



MINUTES OF THE GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 2021, 6:00 PM
Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

I. This item contains documents which provide call in information and instructions for the Zoom Meeting.

B. ROLL CALL.

I. Members: Lisa Hanson - Chair, Jacob Miller – Vice-Chair, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, Sidney Bremer, Randall Petrouske, Derius Daniels and Autumn Linsmeier.

Members Present: Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Autumn Linsmeier, Derius Daniels, Randall Petrouske, and Sidney Bremer.

Others Present: Ald. Lynn Gerlach

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the January 11, 2021, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Autumn Linsmeier, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve the agenda for the January 11, 2021, meeting. Motion carried.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the November 23, 2020, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Sidney Bremer to approve the minutes from the November 23, 2020, meeting. Motion carried.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. (ZP 20-33) Consideration with possible action on the request of the Interim Director for the Department of Community and Economic Development to consider review and possible revocation of the Short Term Rental Permit (STRP-88) at 1135 Shadow Lane. (Ald. C. Wery, District 8)

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Derius Daniels to open the floor. Motion carried.

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

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Autumn Linsmeier to close the floor. Motion carried.

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

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Randall Petrouske to allow the property owner to continue to rent the subject property under the conditions of the Short Term Rental Permit (STRP). If further substantiated claims of violation are reported within the next 6 months, those violations shall be brought back before the Plan Commission for further consideration and potential action. Motion carried.

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

2. (ZP 20-34) Consideration with possible action on the request of the Interim Director for the Department of Community and Economic Development to consider review and possible revocation of the Short Term Rental Permit (STRP-41) at 1136 Shadow Lane. (Ald. C. Wery, District 8)

Moved by Jacob Miller, seconded by Sidney Bremer to open the floor. Motion carried.

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

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Jacob Miller to close the floor. Motion carried.

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

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Randall Petrouske to allow the property owner to continue to rent the subject property under the conditions of the Short Term Rental Permit (STRP). If further substantiated claims of violation are reported through December 31, 2021, those violations shall be brought back before the Plan Commission for further consideration and potential action. Motion carried.

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

3. (ZP 20-36) Public Hearing on the request to rezone parcels in the 1320-1330 Block of Perrot Street (Tax Parcels: 21-1466, 21-1467, 21-1468, 21-1469) from Varied Density Residential (R3) to General Commercial (C1), submitted by John J. Young, property owner. (Ald. K. Lefebvre, District 6)

Chair Lisa Hanson read into record the rules and procedures for the all public hearings and stated that all hearings have been properly posted and published.

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the public hearing on the request to rezone parcels in the 1320-1330 Block of Perrot Street (Tax Parcels: 21-1466, 21-1467, 21-1468, 21-1469) from Varied Density Residential (R3) to General Commercial (C1).

Chair Lisa Hanson asked three times if there was anyone who wished to speak. Hearing/seeing none, the public hearing was closed.

4. (ZP 20-36) Consideration with possible action on the request to rezone parcels in the 1320-1330 Block of Perrot Street (Tax Parcels: 21-1466, 21-1467, 21-1468, 21-1469) from Varied Density Residential (R3) to General Commercial (C1), submitted by John J. Young, property owner. (Ald. K. Lefebvre, District 6)

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Randall Petrouske to table until the next regular scheduled meeting. Motion carried.

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

5. (ZP 20-38) Public Hearing on the request to amend Zoning Ordinance 38-79 (East Town Mall) to allow Limited Production & Processing uses within the Planned Unit Development (PUD) at 2350 East Mason Street, submitted by GB Real Estate Investments LLC, property owner. (Ald. L. Gerlach, District 3)

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the public hearing on the request to amend Zoning Ordinance 38-79 (East Town Mall) to allow Limited Production & Processing uses within the Planned Unit Development (PUD) at 2350 East Mason Street.

Chair Lisa Hanson asked three times if there was anyone else who wished to speak. Hearing/seeing none, the public hearing was closed.

6. (ZP 20-38) Consideration with possible action on the request to amend Zoning Ordinance 38-79 (East Town Mall) to allow Limited Production & Processing uses within the Planned Unit Development (PUD) at 2350 East Mason Street, submitted by GB Real Estate Investments LLC, property owner. (Ald. L. Gerlach, District 3)

Moved by Jacob Miller, seconded by Sidney Bremer to open the floor. Motion carried.

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

Moved by Derius Daniels, seconded by Autumn Linsmeier to close the floor. Motion carried.

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

Moved by Randall Petrouske, seconded by Sidney Bremer to amend Zoning Ordinance 38-79 (East Town Mall) to allow Limited Production & Processing uses within the Planned Unit Development (PUD) at 2350 East Mason Street, subject to the draft Planned Unit Development (PUD). Motion carried.

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

7. (TA 20-04) Consideration with possible action on a request of Ald. V. Corpus-Dax to examine regulations regarding the current zoning code and "Drive Thru" or "Pickup" lanes, and the necessity of bypass lanes and/or menu boards.

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Randall Petrouske to direct staff to draft an amended ordinance to improve the functionality of drive throughs and include suggestions made by the Plan Commission. Motion carried.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Special Meeting to be held Thursday, January 21, 2021, at 6:00 p.m. for single item - (ZP 20-23) Consideration with possible action on the request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for Material Recovery Facility (Salvage Operation) at 1156 Velp Avenue. (Ald. R. Scannell, District 7)

2. Director's Report.

Interim Director Cheryl Renier-Wigg provided the Director's report.

3. Date of next meeting: Thursday, January 21, 2021 for special meeting and Monday, January 25, 2021 for next regular meeting.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Randall Petrouske to adjourn. Motion carried. Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Darius Daniels, Autumn Linsmeier, No- None, Abstain- None

VERBATIM MINUTES

- The commission, we'll go ahead and start with a roll call. Chair Lisa Hanson,
- Present.
- Vice chair Jacob Miller,
- Present.
- Alder Veronica Corpus-Dax,
- Present.
- Commissioner Sidney Bremer,
- Present.
- Commissioner Randall Petrouske, all right.
- Commissioner Darius Dan,
- Present.
- Commissioner Autumn Linsmeier,
- Present.
- Okay. Moving him with the approval of the agenda for the January 11th, 2021 meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission?
- I move approval.

- Woo, somebody beat me to it. Who was that? Autumn?

- I'll second it.

- Okay, so we have a motion by Commissioner Linsmeier and a second by Alder Corpus-Dax, any further discussion? It's been a long time since we've had a meeting All in favor?

- [Board] Aye.

- Any opposed? Alright, so that is approved. Moving on to the approval of the minutes from the November 23rd, 2020 meeting of the Green Bay plan commission.

- So moved.

- Second.

- The motion by Alder Corpus-Dax and a second by commissioner Bremer, all in favor?

- [Board] Aye

- Any opposed? All right, and moving on to regular business. Item number one, considering request of the interim director for the department of community and economic development, to consider review and possible revocation of the short-term rental permit at 1135, Shadow Lane.

- Thank you madam chair. This request, these two requests, the first and second items were before the plan commission back on November 23rd. At that time, the planning commission recommended approval to send those to the council. They were allowed to continue to operate the short term rentals, but was recommended for a six month probationary period, basically. So on December 1st, the council reviewed both of these requests at the request of the alderman. They'd been sent back to the planning commission for further consideration. You know, let's say to the council meeting that sounds like the alderman wanted to have residents another chance to talk to the planning commission and express their concerns. Maybe some weren't able to log in to the meeting or maybe some others had conflicts. So that's the reason why this item has come back before the planning commission, both of them. We kind of treat them as kind of back-to-back items or sister items, but they are two distinct items, they're different items that would have to be voted on separately again. Staff has no new further information to pass along regarding these items. Again, this would allow the neighbors to have another chance to share their input with the planning commission and to have a discussion about both items. So staff is reaffirming our recommendations for both items tonight, that's consistent with the November 23rd plan commission recommendation.

- Thank you, Paul. Is there any discussion amongst the commission? So there's no new information, go ahead and commissioner Bremer.

- Just to clarify, Paul is the owner of each property the same person, or are they two different owners?

- There are two different property owners.

- And they just happened to be across the street from each other?

- It's a coincidence, yes.

- Okay, thank you. And as I understand, by reaffirming the original recommendation it would be that probationary period. And when was the probationary period then start at such time as the accepted the recommendation?

