



MINUTES OF THE GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION

MONDAY, MAY 24, 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, Derius Daniels, Autumn Linsmeier and Ken Rovinski.

Present: Veronica Corpus-Dax, Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Autumn Linsmeier, Ken Rovinski, Excused:

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the Agenda for the May 24, 2021, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Autumn Linsmeier to approve the agenda. Motion Passed.
Yes- Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Derius Daniels, Autumn Linsmeier, Ken Rovinski, Abstain- None.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the May 10, 2021, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Autumn Linsmeier to approve the minutes.
Motion Passed.

Yes- Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Derius Daniels, Autumn Linsmeier, Ken Rovinski, Abstain- None.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. (ZP 21-12) Consideration with possible action on a request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for an expansion of an existing substation in the 2040 Block Morrow Avenue, submitted by Robert Mach, Mach IV Engineering, on behalf of WPS, property owner (Ald. C. Stevens, District 5).

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

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Derius Daniels, Autumn Linsmeier, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Jacob Miller to close the floor and return to regular order of business. Motion Passed.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Derius Daniels, Autumn Linsmeier, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Jacob Miller, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve the request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for an expansion of an existing substation in the 2040 Block of Morrow Avenue subject to the following conditions:

a. The combination of parcels 21-1226 and 21-297-1 for better site cohesion and access from Morrow Street. Note parcel 21-297-1 is extends between Highland Park Avenue and this will have to be split properly between the right-of-way.

b. Compliance with all of the regulations of the Green Bay Municipal Code not covered under the Conditional Use Permit, including standard site plan review and approval.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Derius Daniels, Autumn Linsmeier, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

2. (ZP 21-13) Public Hearing on a request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a limited production and processing use at 1778 Main Street, submitted by Michael Mileski and Tony Loucscher, applicants, Konop Vending Machines, property owner (Ald. L. Gerlach, District 3).

Chair Lisa Hanson read into record the rules and procedure for the Public Hearing. This Public Hearing was properly posted.

Chair Lisa Hanson then opened the Public Hearing regarding a request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit for a limited production and processing use at 1778 Main Street.

Chair Lisa Hanson asked three (3) times if there was any present who wished to speak. Hearing / seeing no one, the Public Hearing was closed.

3. (ZP 21-13) Consideration with possible action on a request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a limited production and processing use at 1778 Main Street, submitted by Michael Mileski and Tony Loucscher, applicants, Konop Vending Machines, property owner (Ald. L. Gerlach, District 3).

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to open the floor. Motion Passed.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Derius Daniels, Autumn Linsmeier, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Jacob Miller to close the floor and return to regular order of business. Motion Passed.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Derius Daniels, Autumn Linsmeier, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Sidney Bremer to approve the request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit for a Limited Production and Processing Use at 1778 Street subject to:

- a. Compliance with all regulations of the Green Bay Municipal Code not covered under the Conditional Use Permit (CUP), including standard site plan review and approval;
- b. The CUP is exclusive to the building primarily located on 1778 Main Street (Parcel 21-1303-1); and
- c. Outdoor storage of material is prohibited.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Derius Daniels, Autumn Linsmeier, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. University of Wisconsin Senior Capstone Project Presentation - Central Yards Redevelopment Concept presented by author Martin Jensen Rose.

David Buck introduced Martin Jensen Rose who presented the University of Wisconsin Senior Capstone Project.

2. Director's Report.

Neil Stechschulte presented the Director's Report.

3. Date of next meeting: June 7, 2021.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Jacob Miller, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to Adjourn. Motion Passed.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Derius Daniels, Autumn Linsmeier, Ken Rovinski, Abstain- None.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Madam Chair, Thank you.
- Well, I'm not claiming responsibility for that. I got emails.
- All right.
- Well, at least you read them.

- Yeah, but, I only got it maybe a half hour or so ago.
- Excuse me.
- Bless you.
- Done.
- All right. Well, it looks like six o'clock. So, welcome to the Monday, May 24th meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission via Zoom. Starting with a roll call. Chair Lisa Hanson, present. Vice Chair Jacob Miller?
- Not yet.
- No, not yet. Okay. Back with that. Alder Veronica Corpus-Dax?
- Present.
- Commissioner Sid Bremer?
- Present.
- Commissioner Derius Daniels?
- Present.
- Commissioner Autumn Linsmeier?
- [Autumn] Present.
- And Commissioner Ken Rovinski?
- [Ken] Present.
- Great. And then going on to the approval of the agenda, and I will just note at this time, because a public hearing was noticed, that the Legal Department at the City needs more time to create information regarding the Cass Street closure to South Adams Street. So that was removed from the Plan Commission meeting for this evening, and it's placed on the June 7th Planning Commission. So if you are here to speak to the Cass Street closure to South Adams Street, that will be for next meeting. Moving on to the approval of the agenda for the May 21 meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.
- With that Cass Street change that you just noted, I move approval.
- Second.
- Second.
- Motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Commissioner Linsmeier. All those in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Any opposed?

- And I see, Madam Chair, that we've been joined by Vice Chair Jake Miller.
- Excellent. Vice Chair Jacob Miller, present?
- Present.
- All right. Moving on to the approval of the minutes for the May 10th, 2021 meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.
- Chair, I'm sorry, Chair Hanson, a word quickly, I'm getting feedback. I don't know if anyone else is giving it? Tony? You just might want to remind everyone to mute their phones.
- I thought you meant from me.
- No.
- Okay. Are we good now? We're good, okay. Excellent. All right. Approval of the minutes from the May 10th, 2021 meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission. Do I have a motion to approve?
- So moved.
- Second.
- A motion by Alder Corpus-Dax, second by Commissioner Linsmeier. All those in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Any opposed? And moving on to Regular Business. Item number one, consideration with possible action on a request to authorize a conditional use permit for an expansion of an existing substation in the 2040 block Morrow Avenue, submitted by Robert Mach, Mach IV Engineering, on behalf of WPS, property owner.
- Thank you, Madam Chair. Let me just set this up quickly. So we had seen this at our last meeting and it was recommended holding. So I'm just gonna run through it briefly again and then go through the data that I've collected since our last meeting. So, this is on the city's east side. This is Danz over here. Main Street's a little bit further down. WPS has an existing substation that was built in the eighties. They're looking to do a site expansion. So this is the site here. It matches up with the zoning and our comprehensive plan. This is the proposed site plan. So as you can see here, all detailed, there's a new fence to go around the perimeter of the property. This is a stormwater management feature here, along with a little bit of a building expansion. But a lot of it is just site improvements as well. So from the last meeting we had recommended approval with the one condition of going through a parcel division. As you can see here a little bit more clearly, this parcel does jump Highland Park Avenue. So we're just asking for them to clean this up and to attach these two parcels, since this is more of a proper site than the one that jumps that. Since our last meeting, I was asked to do some research based on the original approval of this and any conditions that were associated with that. As you may recall, the property owner to the south stated that they believe that there was an agreement about the landscaping for this. So, we went through, I've looked at, I've read a lot of minutes from Plan Commission. Really joyous stuff. The site was originally approved by Plan Commission in 1987. That was attached into your meeting packet with those original minutes that just stated that there was a site plan approval needed, which would not require any berming at that time. There seems to be some sort of an expansion of the substation around 2001, but that's where I looked for the minutes through 1998 all the way through 2002, couldn't find any reflection of that expansion going through Plan Commission. So it either didn't require any action during the code at that time, or the expansion was just for equipment and not for the site itself. So it may not have needed any sort of approval either way. The only thing that I did find within that time period was when the neighboring property, who's questioning this berm, went before Plan Commission, and also in those notes, it

