So the whole site itself is 13 1/2 acres. What's being zoned or recommended to be rezoned for R2 is about 4.25 acres. I had mentioned the part to remain R1 is about two acres. And that leaves the remainder, 7.25, to go into a conservancy district. Some history on the site, in the 1930s through the '70s this property was used as a borrow pit. So soil was from the site. And kind of a pit was created, presumably, for roadway construction on the east side of Green Bay. In the '80s and '90s that reversed, and it was filled. So it received fill when that was construction fill or roadway fill or what not. But they kinda filled up the sites. So currently you can see those colored lines on the map are tow poll lines or elevation lines. And you can see it's relatively flat around the edges. But when you get to the center of the property there's about a 13 foot high hill, very gently sloping, but it goes to about 13 feet high. And that's kinda how that sits today. So the petitioner's proposing to change, like I said, 4 1/4 acres to that R2 zoning, 7.25 to conservancy, and leave two of the same. Their intent is to create 22 lots with 22 homes on them. Where these homes are a little bit different is they're called an R-code single family semi-detached. So they have a common wall. So a lot of people call them zero lot line homes. Some people when they're in a condo setting know 'em as twindos. So it's two single family homes that are typically attached by a garage wall. And they share a lot line. So that is what's being proposed on Superior and Sitka that would come out of this rezoning. The R2 zoning permits those by right. The conservancy zoning is really a holding zone. It allows passive recreation but not much else. So I mean, you can put some trails in there potentially, a gazebo, something like that. But otherwise it's got to stay pretty much natural. And that area would be private open space. It would be owned, presumably, by a home owner's association out of those 22 new lots. So they would use it as their home owner's association saw fit, again passive recreation. And they would be required to maintain that property. And then along the southern section or on the bottom are out lots. So out lots that can't be built upon. As you notice they have no street access.

Petitioner's indicated they've talked to property owners on Gilbert Drive in the past, and their intent is to deed those out lots to the properties on Gilbert, increasing their rear yards, and kinda squaring off the entire parcel themselves. So that's really what's being proposed out there. We did send a notice to the neighborhood association and obviously the alder person. We did receive quite a few responses and questions. The main concerns were concern over two family uses versus single family detached homes and those being out of place, the density that those would create, being more dense than a single family would be, traffic concerns, speeding, and traffic volumes and also the maintenance of the conservancy area by the, well in this case, by a homeowners association or by the petitioner. I consolidated all of those in an attachment in your packet. I think there's six or seven that are listed in there, so you could kinda read those. I received four additional calls today, calls and, or emails. And I'll just kinda read what those are. One is from Randall and Roxanne Dial at 417 Robert Lane. They were concerned that the neighborhood is mainly single family with a lot of children, that the R2 housing would increase traffic and be a traffic hazard to the neighborhood and to the children. And Superior Road, apparently, had closed to full access traffic at Mason Street. And so lefts onto Mason are not possible which forces traffic up Superior, down Sitka, and through the neighborhood which would increase traffic on those streets as well. And that would be unsafe. Another caller was Katie Berera. She is the secretary of the McAuliffe Park Neighborhood Association. She is opposed to the rezoning. She is only comfortable with R1 single family uses and that the neighborhood in general has too many two family type homes already. A third caller was Tracy Hoida at 2757 Gilbert. She was also concerned with the traffic and concerned with the R2 zoning primarily because the duplexes or the attached single family could go up for sale. They could be developed as just regular rentals and not owner occupied housing and that the R2 zoning doesn't have any controls once the zoning takes place except for what's in the regular zoning code. And then the last contact I had was Jane Wold at 404 Easy Street. She was concerned with increased traffic and speeding. She was also concerned that the homes would create excessive roadway wear, especially when they're being constructed and that that road would need additional maintenance. She also felt that if they did become rental units that they might not be managed as well as a single family home. So those were basically the four calls I had received today. To kind of address some of that and also got a little further in the report, I'd like to point out that if this entire parcel, the 13 1/2 acres stayed with the R1 zoning and was fully developed you could get approximately 80 single family lots on this acreage and that's about 7,200 square feet of lot which is what our code would require. That equates to about six units per acre. Now this isn't a plan development or anything, but what was being proposed by the petitioner, again, is 22 single family lots and 22 single family homes. Albeit they're 11 buildings with that shared wall. Those, I had mentioned, range from about 8,000 to 12, 13,000 square feet lots. That equates to 1.6 units per acre. So as far as density goes, this proposal primarily because of all the conservation area is far less dense than a typical single family development might be. In your packet you should also received a memo from our Department of Public Works traffic engineer, Dave Hanson. We did ask him to take a look at this development and give his opinion on traffic and if the roadways could handle this. He did provide that analysis. He stated basically, and that is in your packet again, but much more detailed than say now, but that both Superior and Sitka are collector streets. They're designed to take in a lot more traffic than 22 units. They would also be able to take in traffic from other development within the area. He also wanted to point out as far as speeding goes, that typically once an area is developed where you have buildings, driveways, speeds usually slow down, that right now the street is wide, designed almost as a quote, unquote racetrack. And when it's unfettered speeds typically pick up. So speeding might actually be decreased with development. And then he also wanted to point out as far as safety goes when the development takes place sidewalks are gonna be required to be put in. So sidewalks side of Superior up to Sitka and then on both sides of the Sitka Street, both the north and south side the full length of the development proposal. So those concerns of people walking in the street at this point wouldn't necessarily be a major concern. He basically summarized it saying that he did not have any concerns with traffic or capacity for the roadways. With that, that's what's being