- Right, so this would go back to the council for their consideration if they were to support some recommendation would be on the day that they made that decision.

- Thank you.

- Paul, quick question. I'm assuming if I remember correctly that the owners were on last time. Was this one of the properties that was actually up for sale at that time?

- I don't recall that, no. I don't recall that situation.

- Okay.

- I do know that one of the owners is online. I'm not sure about the other one at this point, but one property owner is here.

- Okay.

- Question two, if you don't mind.

- Go ahead.

- Paul, this isn't clarified, what was council's action on it? They just referred it back to us for more testimony?

- I believe so, there wasn't a whole lot of discussion. I think they had a lot of other items that night. They did have a lot of discussions. So I think as I recall, the Aldermen just wanted to give the neighbors another opportunity to discuss this with the plan commission, that's my recollection.

- Got it. Just want to make sure we're taking this up the right way tonight, if there's anything we're missing.

- Go ahead Alder Corpus-Dax.

- Yeah, I was under the impression from Alder Mary that he had more information that he was going to provide, but seeing the letter that he provided that's in the packet, it didn't look like there was anything additional that he provided. So, but that was his main concern was that he wanted to provide additional information.

- Okay. All right. So no new information, the recommendation isn't changed. And we talked to the owners last time on this on both properties I remember, okay.

- So I move that we open the floor so that we might hear from anybody who wishes specific item having to do with I'm trying to remember, which is which number?

- 1135.

- 1135 thank you.

- Second.

- Have a motion by Commissioner Bremer, and second by commissioner Daniels. All in favor.

- [Board] Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, so we are opening the floor for public testimony on this item, specifically the 1135, Shadow Lane. If you, would you come forward to speak if you would state your name and address, and please confine your testimony to three minutes please, like to speak on this item. Does it look like there's anyone that wants to speak on this item?

- Anybody out there on their phone? If you hit star six will unmute you and you can just request it then if there's anybody that's not on the video.

- Thank you David.

- You're welcome.

- I think I would like to say something, if you can hear me.

- Okay, please state your name and address for the record.

- My name is Jennifer Fisher, I live at 1124 Shadow Lane, my husband's name is Sean. Should I keep going?

- Yeah, you can go ahead with your testimony please.

- I just wanted, nothing illegal happened, I just wanted to state that the owners of that property had a couple of parties and they assumed that we called the police, but we did not. They were taking pictures of our house and my husband went outside and said "why are you taking pictures of our house?" And he said, "why did you call the cops on us?" And he said, "we didn't." And he wouldn't stop and talk, he walked away. And then he drove away and my husband tried to wave him down and say, you know, we didn't call the police, we just wanted to talk to him. And he made some kind of a hand gesture, I don't think he gave him the finger or anything like that. But we just wanted to say that we didn't call the police, we don't mind if people want to enjoy our neighborhood. We just want to have peace and quiet and to tell them that this is a residential area, we want it to be treated as such, this is where we live. I guess that's it really, I just don't wanna be treated like we're the enemy.

- Okay, thank you so much for your testimony.

- Thanks.

- Can I ask a quick question? What was the date of that incident?

- We might be able to find it, I don't remember offhand. It was actually the day I think they had the last band when they had the live band.

- It doesn't have to be an exact date but approximately how long ago was this? Are we talking the last couple of weeks or a couple months?

- No, it was months ago when there was going to be a packer game and they had a live band at the home and we happened to be outside and the police walked by and my husband was chatting with them. So they assumed that we called the police, but we did not.

- Gotcha. Thank you very much.

- Yep.

- Was there anyone else that wish to speak on this item? Okay, I would entertain a motion to close the floor.

- So moved.
- Second.
- A motion by commissioner Bremerton, second by commissioner Linsmeier. All in favor?
- [Board] Aye.
- Any opposed? All right, is there any discussion amongst the commission?
- Just a question that I have, weren't at least one of these property owners new ish to the property? As in purchased it in the last year or so? Or am I misremembering that.
- I think it's possible I136, the other item may be a newer owner. I135 I think they've owned the property maybe for a couple of years. It was a rebuilding, it might be ownership of I136.
- Okay.
- I have notes from that the I135 was 2018, so that would be a couple of years, I guess now. Any further discussion?
- Sid has her hand up.
- I was trying to get recognized but I'm not quite sure where I am on the screen, I'm using a different one tonight, my apologies. Okay, what I'm understanding, I went back to the previous materials that Paul had put together for us when we considered this before. And it sounds as if the police were basically saying that the problems got resolved quickly, that the police felt that they could work things out with the owners so the problems would not recur. I'm surprised that there aren't any other people from the neighborhood, because I rather thought that the notion they wouldn't recur was just simply not enough to satisfy them since it sounds like the noises and the bands and the loud talk and the arguments and so on were very disturbing. But the police seem not to consider that to be grounds for considering it a public or chronic nuisance. With that advice, I don't see any reason for us to change our earlier approval of the recommendation from approval.
- I'd second that.
- Okay, we have a motion by commissioner Bremer and a second by commissioner Petroski. Anyone else have anything else to say regarding this?
- Maybe said they were the people looking at comment maybe are hanging onto the next item.
- Could be.
- If I remember correct, there was a little bit of a consternation about the I136 versus this one.
- I think you are-
- So maybe they're just hanging on politely until that item
- So for this item, I135, I move that we affirm the staff's recommendation and I believe that's what Randy seconded.
- That's correct.

- We'll go ahead with our roll call vote then. Vice chair, Miller.
- Aye.
- Alder Corpus-Dax
- Aye.
- Commissioner Bremer
- Aye.
- Commissioner Petroski,
- Aye.
- Commissioner Daniels.
- Aye.
- Commissioner Linsmeier.
- Aye.
- And I will also vote affirmative on this. So that's the unanimous vote going ahead to the next city council meeting on January 19th, okay, perfect.
- All right, and then moving on to item number two, considering shingle act on the request of the interim director for the department of Community and Economic Development to consider review and possible revocation of the short-term rental permit at 1136, Shadow Lane.
- Thank you, Madam chair. Again, just reaffirm our recommendation from the previous meeting.
- Anyone from the commission have questions for staff?
- if not, motion to open to floor.
- Second
- Motion by vice chair Miller and a second by commissioner Bremer to open the floor, all in favor?
- [Board] Aye.
- Any opposed? All right, and then with the floor open again, if you would just state your name and address confine your testimony to three minutes. And if you are on audio only, is star six to mute yourself.
- Mary chairman and fellow commission members, my name is James Regress senior. I live 1137, Thorndale street, right partly about 1136, Shadow Lane. Unfortunately for the neighborhood, this property has caused numerous problems. The police have been there numerous times, the department of public works has had to deal with this place numerous times. On one occasion, my family had to witness a person urinating in the backyard in front of us. Another night, late at night after the ordinance of the quiet time at night, a party of a bachelorettes were screaming, hollering and cussin' and cursing. You could hear it all over the neighborhood. That occurred not at one bachelor party, but at two separate bachelor parties on two separate weekends.

We're a neighborhood of people that have been living here 30, 40, 50 years in this neighborhood, it's a residential neighborhood. You know, we have, we having our grandchildren that come visit us and such. It just becomes, has become intolerable at that address. We never had problems until just last year, this last year with the summertime it was just out of hand too many times. What I like to see is instead of just having a six month on this because of football season, won't concur again till next Fall that we go until the end of the 2021 packer football season with observation of this property. Because right now there's a short-term renter in there, I think their house or somebody has to pay rent, but once the football season occurs again it's going to be like an Airbnb. And every weekend, a different group of people are coming here, they don't live there, they don't care about anything. They just come to have a good time and they leave and they cause trouble in our neighborhoods. So I would like to see this property have an extension under your observation and the planning commission up until the end of the 2021 packer football season. And I did thank you Madam chair and the commissioner for your time.

- Thank you very much for your testimony, Mr. McGrath. Is there anyone else wishing to speak on this item?

- I do believe that property owner was on or someone related to that. Now it would be a good time if you are on.

- Can you hear me?

- Yes.