doesn't require any berming on their property or otherwise. And there is no, you can't condition someone's site to have something that's a condition on something that they don't own. So it wasn't mentioned in the minutes, but it also wasn't conditioned, because that would have been illegal to force it onto a different property owner at that time. So all in all, we didn't find anything on our end through Plan Commission action that would have held the city accountable to this berming. I know that WPS has their real estate department, that they also did some research. They did some title research. They went through their project expansion to see if there was any mention of this, and they couldn't find anything either. So that leads me to believe that there is no city involvement here. It's specifically a civil matter. I did inform the applicant and the neighboring property owner of that, and then my recommendation would remain the same, that we should approve this since it is allowable under those seven criteria that we judge conditional use permits by, and that we still don't find any need for additional berming. Any additional landscaping, transitional yard, they seem to have met their qualifications based off of those seven standards. And then also, off of our design standards required for utility uses, which were also attached to in your packet. So our stance remains the same, is recommendation with those two conditions. I do know that Bob Mach is here as the applicant, along with representatives of WPS. And I think, I had today off, but I just caught up on my emails, and it looked like you all were sent an email from UFG also, asking for a request on an additional condition about some landscaping, not berming, but trees. So that's up for consideration. At this point, staff is still just going for the two conditions, both still recommending approval. So that's where we stand with that research.

- Thank you, Steph. Do we have any questions for Stephanie? Go ahead, Madam, or Commissioner Bremer.

- I'll be a Madam too. So Steph, one thing that I don't think your report addressed is something that WPS emphasizes in its letter, that the current stormwater requirements eliminates the possibility of a berm. Can you tell us, can you address that, and tell us anything about it? That was the first I'd heard of it.

- Yeah. Let me pull up their site plan again. That might help describe that a little bit better than I can do in--

- This was in their letter dated the 20th of May this year. They note that there was no previous agreement, which surprises me, since one of their letters from ought-ought said that they'd be willing to cooperate and provide appropriate plantings at their cost. But it also notes the increased public electric needs. And this notion that the current stormwater requirements would eliminate the possibility of a berm.

- [Stephanie] So with the extension of this building, they'll kick into the stormwater management requirements, which is why it hasn't been seen on their site before. So the expansion is what requires that. So this area here is the entire stormwater facility. The berming area in question is along this property line and this property line. So if they were to be required to put it on their property, it would eat into the stormwater area, and then into their expansion area. So they would have to go closer to the roadway, which would not work out with the footprint of that existing structure or the existing substation. So I think that what they're saying is that since the berming is requested to be here, this is their stormwater facility that already has a pretty small setback. So they would have to shrink this, move this, which may be possible, but probably not likely, given that stormwater facilities are really built to handle whatever company or department of engineering tells them to do. It's kind of based on the size and what you're really outputting. So I'm sure it's a site design issue that they would run into if they had to put in a berm on that side.

- [Sidney] So is the stormwater retention pond plan then, just up to the requirements, with no give?

- [Stephanie] That I'm not sure. This site plan would have to be reviewed by our Department of Public Works. Last I saw they didn't have any flags raised about it. So I don't know if there's a lot of wiggle room here. But typically, if you see, people aren't overbuilding their stormwater, they're gonna build it to the right capacity, 'cause they're expensive to do also. So, I'm sure they're not gonna overdo it, but I really can't say yes or no on that.

- And while we have this map up, could you show me the difference between the size of the current substation and the size of the proposed one?

- [Stephanie] Sure. I don't know if it's shows the lines in here. But, maybe this one. I would say that, so this is, can you see my mouse moving?

- Yeah.

- [Stephanie] Okay. So that's the line of the expanded area. And I think the existing is here. So the encroachment really kind of just expands out a little bit in all directions, but I think Bob Mach might be able to answer that better. Or if you would like to hold, I can open up another rendering? With more details.

- I can certainly wait until we have a chance to hear from Bob Mach, too.

- Okay. Sounds good. But I know, there's a lot on that site plan. Site plans have a lot of information on them. So the lines can be really tricky to read.

- Thank you.

- You're welcome.

- I'm asking about that, in part, because you note that since it's simply an expansion of an already existing site it doesn't have any impact on others. But if the expansion is double the size or triple the size of the previous site, then that would seem to me to impact the neighbors.

- Great. Yeah. Let me pull up the site plan for that, because that'll have all the different information about square footage and that sort of stuff too. So that would be helpful.

- Thank you, Steph. Yeah, that would be helpful.

- [Steph] Okay. A pause for technology. Well, okay. So this is showing the existing conditions of that site. Has that loaded? Yes. Okay. So the existing building footprint goes along here.

- [Sidney] Mm hm.

- [Stephanie] Let me switch. So it's not expanding by very much. So existing site. Let me blow that up a little bit so you guys can see too. I'm reading the impervious coverage here, 'cause that'll show us that statistic.

- [Sidney] Thank you.

- [Stephanie] So it looks like the total impervious surface on the existing site is about 36%, and it jumps up to about 60%. But that would include building and pavement as listed here. So the building is going from 501 square footage to 782. So not that big of a jump.

- And could you show me as well, and you're right, it's a very detailed site plan, so I wasn't sure how to find it, where the building itself is?

- [Stephanie] There, is that a little easier to read? See those lines there?

- We don't have the--

- Oh, it didn't move.

- There we go.
- [Stephanie] There we go. So this area here.
- Is the proposed one or--
- Proposed.
- [Sidney] I'm asking about the building now.
- [Stephanie] Yep. This is the proposed building area.
- Okay. And the current building area then is that interior set of lines?
- [Stephanie] That wouldn't be shown on here. I don't think that we have one that is a comparison between the two. Maybe Bob has something like that, but we only have existing versus proposed. But it would be inside of this area here. And I think the building kind of like moves a little bit too.
- I believe the building that's over to, this is David, the building over to the left is new. Am I incorrect? That one?
- [Stephanie] This?
- [David] I think so. At least just looking at the two plans that you just had shown.
- Okay. And I see that that outline for a building. Is that a new building in addition to the current one? Or is it instead of the current one?
- [Stephanie] It's just an expansion as far as I know. I think that we need to talk to Bob to get more details about what's accurate here, because this is a very detailed site plan, that I think we might want him to walk us through.
- Thank you. You got us closer, Stephanie.
- I'm trying my best here.
- You are.
- Were there any other questions for staff or discussion amongst the commission?
- I did have a really quick question, and Commissioner Bremer alluded to this earlier, but in our packet we did see the information from the gentleman's agreement, the civil matter around the berm. And I ask, Steph, did anyone address that? Or is that almost like it, no one ever saw it? Because I did read that information in there, and I'm just, a very, very high level overview, was that addressed or has that been addressed, other than being in that letter?
- There was no formal document drafted after that letter. So that letter came when both WPS were talking about an expansion back in the early 2000s, and when UFG was going to be going through a proposal on that site. So it was part of a development that they were having that conversation to begin with. So, I read the same letter that you guys did. Sounds like they were going to set up some agreements so that as they were developing together, it would happen. But there is no legal document to that effect. No parties can find that legal document. And more importantly, the city is not held to any of those standards, any of those, people decide things between themselves a lot. So if there's no legal document, we don't find it necessary. The

berming seems very over the top, considering the types of uses we're talking about here. But that's just staff recommendation. So if you guys feel that additional landscaping should be required, that's up to you. If you guys feel that they should be honoring that agreement, that is also up to you. To me, it's just the documented, the letter itself is 21 years old and no development occurred, which is why I think no legal document was ever drafted. So, from a City perspective, we don't really have many thoughts on that. We recommended that the property owners worked it out together, and I hope that they do, but it's up to you all to decide if additional landscaping is required.