proposed. The next slide that I have on here are conceptual. There you go. These were supplied by the petitioners. These were conceptual designs or conceptual elevations that could go on those lots. Again, this isn't a planned development or anything. This is just a straight rezone. But this is the intent. These types of buildings are the intent of the petitioner. In talking with his applicant, the real goal here is to do a zero lot line, zero maintenance type home, almost like a condo except that you would own your own lot. So you wouldn't have to cut the grass or dress any of the exterior, kind of geared towards empty nesters, retirees who still wanna have that single family home but not necessarily have so much maintenance. So that was kind of the concept of what the three potential buildings could be that would go up. And as you see the one on the top has a shared garage. The ones on the bottoms do not. They have a shared interior wall. And that is that.

- I want to remind you that this is a public hearing, and it has been properly posted. And the public notification has been published in the Green Bay Press Gazette. The Plan Commission is interested in hearing public comments on the subject. We invite your comments. And we ask that after your name has been called you state your address, whether you represent a group or association, whether you favor, oppose or are only providing information on this matter, and then offer your comments or concerns. We do ask that you confine your testimony to facts related to this particular proposal and avoid repetitive testimony and please do address the Plan Commission with your comments. I neglected to do this before, but fortunately we did it anyhow. I am going to be asking first of all for any of those who wish to speak in favor of the proposal. Then I will ask for those who wish to speak in opposition to the proposal. And then finally for anybody who wishes to provide information only. And we will now open the public hearing on the request to rezone the areas of the 2900 block of Sitka Street from low density residential to medium density residential and conservancy district as submitted by Joel Ariff, Mach 12 Engineering and Surveying LLC on behalf of Green Viper Inc, property owner. So is there anybody who wishes to speak in favor of the proposal?

- I believe so. I believe we have Joe Erforth who would like to speak. So I'm gonna turn him on first.

- Okay. Mr Erforth, please, your address. Yes.

- 2260 Salsreiger Court with Mach IV Engineering and Surveying. We're representing the developer in this application. I guess I'd just like to kinda piggyback a little bit on what Mr. Buck mentioned. And really the intent of this project is to deliver a product that is currently in high demand in the market, particularly in the east side of Green Bay. And that demand is really a single family home that has basically zero exterior maintenance. So this is gonna be very analogous to a condo development, but rather this is a homeowners association. So these are the zero lot line single family homes with the homeowners association which is primarily set up to handle the exterior maintenance. It's a very high demand. What we're seeing is a lot of young professionals are purchasing these homes and a lot of snowbirds basically or folks that are looking to downsize but still want a nice place, still have a lot of stuff, but still want the freedom not to be tied to mowing the lawn or shoveling the snow and be able to take off for a couple of months at this time of year, what have you. So the intent is to basically build two or three of these units. Sell them. Build two or three of these units and then sell them and I guess basically be pairs of units in our situation. But it would be a single family use. I heard that was one of the concerns. But these are intended to be used as a single family home. I think most folks most know that the developer actually lives in the neighborhood. He's got a very good track record of building high quality developments in that neighborhood and has a very high vested interest in maintaining the integrity of the neighborhood as well. And he shares all those concerns as well as the traffic and the pedestrian safety. It's very vital to him as well. I think Mr. Hanson, he in the report addressed the traffic where actually has the potential to probably increase safety in his

opinion. And then the city is in the process of reconstructing Sitka Street as currently. And they should be finishing that up this year, I believe. And Sitka as well as Superior is set up for sidewalks. So the sidewalks that are typically pulled. They're put in as a condition of occupancy. So those will progress down Sitka Street like any other subdivision in the city, so. I guess once you get to that point we'll be available for comments as well. But that's what I wanted to kinda reiterate on some of the stuff Mr. Buck had talked about.

- Thank you very much. Does anyone else wish to speak in favor of this proposal? I'm looking for any raised hands or signals of a raised hand. And I'm not seeing any. Are you Kevin?

- I am not. I will unmute for a moment and let you ask your question again. So it might get a little bit crowded for a second.

- Thank you. Does anybody else wish to speak in favor of the proposal? Once again we have the number 603200987, but I'm only hearing some general chatter rather than an individual voice. I'm very sorry. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak in favor of this proposal? Then is there anyone who wishes to speak in opposition to the proposal? And I'm looking for a hand raised or?

- Yes I will let Alder Corpus-Dax speak first. And then followed by a Dave C. And then followed by a Rose Rottier. So I'll do Alder Corpus-Dax first.