- Okay, thank you. This is Drew Leatherberry, 461, West Briar Lane, Green Bay. I'm one of the three property owners. I did have a chance to present on our previous conversation as did Mr. McGrath. I don't believe any new information was presented tonight but I will address what has been done since our last call. The three property owners myself included, have put together a plan of how we're going to address privacy and also, you know continue enforcing any concerns with noise. We've specifically worked on some ways to communicate again about the ordinances and really stress those on the way in to the stay. We're planning on putting up a privacy fence around the backyard. And we have also started to research putting security cameras, both the fence and the security. Most security cameras won't be installed until the Spring time, I mean for obvious reasons, and also when our short-term renter does exit. We don't currently have a date when that short term renter will be out, but certainly as soon as that's happened, we will reasonably follow through on those couple of items. I just wanna remind everyone that we have been very responsive. We've been communicative with the police. We certainly care about the neighborhood, we care about our neighbors, and we wanna make sure that the area is, you know, that rules and the fact that it's primarily a residential neighborhood. And so we're gonna do our best to make sure that any renters are adhering to the same rules as well. And then just for the purpose of, you know, what our intent is long-term, we are to continue to seek renters that are staying in the property over a longer duration of time. Obviously we do pass on on the weekends for packer games. And I will say that we have connected with a number of folks that are going to be coming back on a recurring basis. Families that have not been the the ones that have been an issue, we've looked back through our tenant history. So we are attentive and wanting to make sure that that we are not only giving the renters a good experience but also our neighbors. So I appreciate all of your consideration, I think our current six month probation sufficient for us to prove this back to you all. So thank you.

- Thank you, Mr. Leatherberry. Commissioner Bremer, do a go ahead and take yourself off mute Sid, you're still mute.

- Thank you, different device that I've used before. Mr. Leatherberry, I did want to ask, I understand that this would not be an appropriate time to put lights and such in the backyard, and notifying your current renter and preparing paperwork to notify any future renters of the 10 o'clock noise ordinance.

- Yes, we actually do have that in the guidelines that are provided and are out in the open but we are gonna actually include it in the confirmation the communication that we have when they confirm the reservation. And

then we'll also make sure that we're emphasizing that when renters arrive. So we're gonna add those couple additional fail-safes.

- Thank you, that's clearly important as vice chair Miller noted, there is a difference in the kinds of complaints issued for the two properties and in the case of your property, all but one of them were for noise that occurred after 10:00 PM. Well after 10:00 PM including all the way into the next day in one instance. So I would consider that particularly important. And thank you for responding to my question.

- Thank you.

- Was there anyone else that wished to speak on this item? All right, anybody see any hands up? I don't see anything. So I would entertain a motion to close the floor.

- So moved.

- Seconded.

- All right, motion by commissioner Bremer, second by was that Vice Chair Miller? Okay, all right. All in favor?

- [Board] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right, was there any further discussion amongst the commission regarding this item?

- I do have a concern that this seems like a more egregious series of problems in the past. Since the recommendation of staff was for a probationary period, assuming that D going to go to the, undertake the various changes that they've suggested. Extending that probationary period would not be any detriment to them. And it might leave the neighbors with a feeling of greater protection. I stand ready to hear other opinions on that matter though.

- Well, I guess Paul is that, I mean, that's something that we would be able to do is to change the probationary period, correct?

- Sure, it's certainly up to plan commissioner, ultimately the council, but sure you can modify it.

- We could change it simply to the-

- Do you feel like it would just-

- I would suggest the end of the current calendar year. Which takes care of most of the packer season that Mr. McGrath had in mind.

- Right.

- So I guess I'll make that as a motion to amend the recommendation.

- Second.

- So we have a motion by commissioner Bremer and a second by commissioner Petroski to, I'm down at computer today. So I have less things to look at, but-

- To amend the recommendation to extend until the end of the calendar year, the probationary period.

- Correct.

- So we need to vote on that first before we vote then on the full motion.
- Or you could just make the motion with that amendment to it, 'cause it's already been said.
- Okay, good point, I'll do that. How does that sound to you, Riley?
- Second.
- Okay. All right. Okay. Any further discussion?
- I thought that was what I was seconding, so.
- Good, we're on the same, same page then.
- Okay. All right. I'll go ahead with a roll call vote, Vice-chair Miller
- Aye.
- Alder Corpus-Dax.
- Aye.
- Okay. Sorry
- Aye.
- Commissioner Petroski
- Aye.
- Commissioner Daniels
- Aye.
- And commissioner Linsmeier.
- Aye. All right, and I will also vote in the affirmative to move it ahead again with an extension of the one-year probationary period.
- Well, excuse me, Lisa. Not one year, but to the end of the current calendar year. A little bit less, yeah.
- Right, so to the end of 2020. December 31st, 2021.
- Check, got it. It takes a village.
- Right, that'll go ahead to city council then for the January 19th meeting. All right, and moving on to the third agenda item, it's a public hearing on the request to rezone parcels in the 1320 to 1330 block of Parrot Streets from very density residential R3 to general commercial C1 submitted by John J. Young property owner. And with the public hearing, 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 public hearing, in 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, whether you favor oppose or

only providing information in this matter and your comments or concerns. We also ask that you can find 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 chair. Comments will be limited to three minutes. So if we could, I guess get a brief overview from staff to get an idea of what the public hearing and the agenda item is about.

- Sure, thank you madam chair. Can everyone see the screen?

- Yes.

- Okay, this was a request for rezoning from very density of residential R3 to general commercial C1. The property is located, where the properties are located in 1320 1330 block at Parrot Street. This is North Irwin Avenue here, I 43, North of the highway is a wildlife sanctuary. This is an interesting area and a variety of land uses here. We have some commercial uses along North R1 Avenue, we have some light industrial uses that are to the North and to the East, and then we have some single family and two family homes that are kind of surrounding this property here. So the city's comprehensive plan the red represents commercial. Again, you can kind of see the outline of the properties here. The yellow color represents a low density residential. Taking into consideration some of the surrounding land uses and some of the existing uses along Irwin Avenue, there could be a potential for a comprehensive plan amendment here, to maybe eliminate that. But that's something for another day. But the comp plan does recommend low density residential here. And this is the current zoning of the area. This is the very density residential and kind of the Tan color. You have some light industrial to the North, and then business park to the East, and then some commercial, highway commercial along North Irwin Avenue. So, the applicant owns the three lots to the West here and has an offer to purchase on the fourth plot. He has an existing business on, two existing businesses both on Irwin and on Parrot Street. So his hope would be to redevelop this property by obtaining this zoning change. I did talk to the applicant late today just before the meeting, and he's asked that this item be held up. He's got some issues that he's looking into regarding the properties. I would suggest that to the plan commissioner that you move ahead with the public hearing so we can get that out of the way. When it comes to the action item, we'll have to recommend that it'd be tabled until the applicant's ready to move forward.

- Thank you. So was there anyone? Well, let's see here, was there anyone looking to speak? Interested parties should be called, I guess we're looking for people who are in favor of this item. So if you are looking to speak in favor of this item, please come forward to be recognized. Is there anyone looking to speak in regarding I guess in opposition of this item? Is there anyone opposed to this item? I'm looking to speak to provide information only. Is there anyone else wishing to speak? Is there anyone else wishing to speak? Is there anyone else wishing to speak? Let the record reflect that no one came forward and this public hearing is now closed. Moving on to the agenda item, item number four, consideration with possible action on the request to rezone parcels in the 1320 to 1330 block of Parrot Street from varied density residential to general commercial submitted by John J. on property owner.

- Thank you madam chair, at the request of the applicant, this item should be tabled until the next available meeting.

- So move.

- Second.

- Motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Commissioner Petroski. Any further discussion? Then I'll go ahead with a roll call vote, Vice chair Miller,

- Aye.