- Thank you, Steph.

- Okay, if there's no further discussion, I think it sounds like we might want to hear from the petitioner. And there might be other people that want to speak as well.

- So I move that we open the floor.

- Second.

- A motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Commissioner Daniels. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right. Do we want to talk right away with...

- I think start with Bob, probably.

- With Bob, okay.

- Yeah.

- I'm not seeing him.

- I was gonna say, is he on a call? Or is someone, I guess--

- He was on.

- Oh there he is, Bob.

- Yeah, Robert, yeah.

- Ah, up in the corner there, hiding. So can you help with understanding the, can you help with understanding the difference in the size of the building between the current and the proposed substation. And yeah, DJ points out that you were muted, but you aren't anymore.

- All right, yes I can. Thank you. So Stephanie, could you go to Sheet C 2.0? More site plan? And kind of zoom in, like you had it before, showing most of the site. I think that'd be the easiest to explain. I can kind of walk you through the best I am capable of doing here. While she's doing that, let me give you a little background on the site. The, okay, here we go. So this is an expansion of the existing facility. WPS staff is on the line as well. They can talk about some of the specific needs for that expansion. When they expand these facilities, they have to keep the existing facility operating. So on this view that's on your screen now, you'll see the wires coming in from the east side and we have numbers one and two, keynotes one and two in the middle of the screen there, that's where their primary equipment is now. That has to remain operational while they do the expansion and put the new facilities in, to continue to provide power to people. So part of this expansion, then, is going both to the north and the south of this area. We have obvious limitations in every direction. To

the north, we can't really push much farther than what we did. You'll see on the north side along Morrow there are existing delineated wetlands there. And from the DNR's perspective, if we have room on our site to avoid those, we have to pretty much avoid those at all costs. So we can't go any farther to the north. We already are constructing a pretty significant retaining wall to be able to put this facility in and not encroach into those wetlands. So there's construction issues and significant cost with doing that to not encroach into those wetlands. So we're pushing our boundary as far to the north as we can. We can't really go any farther to the east because there's existing transmission lines and high pressure gas main through that area. And then to the west, we have to put in our stormwater management pond. Commissioner Bremer, you had asked about the size of that. And the answer is yes, that is a minimum sized pond. Probably a touch bigger than what it needs to be for this facility, but from practical and code restraints, there's a minimum size on the stormwater pond of 10,000 square feet, and it's really impractical to go below that because you don't end up with enough depth, you don't have a proper treatment, and they become really ugly cesspools, basically. So this is the minimum sized pond. We would gladly reduce it, but we really cannot. Then, Stephanie, if you want to flip, oh, one thing before we switch from this page, if you see where keynote four is, kind of in the, right, right in there. So that is the existing, those are the existing buildings where they have some of their electrical equipment on the site. Those will be taken down when the new buildings come online or new building comes online. So Stephanie, if you could flip to the next page, please. Okay. So this is the proposed site. We have that wall along the north side, where keynote one is showing. That's that retaining wall keeping us away from those wetlands. You can see on this site, relatively speaking, where the existing lines came in. Those are still shown. So if you look kind of in the middle where we have benchmark three, BM-3 noted, so north and south of there, yes, that's where the existing equipment is. So part of this has to get built around that. So we have expansions to the north, expansions to the south. Because of the expansions and the additional area, yes, we are required by state code and city code to put in the stormwater. There's really no way around that. We touched on that. That is the minimum. The proposed building that's going to house their equipment is, like Stephanie had indicated previously, kind of in the southwest corner there. Now you can see, kind of faintly on this drawing, the outline of the existing substation. So right where your cursor is, Stephanie, if you go straight east there's a dashed line. You just, no, put it back on the south side of the control house. So if you go straight to the east, that little, a little south. Okay, there's a dashed line through there that outlines the edge of the existing gravel. Yep. And then that goes north and then to the northeast. Oh dog. That's the one.

- Thank you. That's very helpful.

- And let me just see if there's anything else that was brought up or any questions that I could touch on. One thing I just wanted to point out about the agreement that was, seemed to be of, like they were previously negotiating that 20, 21 years ago, as part of that PURD that was done for the property to the south. The Plan Commission back in September amended that PURD to remove those requirements from this parcel. So, any requirements for a berm or any of the development or anything else I would think would also not apply, because the PURD was removed.

- And the document you just referred to is a Plan Commission document? From September of which year?

- The Plan Commission document he's referring to, sorry to step in, Robert, was the minutes from the Plan Commission meeting in September of 2020.

- Okay, thank you.

- It essentially stated that with the removal of the PURD, the plans were proprietary to the development, and with the removal of the PURD, those proprietary plans were removed. Required of the site. In preparation for the sale of the property.

- Thank you. And that was Scott Shepherd, for the record, who was speaking, and before that, Bob, I'm sorry, I lost your last name.

- Mach, M-A-C-H.

- Mach, of course..

- Please state your address for the record too, both of you.

- Sure, Bob Mach, Mach IV Engineering, 2260 Salscheider Court, Green Bay, 54313.

- And Scott Shepherd, WPS, 800 South Lynndale in Appleton, Wisconsin.

- Thank you so much. Do any other commissioners have questions to share? Did you have additional things to say, Mr. Shepherd?

- Yes. If you'll indulge me. I was just gonna maybe reiterate a few points from the Plan Commission we attended just a few weeks ago. And that is basically, I want to restate the need for the Preble substation expansion. This expansion is important to the public and the city of Green Bay for several reasons. And I'll go through just a few here. The growth in the east side of Green Bay is really driving the need for this expansion. Currently we have two substations in this area. The existing Preble substation and the existing Henry Street substation. Currently the Henry Street substation is becoming obsolete. It also sits in low ground. It has a tendency to flood. And therefore it creates public safety hazards and reliability issues for the residents that that substation serves. So that substation, the Henry Street, will be retired when this project is complete. And these two new, larger circuits within the Preble substation are completed. The Preble site is perfect and ideal for expansion because it's higher ground. It has the space to do the two transformers. And Bob keyed in on something that's very important, and that's that we need that substation to continue running while we construct. So, I want to make sure that that's impressed upon you, because without it, it'd be very difficult to serve the city of Green Bay going forward. It has the space for both. And the storm water requirement will improve the storm runoff, again, all required by code and so on. So, I guess I just offer that up as the need for it, to reiterate our points from last time. And again, we're not asking for any additional property. We're just asking to use our property very efficiently with the space we have. And I'm available for questions as well. Thank you.

- Thank you very much. Go ahead, Commissioner Bremer.

- So then one additional question, Mr. Shepherd. Does that efficient use of your current property include the possibility of some landscaping to improve the aesthetics for the neighbors?

- With the space that we've got, between the fence line and the property line, we have to have a certain amount of gravel that extends beyond the fence line. Our grounding grid extends beyond that fence line as well. And that's a requirement for public safety in making sure that all the. Electrical, and so that any anybody outside there can be safe in walking and working around that site. By having to keep the substation running, and therefore building the new lines, if you will, the new transformer, the new circuits, outside the existing, that only gives us room for the fence, the gravel, and the grid. And then we're meeting the required setbacks. Now, there's a public safety component beyond just the ground grid. We've done a lot of work in the recent year with public officials, whether it's fire or public safety officials, police, and so on. And what they've told us is, if there's any problems or any calls, they would prefer to be able to roll up to the substation, be able to look in, see any potential criminal activity, potential hazards, potential sparking, or any fires or hotspots. Now, from a company perspective, we happen to agree. Trees of some types provide climbing hazards for anybody that might want to enter. Now, of course, you can't see electricity, so you get into a situation where unknowing individuals may grab things that look like great scrap metal copper. There have been several incidents throughout the utility industry with incidents like that, especially when times are tougher. But, anyhow, my point being, climbing hazards, any kind of blocked view into the substation, it does become an issue. So, for all of those reasons, there's just simply not the space or the proper handling of public safety to have those shrubs on our.