- Thank you. I'm just reading off an email that I received as well today from a resident, Becky and Gary Oeder at, I'm sorry if I butchered the name, it's o-e-d-e-r, 414 Easy Street. They moved in there this past fall. It was mainly due to the type of neighborhood. "We wanted to express "our view of rejection of this proposal. "It would change the makeup "and density of this area. "Please do not let this pass. "Thank you, Gary and Becky." And that is all that I have for the moment.

- Thank you. And Kevin the next person you wish to recognize.

- Next up is a Dave C, and he'll be followed by a Rose .

- So Dave C.

- [David] Okay, yes, my name is David Catalano. I live presently on Beth Drive. I'm presently the president of the McAuliffe Park Neighborhood Association. Let you know that I too received a number of people's commenting on not wanting to go to R2, to stay as R1. And I attended the meeting that was take place a number of years ago where there was opposition as well to this proposal. One thing is the fact, even though they're single or dual, I guess you'd call them, double condos, whatever type of thing, is that even though they are, they still look like a duplex as well. So it's one of those modern things. Two is you look at 'em. Our neighborhood association presently has over 77 duplexes within our neighborhood association alone. And in that same area that's hard to kind of Gilbert there's a four out of the three them right there for sure as well as one . Two of them next door to me and one across the street. I have no problem with the residents themselves, okay. It's just that the as you look at it when you're coming to buy a house and sell a house it generally gives that classification that some people won't find desirable. That's the one thing. And so I agree with everybody in the neighborhood there who are in opposition to it. Two other things, one is the conservancy zone, being mostly dry grass, I don't see any method of the fire department getting into a landlocked area such as this, has some property all the way around it. There's no access for a fire truck to get in case of grass fires as well. That would be a concern if I was there. Plus, you have people who are having charcoal or whatever putting it out in the grass, and how you gonna stop that? I understand that at first there won't be all houses. Eventually, they'll be empty lots. But the results all locked in. What

are you gonna do? The other item I have too is they're talking about the RI staying behind the houses on Gilbert. Are they going to just automatically get that property. And if they are gonna automatically get it, who's paying the taxes on it? the taxes on additional property without the request. That's another concern of mine as well. Outside of that I guess just the number of density of those type of homes, I guess, is the key. So hope you receive that well. I wanna thank Mr. Buck for his comments, the email as well and that way too, and also then our Alder Veronica too. I thank her for her input as well for that. And thank you very much for this opportunity.

- Thank you very much. And Mr. Vonck if you would recognize the other person.

- Yes, next up will be a Rose Rottier, followed by Jolene Bartlett. So next up is Rose.

- So Ms. Rottier you have been unmuted so we can hear you, if you would care to share with us your, first of all, your address and whether you represent a group or association.

- [Rose] This is Rose Rottier. My address is 2952 Gilbert Drive. And I have my husband, Patrick, here with me. And we both wanna say that we agree with what Dave said, president for the neighborhood. We oppose this and we do not want it. We want to keep it as a RI.

- And could you provide us with your reasons for that, and I say that because as a matter of state law this is not a matter of voting by current residents. We're not allowed to simply say, okay, most people don't want it or most people do. But we are allowed to consider your reasons for your opposition.

- [Patrick] Because we have plenty of duplexes in the area already. We really don't need anymore. We just like to see it single family homes.

- Thank you Mr. Rottier. And Ms. Rottier.

- [Rose] Thank you.

- Thank you very much. And you said one other person Mr. Vonck.

- Yes, next up I have a Jolene Bartlett. So she's on.

- Hi. This is Jolene Bartlett. I live at 2989 Beth Drive, Challenger dead ends on Beth Drive. And my concerns are the traffic that's gonna come in as all the safety due to no sidewalks in our area. So coming from Green Bay proper, Challenger's the first entrance into this area. And there are no sidewalks there. And to get back into that neighborhood there are no sidewalks. And there are a lot of families that walk here. And currently the traffic that comes in on Challenger to Beth do not pay attention to the stop sign that is there. So we already have issues with speeding and traffic. So those are my main concerns, the road conditions and no sidewalks for safety purposes.

- Thank you Ms. Bartlett. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak on this matter in opposition?

- I do not see anyone raising their hand, so I will unmute for a moment. So excuse the chaos.

- Anybody else who wishes to speak? You'll have to say your name loudly so we can get it over the. I'm sorry we're still not able to hear whoever. Why don't you mute just that one Kevin, and then let's ask the question again, just so we don't miss anybody--

- Sure I'll do that one more time.

- Okay. Does anybody wish to speak? I don't hear anybody identifying themselves. So I'd ask if anybody wishes to speak or offer information only. Okay, hearing none, I declare that the public hearing is now closed, and we will move on to the final item of our agenda, which is consideration with possible action on the request to rezone areas of the 2900 block of Sitka Street from low density residential to medium density residential and conservancy district, submitted by Joel Aros, Mach IV Engineering and Surveying, LLC, on behalf of Green Viper Inc, property owner. And I would ask if Mr. Buck has anything further that he needs to share with us, apart from the recognition that is now on the screen of the staff where we approved the request.

- It was all I was gonna add.