- Alder Corpus-Dax,

- Aye.
- Commissioner Bremer.
- Aye.
- Commissioner Petroski,
- Aye.
- Commissioner Daniels
- Aye.
- And Commissioner Linsmeier. Commissioner Linsmeier, was that an aye?
- Can you hear me?
- I do hear you now, yeah. Okay good. All right. Okay, perfect. All right, so then I'll vote in favor as well. So unanimously moving forward to or tabled until our next meeting.
- Just to avoid confusion, I think that would be far because we also have that special bidding, that comes between now and then.
- Right, perfect. And I think the date of our, yeah, that one was the, I guess our next regular meeting is January 25th. So moving on to agenda item number five. Public hearing on the request to amend zoning ordinance 38-79 East Town Mall to allow limited production and processing uses within the planned unit development at 2350 East Mason street submitted by GB Real Estate Investments, LLC property owner.
- Thank you, Madam chairman, Paul if you could pop up the PowerPoint, please. Thank you, okay, I'll be pretty brief for the public hearing and the next item would be a consideration and possible action. So I'll get a little bit more detail at that point, but this is the property outlined in red, it's 2350 East Mason street. It is really the center section of what everybody in town commonly calls the East town mall, which is made up of a much greater area. Also includes a portion of the parking lot and the building itself. If you go onto the next slide, Paul? This is the comprehensive plans future land use for the property. You can see it as all commercial and designation. And the next slide, please. And this is the zoning for the property. Now it looks kind of like a mess out there, you got some C3 zoning, some R1 zoning, some R3 zoning, but if you notice the very heavy black line that circles sort of the mall proper, that is a planned unit development. This planned unit development was established in 1979 when the mall was originally built. Since that time it's been amended once for a boundary change and a dozen times for signage changes. So there's actually about 13 or 14 planned unit developments on top of this site currently. And Paul, you could go back to the original Ariel. Well, you could go to the next one too, it'd be fine. Anyway, so this is the property, since 1979 it's been designed as a commercial center, as a mall center. Relatively auto oriented in the L logs, some major anchors were located out here. So you had Shofco on the far Eastern end, Cub Foods on the far Western end, and a cools department store sort of in-between that. Those structures were infilled with about 160,000 square feet of multi-tenant structure, which was the interior mall. And during the timeframe, I guess the last four decades, many other uses were built in free standing buildings, So there is a Pepco, there's an oldies grocery store, hobby lobby. The Cub foods had closed and has now become individual retail spaces, and the Shofco is also closed. what the petitioner is doing, so this, this pre has seen vacancies over the last several years. Most notably, probably the last five to 10 years. The mall proper, which is the red has been relatively vacant as a lot of malls in the country have been. Petitioners purchasing the property, and he is looking to re establish or to establish a new use on the rear part of the property. And that would be limited production and processing.

That is a small scale light industrial designation that's allowed in all our commercial districts in the city with the conditional use permit. In this case, since it's a plan unit development, he is coming forward to propose a portion of the mall proper to take that light industrial use. There you go, you can kind of see the mall and the not perfect but the outlined property. There are about 16 different property owners in this East town mall area. If you'd go to the next one, Paul might be more, there we go. So that's the building itself, what's being proposed is to relocate the few retailers and service businesses that are still in the mall up to the front, which would be the North side, where it says relocated new inline retailers, and give them direct access into the parking lot. kind of an open air mall rather than an internal mall. Also would redevelop the former office max building, and then in the back of the mall with no frontage, fronting East Mason or the parking lot for the mall would be that limited production user production and processing and then also their office space, as you can see back there. That is what is being proposed, so I'll wait to get more into it until the public hearing is included.

- Thank you so much, David. All right, so with the public hearing on this agenda item, we are looking for interested parties who would like to speak in favor of this item. Is there anyone wishing to speak in opposition to this item? Is there anyone looking to speak to provide information only on this item?

- Hi, my name is Katherine Johnson, I am one of the property owners. I live at 2406, Raft Court, so my property backs up, My fence sign is directly on that red line there. We, my husband, Sam and I have come to attend to learn more in regards to the proposed development. One thing we are particularly concerned of is that undeveloped space in the back there we would like to maintain, to keep undeveloped for our family and the integrity of our properties and our neighbor's properties.

- Probably between Gendrude and our backyard there.

- Sure, I did receive an email that did mention there is talk in this in regards to potentially creating that to be a residential space. At one point, I personally don't have an issue with another business taking space in the space that East town mall presently occupies, as long as that is not something that's gonna smell weird or make a ton of noise that would bring down the cost of my property. I'm all for business, I don't like seeing a mall be vacant. I think it would be great to have more business there. On the other hand, I do wanna protect the integrity of our neighborhood. And so that's what we came here today to do was, I don't know if it's necessarily an opposition of what's being proposed currently, but we just wanted to make sure we had all the facts details of what is here today. Thank you.

- Thank you.

- Thank you very much Ms. Johnson. Is there anyone else wishing to speak on this item? Is there anyone else wishing to speak?

- Mr. Vaughn has his hand up.

- Hello, can you hear me?

- Yep. Please go ahead with your name and address.

- Okay, this is Brad Vaughn, I live at 930, Ralph Degraw Street. And I'm back behind the closed in area back there, I've been a resident of that area for 40 years now. And one of the big things in that neighborhood is because it's a pretty secure neighborhood right now. And you know, there's one way in one way out. And, you know, we've had some very success with, you know, the people that live in our area, being able to raise their families and their children with, you know, not to worry about things. And I guess what Ms. Johnson brought up there about, you know, the residential areas are, it is one of my big concerns also. Is having residential areas put back in there and people being able to, I know when the East town mall was going on and everything we had a lot of times where we had a lot of problems with the fence being broken into and, you know, knocked

down and stuff. And then people were started coming back there and traveling through. And that's the only time that we've ever had issues back there. And I'm just very concerned if another residential area it gets put in there, it's gonna cause a lot of commotion and chaos for our neighborhood. And I would be strictly definitely opposed to having any type of residential area back there. And also the back behind the gap there on those courts is where I'm talking, in that area. But as far as the actual mall area, I don't know as far as I'm concerned, I have no opposition to any business, except for if it's going to create like she said, the noise, or any type of order type thing that goes on with that. So with that, that's all I have for now, and I appreciate you taking my comments.

- Thank you very much for your testimony, Mr. Vaughn. Was there anyone else wishing to speak on this item? Was there anyone else wishing to speak on this item? Is there anyone else wishing to speak on this item? Let the record reflect that no one came forward and this public hearing is now closed. And moving on to the actual item, item number six, consideration with possible action on the request to amend zoning ordinance 38-79 to allow limited production and processing uses within the planned unit development at 2350 East Mason street submitted by GB Real Estate Investments, LLC property owner.

- Thank you madam Vice Chairman. So I think everybody is pretty familiar with the current environment for retail. So shopping malls really became dominant in the 50s, 60s. Again, as I had mentioned before they were heavily focused on automobiles which is why you see so much parking put out there and also being a retail campus with very large parking lots and big box anchors. Eastern mall is no different, that's exactly how it was developed. Again, for about three decades, it was very successful. The last decade, not quite, now Paul you can kind of cruise forward. Okay, if you want to hold up a little So really, the commercial of the mall is not a current, I guess Successful model to put it that way. They have been heavily hit mainly by consumer preference of not wanting to go to the large malls anymore. We've seen a resurgence of local small town type stores, main street style stores, but also took an incredibly huge hit with online retailing. So more and more malls are just kind of closing. You've probably been following East town for years. I believe it it's changed hands several times over the last five to 10 years. And again is about the 160,000 square feet of the mall. I would have to say there's probably about 10,000 square feet, maybe 15,000 that's actually occupied. The rest of the mall is empty, theater is no longer in service. And to kind of give you just a quick kind of planning background, there's really four major approaches that are being utilized throughout the country for, they call the malls Greenfields. To kind of redevelop Greenfield sites. The first is take them all down, redevelop something new, whether that's, you know, a new commercial businesses generally not commercial, usually ends up going to an industrial residential type situation. So that is one, the other three approaches really deal with rehabbing and reusing what is out there. So the first approach really is an evolution of a mall and it's usually they get rid of the interior spaces open it up to the parking lot, make it air or open mall. And then one thing that you'll see in a lot of malls is that they'll go for an entertainment or what's called an experience destination. So you'll add businesses in there that make an experience rather than a shopping. You know, the 70s, 80s shopping was the experience, within new consumers that's not the case. So oftentimes you'll see things like Dave and Busters, give you an example in another mall in our area, that's being used to pull in new customers, taverns, theaters, game rooms, laser tag, that kind of thing. That's the kind of thing they go with as their primary anchors. Another thing that's often done is to take the anchor stores, change those into usually high density residential. So you put a lot of units in there, that captures an automatic sort of captured market of consumers. Oftentimes those could be senior housing and then the infill store is usually in the mall section, then cater to those residents primarily. That is another very common and very successful way to redevelop all sites. The last option, which is the one that's being proposed here but really still at the very early stage is to again reduce the amount of retail space within the mall, bring that out to the front and then add a warehousing or a light industrial element to the mall itself or to the property itself. You generally don't want that to be seen by the other retailers or to be out front. You want that in the back, but the buildings are really designed well for that type of use. They usually have very high ceilings. There's no load bearing walls on the interior of the building, opening them up for more of a production type scenario or warehousing type scenario. Oftentimes have loading docks, and loading bees already in place. And it's often preferred because it is less expensive. And generally the other options really require a specific area. You have to have an area where people wanna live, you know, urban malls tend to do that. Or put a residential in there, the entertain of activities, and you have to