- Thank you very much.

- I have a related question, really quick, too. In terms of the landscaping that currently exists, how much will be coming down? Especially in terms of the trees that are providing a good amount of cover from the street, from the neighboring properties, those types of trees or whatever foliage would be there?

- Scott here again. I think I might refer that back to Bob Mach or possibly Drew Bain.

- Thank you, Scott.

- Okay. So the existing trees on the south side of the property will be removed to the property line, as will the trees on the the west side where the pond is going. Now, there, if you look on the air photos, those are, they do show as trees, but a lot of those are relatively new growth from the last 15 to 20 years, from the last time they did an expansion out there, and those were areas outside of the gravel that were just let go and some trees grew up in there. There's not anything terribly significant or large in those areas. To the east there is the transmission line easement and that has some limited growth in there as well. There probably will be a few that remain between the substation and that easement. And I think there is, or there are some trees east of that easement between that easement and the residential properties along Henry.

- Thank you.

- Do we have any other questions for the applicant? Was there anyone else from the public wishing to speak on this item? If you can come forward and state your name and address for the record. If you're calling in on internet audio, it's star-six to unmute.

- I would like to speak, if allowed, Ms. Hanson?

- Sure. Go ahead and state your name and address for the record, please.

- My name is Ryan McMurtrie, address 660 West Ridgeview Drive, Appleton, Wisconsin, the United Financial Group, representing the landowners to the south and west of the applicant. And I'll do my best to be brief and direct. So you guys have all read the letter between the applicant and United Financial Group, documenting the agreement to allow us to put a berm on their land. I'll be the first one to admit this is not a legally enforceable document. We are not arguing that point. And what I do want to highlight is that this was an agreement between the parties that has been documented by letter. And Scott Shepherd, actually, as you are all aware, went on record in September just to make the point that he was not going to honor that agreement. I can sincerely tell you, as a developer in the field of multifamily, I hope I make it to the end of my career without having to go on public record stating I will not honor an agreement with an adjacent neighbor. So, again, there's no argument here, that that was a legally enforceable agreement. It was an agreement with an adjacent neighbor. It was an agreement that led to additional support of the project. And given these issues, if I had been in the position of WPS, as opposed to going on record simply stating that I was not going to honor the agreement, I would have contacted us and arrived at a mutually beneficial solution. In light of the issues that have been highlighted by the applicant with regard to the need for expansion, we did make a proposal today for a middle ground to add some landscaping, the planting of five to six foot pine trees, 12 feet on center, to provide additional screening so that the applicant would be able to retain as much land as possible. We feel that's a very fair offer, given the mutual agreement that did take place 20 years ago. I understand that there's apparently some safety issues arise, but if those trees were such as safety issue, I'm a little confused as to why, number one, they would have agreed to the berm in the first place, or why they would have allowed the trees to continue growing on the south side of the substation to this. So in conclusion, again, we do not have a legal argument. This is simply a documented, in-writing agreement between two parties. And I think it's a very dangerous precedent to set that if any other neighbors ever do have conversations or any letters with applicants. They better pay for an attorney, they better get a legally enforceable document, and they better

have that in place. Because the word of an applicant and what they state in a desire to obtain approval is essentially meaningless. So, I appreciate your time. And that all I have to say at this point. And thank you for your service on the Commission.

- Thank you very much for your testimony, Ryan. Was there anyone else from the public wishing to speak on this item?

- This is Eric Van Schyde. If I could just really quickly comment very quickly on that. I formerly, from a couple blocks away from this particular location, but I live in Milwaukee now. My professional address is 411 East Wisconsin Avenue, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. And simply to state that WPS and any of the arguments that were just heard are things to be heard outside of the forum that we're talking about here. And we support the planner's position on this and believe this is unfortunately something the Plan Commission doesn't need to hear about, that we can resolve the issues as she correctly stated between my client and the other land owner. Thank you.

- Thank you very much. Was there anyone else wishing to speak regarding this item? Further questions for the applicant before I entertain a motion to close the floor?

- So moved.

- Second.

- Motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Vice Chair Miller, to close the floor. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Any opposed?

- Lisa, I'm happy to kick us off, if you're ready.

- Yeah, absolutely. Go ahead.

- So my concerns from last meeting, which were mainly around just the legal issue that may or may not have existed, have been answered there. So I'm pretty comfortable with everything else that's been put on the table. So, the only thing I think we, that sounds like it's a little up in the air, is just in terms of the final site plan review. And I don't know if that's going to really affect too much in terms of what we're talking about in terms of what trees, foliage, that type of thing will be on the site. So, assuming there's no other issues with that from staff, I would move to approve.

- I'll second. I agree with what Commissioner Miller said. Questions that I had before regarding the berm have been answered. So I second.

- So a motion by Vice Chair Miller and a second by Alder Corpus-Dax. Go ahead, Commissioner Bremer.

- I do understand the legal situation entirely, although having somebody state that something was not said before, when it was in writing that it was said before, is disturbing to me. So my hope that in working on the site plan, there would be attention to the concern of aesthetics for the neighbors. Without an enforcement of any previous non-legal document, and I don't understand what makes a written document not legal, but in any event, I would hope that that would be a part of the site plan review to work on the aesthetic issues and see if there's some way of making the situation better for the neighbors. That has been my pride, frankly, in this Plan Commission, that we have looked for ways to satisfy people who start out with opposing viewpoints. And I would hope that we would continue with that beyond what is legally required.

- Thank you, Commissioner Bremer. So we have a motion on the floor by Vice Chair Miller. Any further discussion amongst the commission? All right. Then I will go ahead with a voice vote. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Any opposed? So that will pass unanimously. And then is the next City Council meeting June 1st? Or is it the following week?

- I believe it's June 1st.

- June 1st.

- And so then that'll move on to City Council for June 1st. Moving onto item two, a 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 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 are only providing information in this matter, and 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 chair. Comments will be limited to three minutes. We will now open the public hearing on item two, public hearing on a request to authorize a conditional use permit for a limited production and processing use at 1778 Main Street, submitted by Michael Mileski and Tony Loucscher, applicants, Konop Vending Machines, property owner. And if staff could give a brief overview for the public hearing portion.

- Certainly. Can you all see my screen? Or is there a delay? You got it. Woo! No delay. Anyway, this is David. So this is a conditional use permit request for limited production and processing of guitars, as a matter of fact, on the property that's showing up on your screen. So the corner piece that's outlined in the brighter red is 1778 Main Street. It's on the corner of Laura and Main. It actually consists of three, probably originally three buildings that are connected. And the conditional use permit would actually be in the southern building. And again, they are asking for a conditional use permit, processing of guitars. And that requires a CUP in the General Commercial District.

- Thank you, David. Is there anyone, I guess we'll start with, looking for parties looking to speak that are in favor of the proposal? Are there any people looking to speak that are in opposition to the proposal? And is there anyone wishing to provide information only? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Let the record reflect that no one came forward and this public hearing is now closed. Moving on to the associated agenda item, item number three, consideration with possible action on a request to authorize a conditional use permit for a limited production and processing use at 1778 Main Street, submitted by Michael Mileski and Tony Loucscher, applicants, Konop Vending Machines, property owner.

- Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. So I have the same picture up, this is obviously the same property. I'll kinda just go over some of the surrounding uses. So the structure itself is currently, I believe, fully vacant and had previously been a pet food supply store and retail store and a dog grooming establishment. What looks kind of weird on this site plan or on this map, is you'll notice I have, 1778 is outlined in the dark red and actually the neighboring property owner at 1786 is outlined in pink. These are two separate properties. And I just want to point out that sometime between 1950 and, or excuse me, between 1978 and 1992, a couple of the buildings were expanded over the lot line. So this conditional use permit application is really for the buildings addressed at 1778, but they do extend over the property line. So that'll be in the conditions. And I also just wanted to make the point, partially for the Plan Commission, but also partially for the applicant, that I don't know the building codes. Depending on what type of remodeling they're doing inside, this property line could become problematic, because of fire codes and other types of building codes. Staff looked at trying to be able to split this lot somehow and make it a condition, because it is a non-conforming situation right now. We were not

able to find a solution that didn't cause just as much non-conformity with trying to fix it. So we're addressing this as a legal nonconforming situation. But I just wanted to make everybody aware of that. So the notice went out including both properties, but it really is the one in red. What you'll see kind of in this area to the south and to the west is primarily Low Density Residential, single family. To the east is sort of the Main Street commercial corridor. You have Genes Deep Rock immediately to the east, which is an automobile service center. I think the only full service gas station in the area as well. To the north you have some office space, some tavern space, and then the grocery store, Planet Fitness. So that kind of gives you the lay of land. This is the future land use plan. You'll see it pretty much designates everything along Main Street as commercial, and then residential to the south and to the west. Zoning reflects that. Pretty much everything on Main Street either has, most of it has the C1 General Commercial. The gas station, and for whatever reason, this house, just south of the property, have a Highway Business zoning, which of course requires the conditional use permit. So, as I had said, it is basically two lots right now. The site, if I just call it these buildings, is occupied pretty much with one story, about 11,000 square foot building. Again, built between 1950 to 1980, in stages. It also has a small parking lot here on the north. On Main Street, not many stalls and very awkward. And then a service and loading area and some parking to the south. The building itself, I believe, is completely vacant. I think the dog groomer might still have a lease in there. But what the applicant is proposing to do, and I'm gonna zoom up. Well here's a little bit better picture of the site. So you can kind of see it from different angles. This is the front from Main Street with the retail center, retail portion. This is the back where the manufacturing section would be. And sort of in the middle would be, they're proposing to use it for repair. And as you can see, Genes Deep Rock, and then the building right next to it. So this is the structure itself. And this was a submission with the applicant's petition. So again, they're proposing to use the front end of the building, mainly for reception and retail, a little bit of storage, office space, and a repair shop. And I believe it's not just guitars, it might be musical instruments, but there's the repair shop in the center. And then the southern portion of the building, which is this long piece, the application did show dog grooming still in here, so I'm not sure if they're gonna remain. But they do show the manufacturing piece here. And that would be limited production and processing. We just kind of went through one of these at East Town Mall before. If you remember, that is defined in the Zoning Code as, if I can find it. Small scale activities that are compatible with retail sales and services. These uses produce minimal offsite impacts due to their limited nature and scale. In this case, this is manufacturing to support, not only the retail, but I'm sure they would be selling them off site as well, but it's very limited. It's my understanding that it is only going to be indoor. There won't be any outdoor. And it only takes up, if you look at this, probably somewhere around a third of the building itself. Planning staff looked at this. The production and processing business really just uses standard woodworking and metalworking equipment to do assembly, basically. It doesn't really generate any noise, any odors, outside of the building itself. We are recommending approval of the request. We think the actual proposed use matches the code almost perfectly to its definition. And then to meet the conditional use permit criteria, we don't feel it will be detrimental or endanger public health, safety, or welfare. It should not impede the normal orderly development of the surrounding property, being that it is fully developed. It should not be injurious to the use of other property in the immediate vicinity or impair property values. There are adequate utilities and access to the site. And there is adequate parking facilities provided so that it should not be detrimental at all to the neighborhood. We did reach out to Alder Gerlach, the Oak Grove Neighborhood Association and adjacent property owners, as I said, encompassing both properties, the gas station as well. We have not heard any feedback or had any calls with questions, other than from the Alder. So with that, we are recommending an approval of the request. We are placing three conditions on. One is the standard compliance with all other regulations of the Municipal Code. The second is that the CUP is exclusive to the building primarily located at 1778 Main Street. And then we did add on, although I don't believe they're gonna have any, but no outdoor storage of material.

- Okay. Thank you, David. And I guess, are we concerned at all that they're putting the manufacturing in the portion of the building that is over the property line?

- Again, from a use standpoint, that is really, we're considering this to be a non-conforming situation. So the way nonconformity works, it's allowed to remain and continue for its life span. If it ever gets redeveloped, they

would have to meet code at that point. So, as far as the land use and the zoning is concerned, we are not, like I said, there could be ramifications if they do major remodeling, with the building code, but I don't know that.

- Okay. Thank you, David.

- You're welcome.

- Is there any other discussion amongst the commission?

- Yes. Commissioner Ken Rovinski here. I just had two questions. One, I didn't see anywhere where they talked about the hours of operation. Is that a concern at all? I don't believe the light manufacturing that they're gonna be doing would be any louder than the service station that's right next to the same building. But just, I know sometimes CNC machines or whatever they might be using, can run at any hour of the day without an operator necessarily needing to be there. Is that a concern at all for staff the hours of operation for the business?

- Well, the hours of operation are not a concern for staff, primarily because it's all going to be interior. I suppose there could be some deliveries coming and going from that rear service area, but probably not really late at night or really early in the morning. It could be a concern for the Plan Commission if you did want to limit hours. We did not ask the applicants if they had that in mind or not. So, it's a good question.

- Okay. Yeah, that would just be one of my concerns, being that there are some residential properties right behind there and across the street on Laura Street. So if we could limit that to whatever is a reasonable hours of operation, in case, I don't know how insulated that building is, since it's a metal building, it could reverberate, any kind of machinery they have in there. The other question is, they mentioned the use or applying finish to the guitars or instruments. Are there requirements that they have for like filtration if they're using an exhaust system on the building?

- Yeah, those would all be taken care of through the building code. And that's why I say, depending on the remodeling, the property line could have an effect.

- Just so we know what we're voting on, I wonder if we could open the floor and hear from the applicant so we know whether the groomer's gonna stay, what their hours of operation are likely to be, and other issues that have come up here where we've got some uncertainties. So I would move to open the floor.

- Second.

- I would second.

- Motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right, the floor is open. I guess if the applicant could come forward, state your name and address for the record, and give us a little overview.

- Michael Mileski Green Bay.

- Yeah, one of the two of you should mute while the other talks. We're getting major feedback.

- Is that better now?

- Yes.