- Very good. Thank you very much Dave. Let's just have a motion please to open the floor. Or pardon me, are there any questions first of all for Mr. Buck from the Plan Commission?

- Commissioner Hanson.

- Yeah I did have a couple questions. Dave you had said about the two acres that are to the south portion of that, that was going to remain R1 and that they were gonna allow those homeowners to possibly buy the land. I think the one gentleman brought up a good point about are they just gonna give it to them, and then their responsible for the property taxes. I guess that's my first question.

- Mr. Erfert Pelly have much better knowledge on that. It's my understanding they plan to deed those over for a dollar. And then yes the new purchasers would have to pay property tax, but being that they're unbuildable rear yards, typically that isn't very much.

- So I guess is there a reason why they didn't just decide to make that whole section of that area conservancy versus keeping portion of it, 'cause it doesn't look like it's a straight line border that you used?

- Sure the reason you would leave the R1 zoning is so if they just do a quick claim deed that those two properties could attach together, the out lots and the lots on Gilbert. If it had a different zoning, they'd have to rezone it to match their housing lot.

- Okay.

- So that's why we left it R1 or it's not being requested to be rezoned outside of R1 so it could be attached to the lots to the south.

- Okay. And then the other question I had was about if this were to stay R1, the entire section, and it was sectioned out, you said that they're could be up to 80 single family homes.

- Up to 80 minus the roads. So I obviously can't design the roads. That would take up some property but you're probably pretty safe to be around 60 at the minimum lot size required by code.

- Okay. And this is a proposed development for 11 twindos, so 22 dwellings with the homeowners association.

- Correct.

- Okay.
- Now none of that can be conditioned on the zoning. However that is what was in the application and what the petitioner has presented to us.
- Okay. All right, thank you very much.
- You're welcome.
- Do any other commissioners have questions to ask Mr. Buck?
- Yes Chair, Commissioner Miller does. And then I think the applicant, Mr. Erforth is available to answer questions. I don't know if you wanna ask him first or ask the commissioners first.
- May I suggest that we get our questions to the staff first and then we'll open for public comment, and that could be Mr. Erforth? So Mr. Miller first of all.
- Hey, Dave just some clarification on the current zoning. I know it's all in there as RI, but in terms of if a developer were to come in, there would be some steps along in terms of dividing all the parcels out and other things that would happen here prior to a whole RI neighborhood coming in. It wouldn't happen overnight or would a developer have every availability at this point to begin that process or would there be some other obstacle in the way?
- Well they would have to do a subdivision plat. But beyond that, if the zoning is in place, yeah they could just come in and do an administrative subdivision plat working with public works to design the roadway system and split off the lots. Alternatively they could just split off all the lots along the front edges right now that have street access and develop those with singles right now as well.
- Bouncing off of that, is there a single owner to the extent of what we're looking at right now or is it divided out at all?
- It is not divided out. It's owned by a single owner by Green Viper Inc, just a corporation.
- And what I'm kinda getting at here is if this proposal were to be shot down, I am assuming whoever owns the property right now will look at alternative options. And my first guess would be they'd looking at RI options, so kinda just getting the scope of possibilities out there, especially for the neighbors that are interested. And what may happen to this area is this is one direction, but shooting this down does not mean that the property is gonna be left untouched and nothing else will happen there and kinda . Lisa had mentioned the other option here is maybe 60 to 80 single family homes which is actually a worse problem in terms of traffic. So I know there are certainly saw a position based on just the zoning, but there's alternatives I think that might be available. And I just wanna make sure that was framed up correctly.
- Correct, yep, that's framed up very well. The other thing, I guess, I would add is as far as staff goes, we'd like to see a little bit more density than just the 22 units on there. Maybe not popular to say but that's a pretty low number of units for that much acreage. However this is a unique housing product, relatively unique and probably in pretty high demand. Plus the privately owned conservancy area is pretty intriguing. There are sometimes whole subdivisions designed specifically to have those. They're called conservation by design. This isn't quite that, but it's the same concept, having privately owned open space. So that's intriguing to us as well.

- Anything else Commissioner Miller?

- Nope that answers what I had right there.

- Thank you. Any other commissioner with a question for the staff.

- Sure, I can just also chime in I think to Mr. Buck's comments about staff support for density. Look I think you see, this is Director Vonck by the way, definitely a champion for density in terms of using the land that we have properly but also, I mean, we are severely behind on housing units in the city. We don't have a lot coming online every year. And so when we try to get additional housing units on, we're trying to get as many as possible, and with that I think the other thing we look at is diversifying the housing products that we have. And so I think what we like here is that it's a different type product. May seem somewhat similar to some other things in the community, but it's adding to the mix. And of course, we'll talk later during. We're in the midst of a housing study about just what exactly we need. So in terms of the housing piece, yes, I mean there's definitely a need for additional housing units in our community. So with that you also have Alder Corpus-Dax.

- Thank you. I have a question here. I don't feel as previously discussed that this had come through or the development for this area had come through planning before. How did that differ from what's currently being proposed? Does anyone know, as far as when that came through before.