have those types of businesses that want to come into that environment. So those are sometimes more difficult, warehousing is pretty quiet, it doesn't have a lot of impact, and it's generally an option that is chosen. In this case, the petitioner, Green Bay Real Estate investment LLC, they are requesting to do that light industrial type option. As this is a plan development, We can narrow down that recommendation even a little bit tighter and we could limit that down to just limited production and processing. So that would occupy about two thirds of the building, and Paul, if you go back to the PowerPoint, I'll kind of go through those slides real quick right now. Thank you, sir. So again, this was the mall itself and that's only the center portion hobby lobby and Kohl's is not part of this property, but you'll oops. We have your email and stuff up Paul. Thank you. So you'll notice in the center there, about two thirds of the property would either be office space for the production user and the production user itself. That rear drive by in the back is very, very wide. It is probably about 80 feet wide, very suitable for truck traffic to go down, it's a loading and unloading area right now. And again, there is vegetation to the south and also auto dealership to the south as well. So the impact there is pretty minimal. You can go to the next slide, Paul. So this is how the mall looks today. And if you click on the next one, once the retailers are moved to the front of the mall, again, to be a more open air type situation, you'll see they'll have individual entrances at the front. All the existing tenants would not be displaced and you probably have a much better ability to attract other tenants when they have visibility from the parking lot and from Mason street. And the next slide Paul. So this is the site I did not circle the property itself, but in discussions with the developer, so only thing that's being requested tonight is an amendment for that light industrial type use, the limited production and processing. But what you'll see is kind of this developer's thoughts on what could potentially happen here as well. Again, as the property owners of the neighborhood to the cell had mentioned, there is discussion about future residential on that Southern property, or a potential sale through the Jason property owner. And then you'll notice in the parking lot is a possible in lot development. And that would really kind of be something that could mimic what you see on the front on Mason street, East Mason street. Those are called out lots. There are lots to the mall so that central drive aisle could become a drive aisle, like a road. And you could have development on both sides of that, reducing the parking lot, which isn't really necessary with a vast majority of the commercial space no longer being commercial, and also the preference of people to drive so much and to have such large parking areas is kind of been reduced over the last quite a few years. So this is kind of the thought that the developer has for the future. Now, I had mentioned earlier, there's about 16 different property owners out here. So what city staff will be planning to do and probably early Spring, is to kind of convene a meeting with all of those property owners Kind of get a collective vision of what they think the future of East Town Mall is going to be, working with the city. And what we probably do is repeal all of those planned developments that are out there right now that started in 79, and put one brand new one over the top. It would not only encompass this person or this petitioner's property, but it would likely encompass all of the mall owner property. So you have a consistent throughout so you can expect to be notified and here hold that stuff coming in the future. But again, with that many different property owners, it takes a lot of coordination. Many of them are corporate, they're not in the area. So, but what's happening right now is to kind of get the capital to start running the mall and relocating the tenants. We have to get that limited production of processing use in there. And Paul, if you got onto the next slide, please. All right, so I would be amending zoning ordinance 3879, which is the original creation ordinance for the mall. And these sections just kind of section three deals with land uses in that planned unit development. And the clinicians have those in their packets there online. So it would allow limited production and processing uses as defined by the code to be established and occupy the rear portion of the multi-tenant shopping mall building as depicted in exhibit A. And I put a little insert of exhibit A, it's what you've been looking at. Retail and service business shall occupy the Northern section of the building, with individual storefronts and entrances directly from the parking area. Any and all outdoor display and storage associated with that limited production use on the property would be prohibited. That would be in the front or on the back. Commercial truck traffic, delivery, staging, loading, unloading and any other type of accessory use to that limited production use would be prohibited on the North face of the mall. So obviously that you have that 80 foot drive aisle on the back, you have the garage doors, that's what they would have to use for any type of staging or truck traffic. So I kind of call this a band-aid PUD amendment, until we can get all the owners together and do a full redevelopment plan for the mall area, for the greater mall area. So staff is recommending approval of the PUD amendment with the conditions as listed in the draft plan, unit development.

- Thank you so much Dave, go ahead Vice-Chair Miller.
- Dave, as always, I appreciate your thoroughness on this. I do get it might cause a little confusion, however and I think you did. You were attempting to wrap it up there at the end in what we're actually talking about today which is simply just amending the PUD to allow this, there be usage within there. I think it should be, make it clear to the rest of anyone else that's interested in listening to right now, but this is, we're not talking about increased residential development or other development on the site, this is specifically for this purpose. It sounds like there'll be some other things going on down the line. But I just want to make sure that we're on the same page, that this is what we're talking about, not some of those other things there.
- Correct, yup, this would only address the limited production processing use as you saw on those maps.
- Hey Dave, I do have a couple of quick questions. One two-part question, when do we know the ETA if this is approved, and two, do we already have to address the concerns of some of the neighbors. Do we already have a, I guess a company for the production site in the back already identified, or is that still open up in the air?
- Well, the petitioner is online and he can probably address that if he so chooses. But the point I would wanna make, limited production processing by definition is very small scale. The tenant that goes in there today, could change in six months, in a year, in two years. So you really have to look at the limited production rather than the tenant that's going in. However, as I had mentioned, the petitioner's here and he may be willing to answer that.
- Then to follow up if I might, David, I've got a little bit confused over the limited production and processing, which you said was a narrower definition. Then I believe the other one was light industrial? But the petitioner Mr. Barrett in his letter identified light manufacturing retail office and residential. So, what's your recommendation here? And what exactly does limited production and processing mean?
- Sure, so the scope of the ask for this meeting and this PUD amendment is just limited production and processing. So even though when the petitioner supplied to his application, I kind of went over sort of more grand schemes that was being thought of, we are holding off on that, that was gonna require probably a comprehensive plan amendment in some cases, and also a lot more public input and owner input with the multiple owners. So, the scope is very narrow just to that limited production and processing. And I will just read you really quick the definition of that. So, small scale activities that are compatible with retail sales and services. These uses produce minimal offsite impacts due to their limited nature and scale, may include but are not limited to apparel and other finished products made from fabrics, both building and repair, computer and accessories, including circuit boards and software, electronic components and accessories, film, video, and audio production, food and beverage products, not to include slaughter, green milling cerealing, vegetable oil or vinegar production, precision medical or optical goods, basically glasses, signage, watches and clocks, wood crafting and curving, and wood furniture and upholstery. So the one thing that jumped out at me when I read that definition was boat building. I did confer with Paul Neumeyer, the zoning administrator, that is more like kayaks or canoes, not sail boats. So you really have to look at that first sentence, compatible with retail and service businesses. So it is-
- Which basically means no noxious smells and no loud noises, right?
- Generally so, yes.
- Thank you.
- Was there any further discussion amongst the commission?
- One more point of clarification if that's all right.

- Yeah.

- I assume there's some urgency to this request, that is precluding us doing a full, as you mentioned, contacting all the property owners, coming up with a grand vision for the entire thing obviously that would take some time. I assume the user wants to get in there sooner than later, and that's why we're looking at this number, it's just taking time to do everything all at once. Is that an accurate assessment?

- To my understanding, yes, that's pretty accurate. Again, the petitioner could probably answer this, but to renovate the front of that mall and to start doing some of the interior work and bringing it up to sort of new and fresh and clean, you kind of have to get that income rolling. Very difficult to do that without the tenants in that space. But again, the petitioner could probably answer that better than I.