- Yeah.
- All right. Thank you.
- My name is Tony Loucscher, and I'm a petitioner as well.
- Okay, and Tony, if you could just state your address for the record?
- Yes, 2743 Newberry Avenue in Green Bay, 54302.
- Thank you. And then I guess the questions, hours of operation?
- Well, for the the music store, we currently are in existence at 1764 Main Street. That's about 200 feet from the new facility that we're looking at. And the standard hours here are 11:00 till 6:00. However, we do have employees and such coming in as early as nine o'clock, but we don't really have a, we don't create a lot of noise that would impact the neighborhood. Generally it wouldn't be much more than about six o'clock, and that's Monday through Friday, and Saturdays are 11:00 till 2:00, and Sunday is closed.
- Commissioner Bremer, what was the other item? The other question that you had?
- First of all, just to follow up the hours, I wonder, can you speak to the question that Commissioner Rovinski had about whether or not the building was insulated for purposes of sound protection?
- From what I've seen, the building is normal insulation. The part that we'd be doing the manufacturing in has wood plywood on the inside. From the inside you can't hear anything from the outside. So I'm gonna make an assumption that you're not gonna hear the other way either.
- And I believe that historically the building in question was also, I believe a printing facility. So they had to have insulation to keep the climate controlled.
- Right. There was a very significant printing operation there. That's one of the reasons we were looking at the building, because it has the power and the floor and everything that I need for the manufacturing.
- That's very helpful to know. And then my other question, just being a pet person, are the dog groomers gonna stay?
- I believe so. She's been there for about 20 years.
- And I did talk to Joy to let her know what we're talking about doing, and her current plans are to stay, yes.
- I think she wants to buy a guitar.
- The dogs might like that.
- I guess one more thing that was brought up is the finishing aspects. We also finish in the current facility here at 1764, and we meet all the required codes. Matter of fact, we've had several occasions where the fire department has visited and authorized us to do the limited amount of finish work that we have. But there's no impact on the environment. It's a very limited amount of finish that we use. And matter of fact, not only the Captain of the Green Bay Fire Department is a customer of ours, we also have a few other staff members there that frequent our establishment.
- Did anyone else from the commission have questions for the commissioners?

- I just wanted to clarify on the hours of operation. So the manufacturing would be during the same hours of operation as the retail store?

- I usually start a little bit later in the morning. I like getting out there about 7:00.

- Okay. Thank you.

- Any other questions from the commission? All right, then I'll entertain a motion to close the floor.

- Unless anybody else wants to speak? So moved.

- Second.

- Motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Vice Chair Miller to close the floor. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Any further discussion amongst the commission?

- Yeah. Just in relation to the noise. We do have the City's Noise Ordinance too, to fall back on, if we're concerned about anything like that. I don't really want to overburden this right now by adding conditions for hours of operation. Assuming they're not making noise, I feel like we're pretty well covered there, or not making excessive noise, I think we're covered there.

- I'd just like to add that Alder Gerlach asked me to add that she supports the measure. She couldn't be here because she was attending another meeting, but she fully supported it. So I make a motion to approve.

- Well, with that, because it does seem to match the code definition precisely, as David Buck put it, I move approval.

- I think Alder Corpus-Dax mighta--

- Whatever.

- Can I get you to second, Commissioner Bremer? Did we freeze? Did I freeze?

- Lisa, what did you say?

- Oh, I'm sorry. Could I, 'cause Alder Corpus-Dax did actually, so moved.

- So I will second.

- Thank you. That's what I was looking for.

- That's what we need. Thank you so much.

- A motion by Alder Corpus-Dax and a second by Commissioner Bremer. Any further discussion? We'll go ahead with a voice vote. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Any opposed? And then that will move on to the June 1st City Council meeting. And moving on to Informational. University of Wisconsin Senior Capstone Project Presentation, Central Yards Redevelopment Concept, presented by Martin Jensen Rose.

- Thank you, Madam Chairman. Yes, I'd just like to introduce you, and I see his camera came on. This is Martin Jensen Rose. I've been fortunate enough to work with him two semesters now. He is a graduate now of Madison's Planning and Landscape Architecture Program. He had came to us about a year ago requesting to work on the, what he's calling the Central Yards, which is the rail yard that goes underneath Ashland Avenue. It runs pretty much from Broadway, he'll get into it, the location, and do his senior capstone project on it. We were lucky enough to have him want to do that, especially at this opportune time with a comp plan getting updated and all that. So, with that, I'm just going to let you know the city does not own this property, it is privately owned. But this redevelopment project that Martin had done goes a long way for planning for us, as well as brings a lot of, in my opinion, ideas and concepts that are very intriguing, and I suspect will be looked at and potentially incorporated in our redevelopment plans and comp plans. So with that, Martin Jensen Rose, and his Central Yards Senior Capstone Project.

- Thank you so much for that introduction, David. Can everyone hear me and see my screen? All right. So as David mentioned, this is my senior capstone project, titled Central Yards, and my name is Martin Jensen Rose. And just to kind of note, also, as David had mentioned, the main goals of this project are to initiate and stimulate conversations around the redevelopment of the sites that I'll cover. And with that, some elements may be a bit bolder in execution due to academic liberties, as well as the extent and scope of the project. And this project was completed for the Bachelors of Landscape Architecture Program, the senior capstone project requirements, here at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, where I am joining you today. Quickly, about myself, I am from De Pere, Wisconsin. And within landscape architecture, I find my passion within the urban environment and the life of urban landscapes. And hopefully that comes through within this presentation. And before I go any further, I'd like to acknowledge and thank the stakeholder committee who has helped guide and worked with me this past year, which includes David, as well as other members of Green Bay's community and Economic Development Department, in addition to area alderpersons and neighborhood associations. And it's with my work with them that we were able to drive the project, centered around strengthened community connections, to the linkage of area trails, creation of park and community gathering spaces, and help to diversify housing through community, or accommodate future needs within Green Bay. And kind of an overview of my presentation. I'll begin with introducing you to the sites, as well as going through all the different aspects of the design, starting at the largest scale with an expansive master plan, all the way down to the details of a focus site within that rail yard. And to begin that introduction, as you all probably know, this project is located in Green Bay, Wisconsin, which is the seat of Brown County and located in the northeastern part of the state. The Central Yards Project is built upon three main sites, historically pictured here, from when industry played a pivotal role in the livelihood of Green Bay. To the west lies the rail yard site, with the ship yard to the north and coal yard to the south, along the banks of the Fox River. However, today both the ship yard and rail yard lay vacant and misused, and the coal yard has recently received funding to be relocated, creating the opportunity to revitalize these spaces together. And to give you a better understanding of these sites, the Shipyard project is currently under construction and that was designed by Stantec. The project is an urban waterfront park with a shipping container commercial incubator, marina, kayak launch, and much more, and serves as a northern tether of the district. Next are the coal yards, which as you can see, currently house immense piles of coal. And finally there is the rail yard site itself, and the main focus of my proposal. And with that, I want to talk a void of negative space and its disruption. The rail yard rips a tear in the urban, social, and ecological fabric that is so essential to the health of the communities which surrounds it. And the site has lain vacant for nearly two decades now and serves only really as a scar, paying homage to the industrial roots which founded the city, but preventing its growth from what is to come. And here you can see the remnants of that past, with the raised Ashton Avenue viaduct, which bisects the site, and also divides the surrounding neighborhoods. And to expand upon housing, a recent study found that the primary needs are to be affordable and in higher densities than are present. And it is encouraged that their creation around targeted development districts, such as the one I am proposing. And then finally to wrap up the introduction, last semester, through my analysis, I found the primary design constraints for the rail yard site to be the commercial block to the