- I don't know when that came through. It may have been just neighborhood discussions with the property owner. I don't know. Paul do you have any recollection? It hasn't been in my two years here.

- Nothing in the recent past. I think there's been concepts, but nothing that I can think of that was officially submitted.

- Okay so nothing officially ever came through planning. It was just the developer reaching out to residents.

- Possibly with some concepts, sure.

- Okay.

- Perhaps we can check that with the developer in just a minute. Did you have any other questions Alder Corpus-Dax?

- Yes, David I wonder if you could elaborate a little bit more on the information that our traffic engineer provided regarding the increase in safety or reduction in speed by adding these units, 'cause, I mean, it doesn't sound like that would actually happen, but he did provide some information in there.

- He did. And I'll just kinda read it to you. "The speeding is likely a concern "in the area as common as wide open areas "with little or no driveway access points usually lends "to a more speed friendly operating environment. "Adding development, especially tightly spaced homes "with driveways, then the roadside characteristics "typically lead to reduced speeds. "Both roads are also in the safe walk "and bike plan as signed routes "with shared lane markings "which is also known to calm traffic." So what he's getting at is sort of a concept that if you build it really big and really wide and wide open, it sort of promotes increased speeds. Often things used to calm traffic, they call it traffic calming, is introduction of visual stimulus. So that can be houses.

It can be driveways. It can be tall trees. Sometimes they do physical changes. They chicane the street or the curb the street around always to slow down, to psychologically have people go slower. And I think what he's getting at is there's nothing on either side of the street. They're wide drive lanes. And it just promotes speeding itself. So I think what Dave is trying to say is that as it develops out there you'll get more of a feel that this is an area that I can go 50 miles an hour in. And then of course the signs also showing what the speed limit is.

- Okay.

- Thank you, and I would ask another question for clarification Mr. Buck, if you could. What's the difference between this semi-detached combination and a regular duplex?

- Sure. A regular duplex is gonna be two housing units on one lot. So generally you have one lot owner and two units on it. So they can be owner occupied. But they're more often than not not owner occupied. In this scenario with the semi-detached single family. Each lot is owned with their own housing unit. So those two things go together. Now could I buy two of them and own two lots and then rent them both out? Yes I could. You could do that with a single family home as well. So really physically they kinda look the same. Ownership is a lot different, because you own the property around it as well of your unit.

- I think you've spoken to that before, and I apologize for making you repeat, but I was still having trouble figuring it out. Thank you.

- Great.

- Any other questions from the commission to the staff? Then there were a couple questions that clearly should go to Mr. Erforth, and I'd ask Commissioner Hanson to help us in opening the floor.

- Move to open the floor.

- Thank you. And do we have a second?

- Second.

- Thank you from Alder Corpus-Dax. Anybody opposed to opening the floor? That being the case, the floor is now open. And I would ask Joel Erforth to help us out with questions that were raised that we couldn't answer, if Director Vonck could open his mic.

- Sure. Yes Mr. Erforth will be up first. And then we also have another hand up from Jolene Bartlett to follow.

- Very good thank you.

- Thanks. I guess I can start with the taxes on those homes that you had asked about on Gilbert. What we had done is we'd sent them all. I guess I'll back up. What inspired or started the thought process on keeping that R was most of those houses on that south side, because that lots been undeveloped for a number of years, have been mowing the grass. I think there's a fair amount of landscaping. There's a shed. Some folks are actually using it for coming in off of Superior parking like a bullock, I believe, or campers or something along those lines in the back. Rather than create a ruckus within the neighborhood what we did is we approached each one of them and said the developers willing to, we'll develop the legal descriptions. We'll draft quick claim deeds for you. We'll sell it to you. We'll pay for all that. Sell it to you in exchange for a

dollar. And then we touched base with the city treasurer to get an estimated amount of their in-tax tax decrease and made it clear to them that here's what it is. You're responsible for verifying it. This is our good faith estimate on what your tax increase will be. And would you like to purchase the property or not? What we wanted to do was square off that whole south line, not impose on these folks to have to remove all their fences and all their landscaping. Let them keep what they've been using and then come up with an equitable solution. And all of them on that south line have agreed to do that. So we're just wading through, obviously we gotta get through this process and the platting and so forth. And then we can turn that over to those folks. The one gentleman brought up a very good point, I guess, with the grass fires that I quite honestly hadn't thought of it. But when we do the plat this is the first step of the process. It's just the rezoning. When we bring forth the plat we can put an easement between a couple of the houses and gain access that way should they ever need it. I think there actually is an easement off of Robert Lane. But we can find a home for a swath in here to get to the back. To answer the question has this been brought forward before, I don't recall. It's been probably four or five years. We've started the process a number of years ago, but there were some delays on the city's end as far as reconstructing Sitka Street and getting the storm water pond in place. And until those were done, for example, there was no sanitary sewer or water available. And we couldn't do anything with the storm water till the city built the pond. It never really went beyond some preliminary planning stuff. So it's never come forward in this official a fashion before.