- I guess the reason I bring it up is obviously there's interest in the site, and what's going to happen in the future with it. And, you know, any activity on the site is gonna bring attention to that, and I think that's a question that's probably going to come up from maybe not only the other commissioners, but probably the media neighbors, anybody else, so it's gonna be of any interest in this. And it's a question of mine, of, you know, what is the plan for this? I mean, this is a nice first step but I know we wanna keep the on topic today but it would be good to know kind of what the timeline is for those other pieces, because people are gonna be seeing this driving by seeing an activity happening, you're gonna want to know what's going on.

- What I like to tell people, is look at the petition as it was presented, and that's what's gonna happen. Like anything beyond that, there is no guaranteed and there is no timeline. But obviously time is of the essence for us, but coordinating that many people and getting ordinances written is not a fast process. We would hope that we could convene all the owners together, again this Spring, maybe it brings something back Summer and Fall. We can get agreement from all the owners, a little bit easier now with Zoom, used to be harder with trying to get corporate owners in Houston and Arizona and California up here. But we're hopeful by the end of the year, we could have something coming through that would address if not the entire mall property, a majority of it. because it's all kinda, it was kinda puzzled pieced in there. It's very difficult to do one developer to be able to do a whole change to the feel of that mall, where they own so little.

- Thanks, Dave. I just wanted to make sure I'm on the right track there. Additionally, I did receive a message from somebody I'm looking to comment that wasn't able to, when we're open before. So listening to the commissioners, anything to say, I'd like to make a motion to open the floor.

- Second.

- So a motion by vice Chair Miller and a second by Commissioner Bermen to open the floor, all in favor?

- [Board] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right, so if there's anyone that's looking to speak on this item, you should just come forward and state your name and address please.

- This is Garrett Bader, 300, North Van Buren Street, I'd like to probably get a jury brief overview. Summarize a lot of what's been talked about, hopefully make it very clear for everyone what's going on now and what may be may go on in the future. So as was discussed, the original requests, the only request for tonight is to allow for the limited production use within the mall building itself. I can assure the neighbors who have spoken that the user is quiet, odorless, there are no smokestacks, there's no kerfuffle of any kind. Will be a good neighbor and a neighbor who quite frankly will have some good eyes on the back of the property. Some of them back there already you've seen a little bit of graffiti in the backside of the mall, and some refuse around there. This will help stop that, so this is really a good user. Broadly speaking for the mall itself, those who've lived around it, and patronized it, and driven past it can realize that retail and the nature of retail is changing rapidly, and the

pandemic has put that on overdrive. So mall showed up around 1980, yours truly just turned 40. So I kind of grew up with it, I rode my bike down there around 1990 for those who remember Kmart or Prain Way or Cub foods, I was in all of them, probably way too often. That mall had energy than it had life, the area did, and it doesn't have that right now in some respect. At the same time too many people tried to synonymize the overall vibe of the area with what's going on at the mall. In other words, so goes the mall, so goes to these tone area, and that's just not true. It's a great area, we should be proud of it, We can make it very lively again, and this plan, I believe can do it. For those who saw the rendering there, it's taking the users and turning them inside out. Do you have those external faces? It's swinging doors and neon as I call it, to keep that customer activity to both support those new retailers and the ones around it. This will be essentially a power center, where you have anchors on both ends and smaller retailers in the middle. As designed, the current mall building itself will have a new demising wall which is roughly 70 feet off the front glass. For those who've ever patronized any coffee shop or hair salon or a nail salon or even insurance agent, most of those folks, and it's short started like this had about 60 feet of depth. So we're catering to those users who are active in the market and wants to be there. Behind it as has been talking about will be eliminated production user. So it's taking a facility that is no longer market appropriate or in demand for 100% retail use, and making it a mixed use center that will really respond to the current demand. But in a way that I believe will make neighbors and Jason businesses and just the overall commercial environment happy and productive. The point about timeliness, time is always of the essence usually in these deals. Being able to push forward on a more comprehensive plan for rezoning and full re-imaging of the center will take time. And right now to be able to start not only from a financial basis, but also the needs of the users interested here, we need to respectfully start. So the hope is for your approval today, or city council concurrence next week in February 2nd, that allow for acquisition of the property in mid February and work to begin this Spring. Visual changes will begin to be noticed in Summer and early Fall. The users will begin to operate in Fall to late Fall, and hopefully by this time next year we have a very nice looking, far more productive far more valued center. But then I'm happy to answer any questions that anybody may have.

- Do anyone from the commission have questions for Mr. Peter? Was there anyone else wishing to speak on this item?

- I think you're still muted.

- Can you hear me now?

- Yes, we hear you, we don't see you.

- Can you hear me now?

- Yes.

- Yes, we can.

- Oh, there it goes. For some reason, my mute wasn't working there for a second. My name is Faith Ainsworth, I'm at 92, Ruffed Grouse. Overall, I think of what we, me and my husband see of the plan. I feel like the idea of revitalizing the Green Bay Mall, I think the big concern, which was also voiced by some of my neighbors was just that making sure that the, whatever business is going into the, I guess the back area, which would be considered, just wouldn't be something that would affect our neighborhood. I would say that maybe something to consider would be rewording the the way that the zoning, it's just that like the farm production or things like that that could cause issues wouldn't be allowed. I know I had seen in the news, which I don't know if it's true, about the American tent. I think American tent would be a great company to go in there, but you never know what's gonna happen down the road. So if you solidify it one way and then for some reason they needed a bigger area or whatever, we could then be stuck with whatever the wording was from the language and you don't know what would be in there. That would be my biggest concern. And then also what they had stated about what for the housing to the back area of the Grouse Court. Yeah, just making sure that

whatever kind of housing is bringing value, so 'cause if you put a bunch of, I'm plainly speaking apartment buildings or something like that, is going to devalue all of our properties. And so far we've been here for about a year and it's really, it's a great area, and we'd like to keep it that way and keep it on the upwards. But yeah, thank you very much.

- Thank you very much for Faith.

- Thank you.

- Was there anyone else wishing to speak on this item? waiting to speak?

- Hello, Brad.

- Yeah, go ahead.

- Oh, okay. Yeah, I guess whoever goes in there and now you're talking about redoing everything and stuff like that. You know, we got to, we had kind of a safe guard in our, you know, for coming up to our property, you know, that surrounds the backend of the mall and stuff like that. And when that was all built and put together, Shopko was supposed to be in charge of keeping up the privacy fence and everything that goes along in the back that keeps everybody from the mall coming up into the residential area. I wanna know if somebody is gonna be, you know, monitoring that and taking care of that part of it because that's something that has to be done, you know really to get this thing moving in any direction, I guess, is, you know, we need to safeguard our neighborhood and we have that nice back fence back there that I was talking about before. That, you know, was put up at that time when that mall was built and stuff and they were supposed to maintain that. So, I guess my question is who's gonna maintain that perimeter for our neighborhood?

- All right, thank you very much Vaughn. And Mr. Bader, is that something that is within your realm?

- Honestly, no, because that portion of the fence that I believe is being discussed is not part of this property. Keep in mind, as David alluded to earlier, you have multiple property owners in there, the property owners of the former Shopko Box and that green space next to it are not part of my property. So I can't speak to what agreements were made in the past or who currently maintains or maybe doesn't maintain that fence.

- Okay, thank you very much.

- If I can have, however that if there are any maintenance issues with that fence, tell the city. I mean we have an incredibly efficient inspection division. We'll contact the owners and again, in this case it's not the petitioner, but you know, we'll take care of any non maintained stuff.

- Thank you, David. And then one more question to Mr. Bader that's raised by Mr. Vaughn's questions. As I understand it, the production area in the back would be sealed off from the retail area in the front, and actually add as a further buffer to prevent people who are shopping at the mall from wandering out into the back area. Am I correct about that?

- But there will no longer be a common corridor. So anybody who would patronize one of the retailer commercial spaces to the North of the parking lot exits to the limited production space or to the rear of the mall as they do currently.

- Thank you.

- Was there anyone else wishing to speak on this item?

- Entertain a motion to close the floor.