north blocking trail access, industrial pollutants within the site, the raised viaduct, and low density housing context, in order to create higher density within the site. And on the other hand, the opportunities were connections to the nearby ship yard and coal yard, as I have mentioned, and the 47 plus acre size of the site, as well as expanding upon social anchors, such as 5th street garden, which is an existing community hub within the site, as well as connecting to Tank Park and elementary and connecting area trails. And finally, I also want to briefly touch on the idea of brownfield indicators, as it played a key role in the design of the site, which I'll be presenting next. And the idea here is to repurpose or reuse typologies of industrial landscapes to continue that narrative of contamination. So users are aware of what the site used to be in order to further reduce the risk of exposure, even after remediation. And finally, I can get into the fun stuff, the design itself, and that can begin with a master plan for these sites. And first to kind of introduce you to those key features in context, get the lay of the land. This map, you can see all three, rail, ship, and coal yard sites, in relation to Green Bay's primary downtown and urban core, which is home to the CityDeck, an existing and popular boardwalk, in addition to the Sergeant Benjamin Edinger Corridor Trail to the west, and the Fox River Trail along the east shore of the Fox River. And with that in mind, you can see my proposed trail master plan, which utilizes a mix of both on-street residential, on street protected, and off street mixed-use trails, through the area to link those two trails across three major bridges. And the most notable feature here is the creation of an attached pedestrian bridge at the existing Mason Street Bridge, just north of the coal yard development. And that serves to facilitate a faster connection between those trails in tandem to creating two downtown activity loops, which would provide activity and offer attractive routes that tie the CityDeck into the Central Yard plan. And here you can kind of see the existing conditions of this district. And now it's proposed changes. And notably here I will also introduce the proposal of removing the Ashland Avenue viaduct, and in its place creating the Ashland Avenue tunnel, which I'll cover in the next section. And that brings to Infrastructure Projects, and the two of those being the Ashland Avenue tunnel and the Mason Street pedestrian bridge. And to begin with the pedestrian bridge, as I already covered, it's located in the northern section of the coal yard, and it's proposed as an attached feature, which minimizes the costs. However, it was ultimately conceived to create those activity loops, in addition to that faster transition between those trails, instead of going up into downtown. The other project being the creation of the Ashland Avenue tunnel, which was a decision made to create 3.2 acres. Intersections and personal safety, while maintaining the large traffic loads and high speeds Ashland Avenue requires. And here you can see kind of the northern spur of the rail yard, and how the tunnel allows for a promenade above, in addition to housing and community opportunities, like expanding the 5th Street garden. And that brings us to the coal yard conceptual design. And this site is primarily envisioned as a high density housing and mixed use development, which facilitates off-street trail connections between the rail yard and ship yard, in addition to featuring a community boardwalk to mimic the CityDeck to the north, just south of the Mason Street Bridge. And with a mix of studio, one, two, and three bedroom units, it's estimated the site could support 400 plus units at a 60-40 split of affordable to market rate. And finally, here is a perspective of what that site could be with the attached pedestrian bridge spanning the Fox, ecological restoration of both the site and the shoreline to help mitigate flood risks, as well as that residential high rise and community boardwalk. Moving onto the focus and the rail yard site itself. Here you can see a master plan for the Central Yards project in the rail yard, which can be divided into different districts. And moving from west to east are the trail spur along the former railway, a western residential district, and a community hub, and my focus site, within the center of the site. And that is paired next to the civic green, which is a primary space on top of the Ashland Avenue tunnel, which I had previously discussed and is delineated in dashed pink. To the north of this lies the expanded 5th Street community garden, and northern residential districts, and the eastern residential district to the south. And finally, on the east, is the coal yard connection and eastern track prairie. And here, zooming into the body of the site, here you can see some key program elements. And to highlight a few, there's the Tank Park loop, which connects the nearby park and elementary school. The expanded community garden to the north, which is connected to the site by the Ashland Avenue promenade above the tunnel. And this bisects the great lawn, which is a permeable introduction to the focus site, which I'll cover more closely in the next section. And throughout, pedestrian circulation is dominated by the mixed-use trail, shown in yellow. And here I have overlain where the former rail lines ran through the site, and these locations not only influence the forms and composition of the site, but also in some locations served as paths in the form of rail track rambles. And these secluded paths form feature rail tracks embedded in a crushed granite brown course to help highlight the industrial past of the site and create a unique auditory experience, in addition to

continuing that narrative of the rail yard within the actual design. And here you can see where those paths occur. In addition to how the use of fall color and leaves turning red highlight the different former rail lines come Fall. However, the primary connections are the Tank Park loop, in pink here, the main mixed-use trail in orange, and the bike fast path in terracotta. And that allows bikers to bypass pedestrian heavy areas to minimize collisions. And these in tandem with multiple bike rental and mobility hubs allow for immense access across the site. As for vehicular circulation, here in light blue are all the vehicular accessible areas. And most of the residential buildings utilize underground parking garages to maximize effective green space above. Here I've outlined new vehicular connections to the site, which help to tie the project into the surrounding neighborhoods, as well as the new bus routes and extensions of bus routes and stops to provide better access to and from the site, which is especially important to consider when thinking of proposing affordable units. And that brings us to housing within the rail yard. And this design offers 31, two to three bedroom townhomes, which help to gradually increase density into the site. And those are accompanied by an estimated 360 apartment units, envisioned with, again, that 60-40 affordable to market rate split. And these higher density housing options were implemented to accommodate the future growth and needs of Green Bay's market. Here, you can see that increase in density from the single family context to the higher density residential within the site. And while Green Bay has an average density of 1.5 dwellings per acre, this proposal would up that to 20 and 22 per acre in the densest areas. And that falls in line with kind of the new urbanist ideals, which aim for a 15 to 30 unit per acre density. And supporting and tied to those housing opportunities are the site's social connections, like the market hall and mixed-use pavilion, I'll cover in the focus site design next, as well as the nearby Tank Park and elementary, and expanded 5th Street community garden, which forms social hubs to facilitate community creation within this development district. And those features are further tied to the site with opportunities for, say, the pavilion to be used as a satellite classroom for Tank Elementary or the market hall, serving as a place to sell locally grown food and produce in the community garden, helping, again, to weave the site into that social fabric and community that is already existing. And lastly, that brings me to the focus site. And this community and public oriented space serves as the core of the rail yard project, kind of the heart of the site, and uses the inspiration of the railroad to create a unique identity and experience for the community. Some key features are the rolling metal plaza to the north, centrally located mainline market hall and accompanying playscape, in addition to the rail line plaza and train horn fountain, located in the center, just north of that main mixed-use path in yellow. And to the south of this is the multi-functional junction pavilion, outdoor seating bosque, sculpture garden, and trail overlook, which helps to signify the split between the main mixed-use trail in yellow and the bike fast path, again, in that terracotta, along the south. Looking at the two structures, those are the main line market hall, which would be a large event venue. Year-round farmers are here and could be partnered with the 5th Street community garden for any excess produce. It houses some commercial and restaurant opportunities and the junction pavilion on the other hand provides spaces for community groups to gather, hold local art museums or exhibits, such as connection with the nearby National Railroad Museum to highlight the site's past, as well as it could hold smaller personal events and commercial or cafe endeavors, like a seasonal beer hall or cafe. And next, looking at circulation, users are able to kind of define their own circulation throughout the focus site, as it is all ADA accessible. However, the main path shown in pink does help guide visitors through the site and go to some of those highlighted areas. Vehicular roads and parking are again denoted in blue. And that allows an ease of access to the two structures and the bike fast path and mixed-use trail, which cut through the site and give access to the greater rail yard as a whole. And all the circulation occurs on the regrading of the site in order to make it entirely accessible. We noted that the cut would be entirely dependent on the level of contamination and extent of remediation necessary. And because of this, the amount of cut and fill soil calculations are based solely off of the existing grade that is found there today. And growing on top of this, my proposed tree canopy is 90% native, as multiple different species that support wildlife, highlighted in pink within the table. And those help promote the rail yard as an ecological and wildlife corridor as well. And then, supporting those trees is my stormwater management plan for the focus site. And that utilizes a system of deep root or Silva Cells, storm chambers, sub and above ground systems, catch basins, and detention basins to store, repurpose, and release over 200,000 cubic feet of water onsite. And that is 15% more than what a 500 year storm event for four hours would produce on the site. And then, next, I want to highlight a few key site features which build upon that idea of brownfield indicators. I mentioned way back at the beginning of this presentation, by continuing the story of the site, and they are all inspired by the railroad. And those are being