- Thank you. Were there any other questions that anybody wishes to ask Mr. Erforth? Does anybody else wish to speak to this issue before we go further with our discussion and action? Anybody--

- So I have next up Jolene, followed by then a Debbie have their hands raised. So I will turn on Jolene Bartlett next.

- Thank you Ms. Bartlett. Thank you for waiting.

- [Jolene] Hi when we talk about speed I'm concerned about the speed coming on Beth Drive going through to the neighborhood, not once you're in the neighborhood. Also looking at the Bear Creek Parkway roads, because I've lived here since 1986. And back in the late '80s, early '90s, they talked about putting apartment complexes back there. And one of the main concerns at that time as well was traffic going through the Bear Creek Parkway. That the roads wouldn't be able to handle that. And I don't know if there is something in the plans for that as well.

- I'm not sure who to call on. We'll hold that question, and we can ask it at the end of this question session.

- Okay thank you.

- And you said a Debbie. I see Debbie's iPad down here.

- Yes this Debbie, so I'll unmute her. And if she could, yeah, state her full name and address for the record.

- Thank you.

- [Debbie] Hi, I'm Debbie Tassel on 440 Easy Street. And I have a question for Mr. Erforth and maybe even some of the other commission members. Would you object to 22 duplex dwellings dropped in your backyard, doubling the population that you had had over single dwellings?

- And you are asked to address your remarks to the Plan Commission. Is there anything you wish to say?

- [Debbie] That is my question. How would you feel having these dropped in your , each one of you. How would you feel about having these put in your backyard, doubling the population that normally would be there for a single family dwelling?

- I will be happy to address that when we return to regular order of business. You have anything else you want us to keep in mind.

- [Debbie] No that's what I have in mind with we have limited amount of access unto here. And you can't even get out on Superior for three hours in the morning, three hours in the afternoon. And now you wanna double what the population should be in that area. And I did email both our Veronica Corpus-Dax, and I emailed the speaker with these questions. I didn't know if I heard them actually addressed.

- And Mr. Buck did provide us with a compendium of various things that were sent to him.

- [Debbie] Okay.

- So thank you very much. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak? Then I would be happy to entertain a motion to close the floor and return to regular order of business.

- Motion to close the floor, Lisa Hanson.

- Thank you Commissioner Hanson. And a second to that motion?

- Second.

- Thank you Alder Corpus-Dax. Any objections to returning to regular order of business? None that I can see or hear. So we will do so. I wonder, Kevin, on the slides would you put up the slide that shows the various lots all the way through this area?

- So I'll put them up right now.

- Okay. I do want to address personally the question that was asked. I'm noticing that, as I run along these lots, there a total of 10 from here to here. If I go up here, what I'm seeing is six, nine, 12, 13, so three additional lots. It's not that large a difference, and I'm seeing that these lots and these lots are both on major collector streets rather than running all the way through the development. So no, I would not have any difficulty, if I were one of the people living along here and these smaller single family dwellings were built. I wonder if any other members of the commission would care to address that particular question? Any other discussion from members of the commission?

- We have Alder Corpus-Dax. First, you go ahead. Yep, Commissioner Petrouske and then Alder Corpus-Dax.

- Very good.

- I'm comfortable answering the question, because I actually live in a zero lot line house and in the downtown area off of Van Buren by the CVS and Main Street. And I can tell you that the complex that I'm in is 10 units. There's an additional four that have been put in the down street. And then I believe there's an additional 14 more going in. And I think that if you talk to anyone

in the neighborhood, they would objectively agree that it's been an incredible improvement for the Whitney Park District. It's really increased the vibrancy and diversity of people who are living down here. We have everything in our block from people who are retired to young professionals, a family with children in high school. There's a nurse who lives here. There's a professor at NWTC. It's really been a tremendous improvement for this particular part of the community. So that's my two cents on how these different style of living for people who don't necessarily either have time or the desire to deal with a traditional yard have experienced.

- All right, Alder Corpus-Dax.

- Yes this question is for Joel. I know that you had mentioned that these are gonna be targeted towards young professionals and snowbirds. Do you have any idea on what the potential price point is for these units?

- Kevin can you unmute--

- Yes I will. Yep he's unmuted.

- Okay. I don't know. I honestly don't know what the price point would be. Usually they're gonna be very comparable to any other single family home of that size. So you're usually looking, on today's day and age, hard to build anything for, by the time you buy a lot or it's really hard to build anything for under 250, \$300,000. Right now what we're hearing anyway is building cost for a new home is about \$190 a square foot. Plus you thrown in a lot. So you're probably, I would guess, entry level is at least 250, I would anticipate.

- Okay. Thank you.

- Sure, that's just a guess, but.

- Thank you.