- So moved.
- Second.
- Motion by Commissioner Daniel second by Commissioner Linsmeier, all in favor?
- [Board] Aye.
- Any opposed? All right, any discussion amongst the commission?
- Only thing I'll say, Dave or whoever is going to be heading up, if you could just keep us up to date as this progresses along with the informational updates just as it goes on. So, just
- We did-
- I would emphasize Jake's earlier comments about timing being important. The wonderful thing about this plan is it might finally break through something that has been a real eyesore and an energy drain in our community for a long time. So there's going to be a lot of interest in it.
- Staff is very hopeful that this first step in the revitalization of that whole sort of sea of asphalt that we see out there right now that we're gonna progress pretty quickly, very optimistic.
- Would they recall that this when the mall first came up for sale, there was discussion about potentially the city purchasing the mall, and the redevelopment authority decided against that because we had hoped there'd be developers that would come forward. So this is, I think, great for the city that we have a developer that's willing to invest in this area. And I am super excited about the work that our team will be doing in getting all those owners together, out there, right? 'Cause like a lot of you, I also grew up with East halls. We're all so, I'm like, yay. We can maybe get some things moving out there as well. So yeah, so we're really excited about the potential of actually doing some development in that neck of the woods.
- Yeah, very excited about that. The quickest or as soon as I can get back and by works and Get in and out, I'm great.
- I'm glad to have somebody with such a good track record is Karen Bader too, thank you.
- Yeah, Commissioner Bremer took the words right out of my mouth. It's really reassuring to see someone who has already demonstrated so much success in going into areas that were maybe challenged in the city and creating a great deal of improvement for them as Garrett. So with that, I would move to approve the proposal.
- I'll second.
- Okay, so a motion by commissioner Petroski and second by commissioner Bremer to approve the request subject to the draft planned unit development. Any further discussion? All right, hearing none. I'll go ahead with the roll call vote. Vice chair Miller
- Aye.
- Alder, Corpus-Dax
- Aye.
- Commissioner Bremer,

- Aye.

- Commissioner Petroski

- Aye.

- Commissioner Daniels,

- Aye.

- Commissioner Linsmeier.

- Aye.

- And I will also vote in favor of approving the request subject to the draft planned unit development. And this will move forward to the next city council meeting of January 19th. And moving on to the final agenda item, item number seven, consideration with possible action on a request of Alder Veronica Corpus-Dax to examine regulations regarding the current zoning code and drive through or pickup lanes and the necessity of bypass lanes and or menu boards.

- Thank you madam chair, I just want to give you a few bullet points on the request of the promo report. So looking at the history of drive-throughs, we kind of trace that back to the original highway business district from the 1960s, that district was modified in 2006 to the highway commercial district. Something that we saw in the B2 district like queuing and stuff came in the 1980s, and then our current standards were, you know, determined in about 2006. It was about six development standards that are included in the report. Some development standards for the development of drive-throughs. Drive-throughs are defined in the zoning code. There is some improvement staff believes in some of the terminology. So we might propose that that definition could be beefed up or improved a little bit. We kind of look statewide with contour sampling of different communities and their drive-through requirements. But one interesting thing that we found is that many communities, almost all of them didn't require a bypass lane. So I think we're one of the few that actually have that. Maybe that's a little cautionary but we didn't find that with other communities. Otherwise we did find communities had similar standards that we had as far as queuing, buffering and accommodations for pedestrians in relationship to drive throughs. You know, we've reached out to Green Bay Metro Fire in the past regarding drive-throughs. I think we've got some correspondence for them, where they're really looking to participate in an ordinance change. They've kind of indicated to me that they'd like to remain neutral on this, so I don't have a strong recommendation from them from life safety perspective. Likewise, we've out to our sea traffic engineer and he hasn't offered much comment as it's on a private property, he tends to comment more on the public right of way. So those are two entities we don't have a strong recommendation from at this point. Staff feels there are some potential changes that we could recommend. Again, eliminating the bypass lane might be one of those options that might be more efficient from a land use perspective. We could also improve the development standards talking about menu, board placement and width of those drive-throughs. And also where drive-throughs are allowed, there's one potential change where we could remove it from the Downtown District. The reason being, there's not always a lot of room in downtown properties to allow for a drive-through to occur, and we're really trying to promote walkability in downtown areas. So that might be an option we might propose. So, as staff we're suggesting that there could be some changes to or improvements to the drive-through language. I suppose the plan commission could also choose to do nothing as well and we could just leave those requirements as is, but staff feels there's an opportunity to kind of revamp the ordinance. And we wouldn't suggest that we could bring back a draft for the commission members to review and we could hash out some of those details moving forward. So at this point, we're looking for comments from the Planck commission if there are some, I know Planck commission did see recently 901, Main Street and that discussion about the drive-through and that was a little controversial, I suppose. But yeah,

I think staff feels we can improve the ordinance slightly and we'd like to bring a draft back to you for your consideration.

- Thank you so much, Paul. Yes. All right. Was there any discussion amongst the commission?

- Yeah, I have some thoughts. I think that this is the great idea. Why is the bus to revisit these types of ordinances from time to time to be able to address the evolving needs of both the businesses and the citizens who are gonna be living at different quadrants of the city, different sections of the city. I think that the idea of making these particular ordinance more flexible, isn't really a good idea. But I'd like to hear some other feedback and what everyone else has to say as well.

- And I'm interested that neither fire nor all traffic engineer was interested in making any input here, which suggests that they don't see anything wrong with the current ordinance. So I'm wondering if Veronica Corpus-Dax could say a little bit about what brought her to asking us to take a look at this.

- So yeah, so what actually one of my concerns, before we move on is the removal of the drive-throughs all together from downtown. I don't necessarily think that that's the best way to go, I think that there's opportunity there where a drive-through can work downtown. Obviously, that's not something that we would probably in a historical building not necessarily something that we would want to, that would change the historical value so that obviously want to apply. But I do think that there's, you know the possibility there where a drive-through could benefit you know, some of the downtown businesses. So I wouldn't support fully removing that altogether from the downtown district. Bringing it forward was that we had, we kind of had an ordinance that was different from some of the surrounding areas. So I think making that, you know kind of being more in line with what's going around in some of our surrounding city or surrounding villages as far as being on the same page in terms of drive-through standards and drive through and pick up window standards. So it was kind of all over the board and, you know, we had with one of the more recent ones with Downtown, where we were saying we were implementing some standards that weren't actually weren't in line with a different drive through situation that we had downtown with the Shopko pharmacy. And saying like, you need to have the bypass but when we have the Shopko pharmacy downtown, they didn't have that bypass lane and that section of drive-through was longer than what was being proposed at 901 Main Street. So, I think just having more of a standardization there was my reasoning for bringing that forward.

- Thank you.

- My recommendation would be to take out the carte blanche removing the drive-throughs from the downtown district altogether.

- Yeah, I agree with that. I think that a carp launch prohibition on drive-throughs would really be detrimental to downtown businesses. I mean, think of the creative ways that small spaces could be used for something like office shop that could really benefit from a single car drive through that isn't going to create a dramatic backup. I also think that the market will start, I think this is I'm repeating myself from when we talked about one of the proposals. I believe that the market has a way of sorting out the larger scale drive-throughs as it would be the kind of concern that we'd see in a tight downtown urban setting. You know, your Popeye's chickens Chick-fil-A's McDonald's et cetera. They have very, very tight controls that they've placed on their franchisees about the volume of traffic that they need to demonstrate would be able to go through the specific space that they are proposing. Whereas a smaller, more urban mom and pop type place would be able to possibly function and thrive with a more narrow, less restricted ordinance or I should say a more broad less restrictive ordinance related to drive throughs. But those are my two cents on that.

- I think what, when we come back with a draft ordinance I think the development standards would include some dimensions. Right now, we don't have a clear dimension for our drive-through width, I guess. So we would specify something. And I think that width will be maybe larger than you think, because we do want to allow for door swings or for emergency people, to get into the drive through areas. So we may have it wider,

but there may be a discount if there's multiple drive-throughs that maybe those drive-through lanes could be less. But I think the bypass lane elimination makes sense, but I think we would still beef up the drive-through lanes themselves, make sure that they're wide enough for modern day vehicles and emergency access

- I would say especially so we have the possibility of getting out of the truck you're in for emergency medical folks getting into a car while it's in a drive-through lane.

- Right, so, you know, I've been thinking at least maybe something around 14 feet or maybe something a little less, but that's a rough number of what we might consider. But again, if you had multiple drive-through lanes, maybe we'd go to something like 10 or 11 because there might be room for others to get in there. So that's just some thoughts that we might present to you in the future.

- I do wonder, go ahead.