the rail line meadow, which uses sunken beds with the rail tracks in them to create a deconstructed prairie in a plaza. And below that is the rolling rail benches. And this uses that same idea, but raises swelling seating and lounging benches out of the planting to create plants and places of respite. And finally, I'd like to highlight the train horn fountain which uses the shape of the auditory sound waves a train makes as the foundation of an interactive fountain, which is framed by rail tracks reaching skyward. And this inspiration continues into the details of the site, where this rail tie bench, I derived from an 18th century form of a rail tie. And you can see kind of how that language was continued into the final design, as well as offering a canopy through cement seating, wall, and planter. And then getting back to the site, I'll end with some of the key areas and sections and perspectives. The first being the Rolling Meadows to the north, which serve as a subtle transition from the neighborhood. And this area plays a key role in stormwater management, as well as it features a detention swale, in addition to above cisterns, which hold stormwater that once processed can be repurposed for grounds work. And here is a perspective, and you can see those meadows with the cisterns creating a wall to the left, the rolling rail benches in the middle, and the detention basin framing the right, in addition to a handcar seating element in the foreground. Next, I want to focus on the rail line plaza, which is the focal point between the two structures, and the deconstructed meadow of the rail line plaza. So here is a view overlooking that plaza, with the market hall and train horn fountain in the background and that deconstructed meadow in the foreground. And focusing on the plantings themselves, the rail line plaza features sweeping grasses, which build to a crescendo in the center of each planter. And again, use red and gold Fall colors to highlight the tracks come Fall. Moving to the fountain, you can see the junction pavilion with accompanying seating bosque in the background and the mixed-use trail, again note in yellow. And also visible are those vertical rail ties which help to mimic the upward momentum and energy of the water and ultimately help to define the space. Then moving into the southern section of the focus site, with the pavilion bosque and sculpture garden, I've depicted a winter scene of the junction pavilion, envisioning an exhibit from the National Railroad Museum, as well as a winter festival with ice sculptures tied to the market hall, to help kind of give a glimpse into the seasonality of this project. But ultimately, this is what you find today. Negative space, disruption, and void. But connections can be restored and spaces can be cast in new light, and places can be made. And it is with this in mind that the Central Yard's Development District hopes to minimize those disruptions, provide a place for community members to call home, to call their own, and restore the urban fabric of the area. And thank you all for the time. That is my presentation for the Central Yards Development District. And I'd like to open the floor to any comments or questions or anything I can answer.

- Thank you so much, Martin. That was amazing. There are so many things in there that I would just like, oh, if that could happen, that would be so amazing. But you had me as soon as you said, Ashland underground. I will say that some of the things, like the deconstructed meadows and even the rolling cart. I don't know if he's ever been to New York City and been on the Highline? It was a subway, an above ground subway, that they decommissioned and they have, it's a walking path now, and it really, what you have there really reminds me of it. And I just, I love so many elements. I couldn't just pick one. But thank you so much for your time. That was truly amazing. And I'm sure that other commissioners might have things to say as well.

- Thank you very much.

- I would just underline what Lisa Hanson was just saying. Bravo. That is really, it's so detailed and thoughtful in so many different ways. I just loved it.

- Thank you very much.

- Can we make a motion that Dave Buck puts this in place for the city? It might actually work well over here.

- Yes.

- Go for it.

- Commissioner Rovinski, I'd just like to mention that you add a budget item with that request, please.

- [Lisa] Goodness.

- Very well done. And just, wow, yeah. You're bound to do wonderful things in your career here. If you can put this together as a student, yeah, bravo.

- Thank you very much.

- Martin, I really wish we were in person tonight, because I think you probably would've got a standing ovation from us. This is absolutely beautiful. I've fantasized about this site for awhile now of what could go on just this, like you said, a scar, on the west side of the city. And I could never imagine something this great. It's absolutely beautiful. It is ambitious, but this city needs ambitious projects. We've kind of settled for the status quo for so long. And we need things like this because this is a historical city. We need to have these nods to the past, while also being looking to the future and being ambitious with these type of projects. So, will all of this end up ever happening? It sparks some imagination and joy that I haven't had for this part of the city in a long time. So congratulations on that. It's absolutely wonderful. Thank you so much.

- Thank you very much. And yeah, that's ultimately the goal, is to just show what the spaces can be to get those conversations and get the ball rolling.

- I just want to echo the sentiments that my fellow commissioners have said. I think this is such a great idea. So, kudos to you. When we talk about how we're in need of more housing, this is such a big area that there's so much that could be done here to help alleviate those housing issues that we have. So it makes me a little sad to know that this is an idea, this is a project, that it's not something that's coming to fruition, but it's just, it's planting the seeds of what could be done here. So, thank you. Thank you for presenting this.

- Neil just said, not coming to fruition yet.

- Yet.

- Right.

- I think that's good to keep in mind. It's lovely. And thank you. We gave you time, but you gave us inspiration. Thank you so much.

- Thank you all for listening to me ramble on.

- All righty. Well, thank you Martin. Thanks for your hard work. And don't be super shocked, Plan Commission, if you see some of this stuff popping up when we're doing this district of the comp plan, because there are some inspirational things in there. Martin did a great job. and I also want to point out, he kind of just nodded that he had a stakeholder committee. It really did kind of constrain what he could do. There were certain things that he had brought up, we're like, "Well, no, we gotta do this." And then it was incorporated. So this plan isn't all academic. He did take quite a big amount of input and incorporated most of it into his plan. So that's all I'll say.

- Even as a former professor of Urban Studies at UWGB, I would note that academic is not a nasty word.

- True.

- All right. All right. On to the Director's Report, Neil.

- Very briefly, Martin, thank you for your presentation. And I want to make sure that everyone notes, Martin did not have to come do this tonight. He actually, David begged and pleaded with him. He'd seen the

presentation a couple other times. And so I think he's done this probably three times now for various groups here at the city. So much appreciated, Martin. Thank you for that. And again, an excellent presentation. Thank you. So clapping is okay if anybody wants to. Yes, absolutely. Very briefly, I just want to recap a couple of items that have happened through the RDA and through City Council. Folks probably noticed that City Council approved a development agreement with Merge Urban Development here for the Shipyard, speaking of the ship yard, that development agreement has been approved and is going to be moving forward. So we're excited about that. And just to build on the good momentum that is there, the Badger Sheet Metal site that is immediately adjacent to this site, now has a planning option on it, with Impact Seven, to do a similar type of project. A nice residential, good density project, that hopefully they're gonna, I think we've given them a three month planning option, I believe it was. So looking for some more exciting news coming from that immediate area here in the very short future. Plus several other projects in the pipeline. We look to have some more updates, hopefully, for you in the very near future. And available for questions if anyone has any.

- All right. Thank you so much, Neil. And it looks like the date of the next meeting is June 7th, 2021.
- Motion to adjourn.
- Second.
- Second.
- A motion by Vice Chair Miller, second by Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Any opposed. And with that, our meeting is adjourned.
- Thank you, everyone.
- Have a good week.
- Bye, everyone.
- Thank you, all. Stay cool.