- Sure I can maybe offer a little bit of a context. I mean, ultimately we're dealing with a zoning issue here tonight. I do know that the county does share on their website, and I'll see real fast. One second here. Where is it? Recent sales. If you look at some of the in there. Sales over the last year have gone, at the low end, from \$150,000 up into the high end, 250, 280, a few 300s in there. So I mean, ultimately, it depends on the ultimate build out and finish. And with that I think, again, as we've discussed before, one of our interests in terms of the recommendation is as a new housing product that's not offered in this area and not offered in this neighborhood. And I think a larger planning goal that we've discussed is making sure in these neighborhoods, in a way by diversity of housing options and then are really trying to be reflective of what's out in the market. I think the number of sales that have been out here have been good and healthy, just speaking anecdotally. I don't live out there, but for those who do are saying they don't last on the market very long. So in terms of it's a very desirable place to live. And so with that I think it'll be just some context in terms of where those numbers might be for the neighborhood.

- Thank you.

- And then it's Commissioner Miller.

- Yeah, I guess I just wanna throw a couple of comments in, and I think the couple before me kind of made some good ones, so I'll just jump off and here quickly, but. As someone who recently had to go through the home buying process as a young professional, it's difficult, especially to find things that are gonna be more affordable like these are, with smaller lots, and

I'm not sure exactly the set up that's gonna be there. But having a variety of housing options is something that Green Bay sorely lacks. So I'm happy to see something like this is being proposed, especially in the area on the east side which doesn't really have a whole lot of variety quite like this. So it's good to see that. It seems to be the biggest concern is traffic, which is not something that we're unfamiliar with. It seems like whenever there's any multi-family or little bit more dense type of residential development we see a lot of similar complaints with traffic and speed and a lot of those aspects. So nothing new there. It seems to be a common concern. What strikes me as a little different though is it seems like it's a fairly big concern already. And while I don't think this particular development will cause immense more strain it does sound like there's some concerns within the neighborhood that are already happening. And it's just a matter of time before these open parcels get filled in. So if there's concerns about traffic now, they should probably be looked at and discussed at the community level at what can be done. In terms of the capacity of the streets, I appreciate the traffic engineer Wayne in advance versus us having to request that. It's good foresight to know that was probably gonna be coming with the concerns there. So I trust his judgments on this. And obviously the neighborhood was built with this area intended to be filled in. So the streets were built with that same consideration as well too. So I don't have a concern there, but there is a perception within the neighborhood that it does appear to need to be addressed in some way, whether it's via traffic cameen or other measures. I think that's a little separate from what we're talking about here, but it definitely does seem like a concern for the neighbors.

- Perhaps Mr. Buck can convey that perception back to the Department of Public Works with our thanks for the analysis earlier. Thank you. Anybody else on the Plan Commission wish to offer any points? Do we have a motion?

- Alder Corpus-Dax, I think.

- So just a couple of comments here. I appreciate all of the residents who contacted myself and David sent emails, called, voicing their concerns regarding this development. Completely empathize and understand where they're coming from, that property or that piece of land as well as across north of Sitka had sat empty. North of Sitka was, I think, farmland for so long and then just sat empty for so long. So the potential for all of this development coming up now. I mean, I would be concerned as well. What I would prefer, if I were a resident in that area, would to have is few housing units as possible to be added. So here where the developer is requesting 22 two single family lots with an R2 zone versus what could potentially be R1 and anywhere from 60 to 80 single family homes. I would prefer the less dense, because that's gonna mean, in my opinion, less traffic. Absolutely agree that there is speeding issues in that area. I'm told that this district is one of the worst, because of how those streets were constructed, wide. Superior, Sitka, Deckner, Newberry, all of those streets, they're constructed wide for both motorists and cyclists and pedestrians. And what you have is you have a lot of motorists running down, speeding down the street. So I understand that, and I experience that as well. For all the potential that R2 could provide as far as different housing units, I would rather see this twindo type development with zero maintenance exterior. You have a potential for a housing association to be a part of that. I like that idea. I think it brings a little bit more piece of mind than to have just these random duplexes built up that anyone could go and purchase and turn around and rent them out. These have the, my understanding, and the intention of being owner occupied versus someone coming in and renting 'em out. Again, to answer Debbie's question, would I want this. I would prefer this over a potential of 60 to 80 housing units under an R1 zoning. So I don't think this vote lightly. I get it. I understand where the residents are coming from. But this just to me seems like the better option here. Thank you.

- Thank you. Anybody else on the commission have any other comments or--

- Commissioner Hanson has her hand raised.

- Thank you Commissioner Hanson.

- Hi. And kind of piggybacking off of Veronica's point. But I appreciate the staff would prefer to have something more dense. And RI would actually keep it possibly more dense, but I kind of appreciate that the developer has that conservancy area in the back for whatever purpose that or however that's gonna be set up. But yeah, I mean, the 22 or 11 twindos is definitely less dense than having 60 to 80 homes. I guess that was just what I wanted to add. Someone's distracting me over here, so.

- I like both your four legged and your two legged guests. Thank you Lisa.

- Thank you.

- Anybody else? Do we have a motion?

- Lisa Hanson, I would move to approve.

- And a second?

- I'll second.

- And Jake Miller seconds. Any further comments? Then all run across the top here. I will vote in favor. And Commissioner Hanson?

- Aye.

- Commissioner Miller?

- Aye.

- Commissioner Petrouske?

- Aye.

- Alder Corpus-Dax?

- Aye.