- It's I guess to make a longer discussion shorter, I would be in favor of moving into direct the staff to propose an amended ordinance as suggested.

- With the downtown remaining, is that correct? We don't wanna touch the downtown.

- I'm sorry?

- We don't wanna touch the downtown district, we'd wanna keep that in place.

- I guess I don't understand. Would we target the downtown with this amendment, or?

- No, I think we were suggesting that we could remove drive-throughs from the downtown district because of just the limited land area, I guess, but I don't, I think Alder Dax and yourself were saying that we should leave. I just want to clarify you wanting to keep drive-throughs in the downtown area.

- Yes, I wouldn't want to strike down drive-throughs from the downtown area. I think a way to come up with a more creative solution for drive through is in the downtown area to make it more approachable for smaller businesses I guess, would be the way that I'd look at it. But, I think that that's something that could be a work in progress over the course of the amendment and proposals and the spots, et cetera. But I would be against for removing any carte blanche from downtown.

- Right, and I think that's one thing that's kind of important when we look at the downtown, the nature of downtown, the land areas of downtown, we probably would put special conditions or standards on them that you may not find in a suburban setting or a highway setting, if it's to remain in downtown. But yeah, it's not, generally, it's not rocket science. I mean, we call them everywhere and take the good stuff from everybody else's codes. So, yeah, but yeah.

- And I'm assuming that one of the things that you would be paying attention there is flow of traffic, which gets a little bit wilder downtown.

- Correct.

- You know, I think there's-

- Just making sure that the entrance and exits did not seriously interrupt the flow of traffic.

- Yeah, and there would be other things, you know, we have, what's called a floor area ratio. I mean, I don't know if anybody ever saw one of those Joe to goals, or those small they look like a toll booth, a through that

probably, you know, we'd have the building conditions to not allow that type of use There's a lot of negative things that can happen, and so we would, we would draft it to try to prevent those.

- Would you all like to have a motion that we would like you to draft a new ordinance?

- Yup, looking for some marching order So we can go ahead and we'll bring us something back at a future meeting.

- So moved

- Second.

- A motion by commissioner Bremer and a second by commissioner Petroski. Paul, can you switch the screen back to the gallery? I don't know if I feel that.

- I'm sorry.

- So much. No, that's okay.

- Thank you

- All right. Bremer, second by commissioner Petroski. Is there any further discussion amongst the commission? All right, we'll go ahead with a roll call vote. Vice chair Miller

- Aye.

- Alder Corpus-Dax.

- Aye. Oh, okay, aye. All right.

- Commissioner Bremer

- Aye.

- Commissioner Petroski

- Aye.

- Commissioner Daniels

- Aye.

- And commissioner Linsmeier.

- Aye.

- And I'll also vote in favor of moving that forward. So then there's no timeframe that we're gonna see it, it's just we're giving you direction to go ahead and draft it.

- Then we keep it on the list, we'll move on it right away. I think you'll see it sooner than later.

- Okay, perfect. Thank you so much, Paul. All right, and then moving forward to the informational, number one special meeting to be held Thursday January 21st, 2021 at 6:00 PM for a single item, which is consideration

with possible action on the request to authorize a conditional use permit for material recovery facility at 1156 Delta Avenue.

- This is just gonna be that item?

- Yes, this-

- And like everything else is going to wait until the 25th?

- Correct.

- Yes.

- Correct, this was a special meeting just to deal with the auto salvage proposed auto salvage use. It has been the plan commission four times I believe, meant to council once or twice. So I think at the last meeting in November the plan commission thought let's have a special one, we're gonna get it over with, and then offer a recommendation. So yeah, just same time, six o'clock, but it's Thursday. It makes it a rough month because we have three meetings in a row, three weeks in a row, but you have to pay for having most of December off, so.

- All right.

- Hey Dave, have the Alders been notified of that meeting as well?

- They have. So after the November meeting, I sent out a letter to all the property owners within a little bit over 400 feet. And in that letter, I basically said it was postponed. A new meeting would be coming in January, provide me any information you have by the end of last year, by December 31st. I also contacted by phone both Alders, and by email, the neighborhood association.

- Okay.

- Right.

- And the address from multiple parties that have been involved, have also been contacted.

- All right. Thank you so much, David.

- Certainly.

- All right. So, and then director's report.

- That's me for a little while longer anyway. First of all, the last council meeting there were just a couple of second readings for adoption, that went through regarding parking and then that game day parking. And then the only two items were pulled, were the ones you covered tonight, so we'll be sending those back on Shadow Lane. And then I guess the other big thing I wanna tell you is that we have a new director, planning director that will be starting February 1st. He needs to go to council for approval on the 19th. His name is Neil Stechschulte, and he happens to be in the meeting today I saw him just pop up.

- Oh, awesome.

- Evening everybody.

- Good luck with the council, they'd love to see you.

- Thank you, thank you commissioners. Now I appreciate you letting me being a fly on the wall tonight and learning a little bit more about what's going on. Also want to certainly thank Sheryl and Dave and Paul for obviously all the work they've been doing these past several months. You guys have been plenty busy I've been looking back at all the different meetings and different projects you guys have been working on and all of the ones that are in the pipeline for now. I think it's a great growing community and you've got a great team that really makes this a really, really great opportunity. So looking forward to hitting the ground running hopefully on February 1st, and again subject to council approval on the 19th. So just wanted to briefly say hello, and looking forward to working with all of you, so.

- And how can I top that, right? Okay, I may be a little bit more excited than the rest of you are.

- Thank you Cheryl, for all you've done-

- Yes, thank you Cheryl.

- Hey, I heard, you know what's great, is that we have a great team, our department rocks. I mean, we get it done and we all chip in and that's why I love working for the department, so.

- These guys don't know yet, but I'm instituting some sort of rule that none of them can leave now.

- That's all I had to share.

- I have one, I have one thing, you talked about drive-throughs tonight. 901 North Main we'll be back at the council, at the next council meeting. They had postponed that until the January meeting as well, they didn't send it back to you, but they postponed it. There was a couple of questions about lot lines and some legal issues with some really really hundred year old deeds. And we have those figured out. So we'll be reporting back to council and we'll see where that goes. But I just wanna let you know it'll be back on the 19th, the 901 North Main, sorry.

- Okay, excellent. All right. So then moving on the date of the next meeting and this is the special meeting, Thursday January 21st, 2021 for special meeting. And then our next regular meeting will be Monday January 25th, 2021.

- May I have a quick point of privileges before we adjourn?

- Sure.

- So my wife and I have purchased a house and we'll be closing on January 25th, knock on wood. Unfortunately, that house is outside the city limits of Green Bay.

- Shoot.

- Yeah.

- You didn't get in there fast enough Neil.

- So I know. So in all likelihood, I'll be resigning upon successful closing of this house, but I just wanted to echo some of the comments regarding the staff. Really, it was an eyeopening experience of local government for me to see the incredible hard work thoughtfulness and creativity from, you know, staff, Paul, David, Jessica keeping all of us on track, Cheryl in your capacity as director and also my fellow citizen commissioners, just the time commitment everyone's put in, the thoughtfulness and thoroughness everyone's brought to the table, I think this really speaks volumes about the city of Green Bay and where we're heading. So my business will still be

remaining in downtown Green Bay and my heart will still be remaining in Green Bay of course, unfortunately, my address will be just slightly outside of the city proper.

- We'll miss you.

- I don't think you planned that properly, Randy.

- I know, well, it was just, you know, one of our criteria was we wanna stay in the city of Green Bay, but we had about four other criteria and we hit on all four of them. And unfortunately this one just gave away. So we'll be joining the community of Howard at least for the near term.

- Randy, how can I sabotage that?

- I think we should assign him to make peace between Howard and the Oneida, that will take care of it.

- Cool, wow, that's all. I had that knocked out real quickly. but I likely will be looking to get involved on, through the Brown County Governmental Organization a little bit more, you know. So I'll pop up from time to time I'm sure. But I've really enjoyed working with all of you a great deal.

- We've enjoyed you too Riley.

- We will too.

- Will be sad to see you go.

- All right, drive a motion to adjourn.

- So moved.

- Motion by Veronica Alder Corpus-Dax and a second Commissioner Petroski, all in favor?

- [Board] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right, so I guess we'll see everybody next Thursday.