- Then the vote is unanimous to approve the recommendation of the staff. I want to add my thanks to those that have already been expressed for those people from the neighborhood who came to express their concerns. And I trust that Mr. Erforth will be happy to take those and consider in any ways in which they can be accommodated further. But the thoughtfulness of the design looks very good to me. I would remind you that this will be coming to the Common Council on what date again Mr. Buck?

- This would be the next council meeting which I believe is the 21st.

- Okay, so you'll want to be there Mr. Erforth to represent your client at that time. And any of you who wish to share your concerns with members of the city council will want to attend that meeting too on the 21st. So our next item on the agenda is informational, the director's report. Director Vonck. You'll have to--

- Thanks very much. So number one, thank you. I think this went over pretty well. I really do appreciate everyone taking the time to get involved with the technology, a quick learning curve. Also appreciate members of the public. I think that's why we nixed the last council or the Plan Commission meeting. We weren't quite sure how to do public hearings and saw what's in the balance of doing them legally. But working with our law department and here think we went through a pretty good process in making sure that those who wanted to be able to speak had an opportunity to speak. And so I thank members of the public for doing that. And just to our team here learning all this, right being doing this virtually. We've all had to learn over the last few weeks. I think there's probably a lot more pressure, because there is no down time. If your camera is on, you're on all the time. And I'm sure Dr. Fauci will probably scold us, because I don't realize how many times I touch my face and everybody else touches their face. Right now, right, I'm pointing at Dave and Jake and just gone around and saying, oh my gosh, it really does happen. So yeah, thank you for doing that. I know you got comfortable doing Zoom. We're gonna be working with our IT department potentially for our next meeting. We may be moving to a different platform, GoToMeeting. So you guys got this one in the bag. So we're using our quarantine time for technology training. So we may have another one coming your way. Again, I think don't be shy about reaching out. If you wanna go through and do a test meeting beforehand, I think tonight's set up worked pretty well. And we were able to get through all those items there. And then just quick notes, in terms of sharing, 'cause I have totally no idea, right, what month or day it is. But the last time we met was February 24th. So going back meeting those items went to Common Council Tuesday March 3rd, which seems like an eternity ago. But with that the public hearings were held about the PUD. That was for the sign at Green Bay Packaging. And then part of closing portions of Acme Street, Lawrence Street to public traffic. So the PUD went through. I think the planning still has one more holding period that has to be open. But that'll be coming back. Those both went through. And in terms of the Plan Commission report, I'm gonna just get down there a little bit, sorry. I'm just doing this, so I make sure I don't forget anything here. So the Planning Commission back from February 24th, the PUD as far as the billboard, went for by the Festival Foods and Burger King. That was not polled. So that item was upheld as denied. And then we did for 1860 was Mason Street from C1 to C2. That's the infamous Popeye's that's coming down on West Mason. And then the CUP for the lid work units at 815, 827 South Monroe. That's the photography studio. That also went through. And then just held over things that went for second council meeting. There's a special one that was just addressing some emergency things. Gives me going through here. Just for public hearings the final hearing for the zoning for the Popeye's on West Mason went through. Also with the final resolution, we had enough time to get that through. And then we didn't meet for Plan Commission, so there's no additional items on there. So with that, again, all of our meetings have moved virtually. So we'll be looking here at meeting again in two weeks, potentially on a different platform. And I do wanna say to also just to shout out to all of our staff in the department. We're pretty much doing everything that we have been doing before with the exception of, I think, liquor license inspections is the only thing we can't do, because we can't go into a premises. But we're still continuing to process site plans, zoning and plus other things, requests for city action. So we'll keep doing business, because things don't stop just because you have to stay at home. So we'll continue to do that. We really appreciate everyone taking the time to help us keep things moving at the city. That's all I have for this evening, Madame Chair.

- Thank you. Can you hear me by chance?

- I can.

- Good, because my screen is no longer showing anything, but can hear you. So I would note that the date of our next meeting is scheduled for April 27, in two weeks and ask if there's a motion to adjourn.

- Move to adjourn, Lisa Hanson.
- And a second?
- Can I request a point of privilege before we adjourn?
- Yes.
- I'd like to congratulate Alder Corpus Dax on her reelection.
- Yes, indeed thank you.
- Unofficially.
- Thanks.
- That's lovely. Thank you so much.
- And I would second the motion.
- Thank you. I believe that's Commissioner Petrouske.
- Yes.
- Okay. Any objections to adjournment?
- No, but just a quick comment. I think I've figured out that issue with that other line. Do you notice that number is the same number as our meeting number that kept chiming in?
- Oh yes, thank you.
- I don't know how that happened, but that's the exact same number that the meeting number is.
- I was just waiting for a Zoom bomb at any moment. So I was prepared to abort, but it just sounded like somebody set their phone on and then just whatever happened. But we made it work, so thank you. Good call.
- Thanks for that little bit of sleuthing. I just noticed it wasn't enough digits for a phone number. Okay, so no objections to adjournment. I declare us adjourned. And thank you all very much for your patience with this.
- All right, thank you.