



MINUTES OF THE GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION

MONDAY, JULY 26, 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: Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Derius Daniels, Autumn Linsmeier, Ken Rovinski, Excused:

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the Agenda for the July 26, 2021, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Jacob Miller to approve the agenda. Motion Passed.
Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Derius Daniels, Autumn Linsmeier, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the June 21, 2021, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Jacob Miller, seconded by Ken Rovinski to approve the minutes. Motion Passed.
Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Derius Daniels, Autumn Linsmeier, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

Chair Lisa Hanson read into record the rules and procedures for all public hearings tonight. All public hearings have been properly posted.

1. (ZP 21-18) Public Hearing on a request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a metal storage building exceeding 120 sq. ft. in a Public Institutional (PI) district located at 1520 South Point Road, submitted by Cale Pulczynski, Green Bay Area Public School District, property owner (Ald. J. Brunette, District 12).

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the floor for the Public Hearing on the request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a metal storage building exceeding 120 sq. ft. in a Public Institutional (PI) district located at 1520 South Point Road.

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

2. (ZP 21-18) Consideration with possible action on a request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a metal storage building exceeding 120 sq. ft. in a Public Institutional (PI) district located at 1520 South Point Road, submitted by Cale Pulczynski, Green Bay Area Public School District, property owner (Ald. J. Brunette, District 12).

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Ken Rovinski to open the floor for discussion. Motion Passed. Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Derius Daniels, Autumn Linsmeier, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Sidney Bremer 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 (CUP) for a metal storage building exceeding 120 sq. ft. in a Public Institutional (PI) district located at 1520 South Point Road, subject to compliance with all of the regulations of the Green Bay Municipal Code not covered under the Conditional Use Permit (CUP), 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.

3. Consideration with possible action on the appointment of Tracy Hillesheim from the Hyatt on Main to the Downtown Green Bay, Inc.'s Business Improvement District (BID) Board.

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Autumn Linsmeier to recommend approval to appoint Tracy Hillesheim from the Hyatt on Main to the Downtown Green Bay, Inc.'s Business Improvement District (BID) Board. Motion Passed.

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

4. (TA 21-05) Public Hearing on updates to Article XVIII. Off-Street Parking, Drives, and Loading, Green Bay Municipal Code, submitted by Green Bay Community and Economic Development.

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the floor for the Public Hearing regarding updates to Article XVIII. Off-

Street Parking, Drives, and Loading, Green Bay Municipal Code, submitted by Green Bay Community and Economic Development.

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

5. (TA 21-05) Consideration with possible action and review of updates to Article XVIII. Off-Street Parking, Drives, and Loading, Green Bay Municipal Code, submitted by Green Bay Community and Economic Development.

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Ken Rovinski to hold over updates to Article XVIII. Off-Street Parking, Drives, and Loading, Green Bay Municipal Code. 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. Director's Report.

Neil Stechschulte presented the Director's Report.

2. Discuss transition to hybrid in-person/virtual Plan Commission meetings.

Discussion regarding transition to hybrid in-person/virtual Plan Commission meetings. At this time meetings will remain virtual.

3. Date of next meeting: August 9, 2021.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Ken Rovinski to Adjourn. Motion Passed.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Hanson?

- Present.

- Vice Chair Jacob Miller?

- Present.

- Alder Veronica Corpus-Dax? She might be showing up a little bit later. All right.

- [Neil] She's there, but for some reason, Alder Corpus-Dax, are you muted still? She may be having audio problems. I know she was just on screen a moment ago.

- Okay, then we'll move on. Commissioner Sydney Bremer?

- Present.
- All right. Commissioner Derius Daniels?
- Present.
- Commissioner Autumn Linsmeier?
- Present.
- And Commissioner Ken Rovinski?
- Present.
- And moving on to the approval of the agenda for the July 26th, 2021 meeting of the Green Bay Planning Commission.
- I move approval.
- Second.
- Motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Vice Chair Miller. All those in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye,
- Aye.
- Any opposed? And then moving on to the approval of the minutes from the June 21st, 2021 meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission
- Move to approve.
- Second.
- Second.
- All right, motion by Vice Chair Miller and a second by Commissioner Linsmeier. All those in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Any opposed? All right, and then moving on to regular business, starting with 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 subjects. 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: a request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit for a metal storage building exceeding 120 square feet in a Public Institutional district located at 1520 South Point Road, submitted by Cale Pulczinski, Green Bay Area Public School District, property owner.

- Madam Chair, I can give you a brief overview.

- Thank you, Paul.

- If somebody's property is located at 1520 South Point Road, the property is highlighted in red. It's a rather large parcel, it's about 26 acres, but the building, not the entire site is gonna utilized for the building, just the portion behind Lombardia Middle School. They share the campus with Martin Luther King Elementary to the west, and this is a proposed detached accessory, the Conditional Use Permit is required because this structure, over 120 square feet, which is metal, requires a Conditional Use Permit. So I'll have some further details to provide in the abstract.

- Okay, thank you so much, Paul. So now we're looking for people who would like to speak in favor of this item. Is there anyone wishing to speak that's in opposition to this item? And is there anyone interested in providing information only?

- [Cale] This is Cale Pulczinski with Green Bay Public Schools. I guess I don't have any specific comments, I just wanted to say that we are providing a building that looks and performs, in I'd say more than an adequate manner for the school district and the school, and representing the school. But if anyone else had any questions on the building I'd be more than happy to answer them.

- State your address for the record.

- [Cale] Business address?

- Business and home address.

- [Cale] Okay, my home address is 2932 Base Settlement Road, Green Bay.

- All right, thank you. Is there anyone else wishing to speak on this item?

- I'm wondering if I can ask the question on that.

- You can certainly, if you state your name and address you can certainly ask a question, but it's not really a question and answer kind of situation. You can certainly ask and we will check during the actionable item and ask the applicants.

- [Paul] Okay, Paul Bertrand, 2880 West Point Road. I'm wondering what the approximate size of the building is, and if you could show on screen kind of a more specific location of where the building's going.

- Okay, and those are excellent questions and we will certainly address that during the actionable item for the, I mean, I know that it said that it's 120 square feet, which is like probably a 10X12 building is my guess, but we will talk about that during the actual item. Was there any other comments that you had?

- [Paul] No.

- Okay, thank you very much. Was there anyone else wishing to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? Was there anyone else wishing to speak? Let the record reflect that no one came forward and this public hearing is

now closed. And moving on to the corresponding actionable item, item number two, consideration with possible action on a request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit for a metal storage building exceeding 120 square feet in a Public Institutional District located at 1520 South Point Road, submitted by Cale Pulczynski, Green Bay Area Public School District, property owner.

- Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll give a few more details about the site. Again, the property is highlighted in red here. This is one parcel approximately 26 acres in size, West Point Road is to the north, south Point road heading north to south here. Lombardi Middle School, the athletic field, and Martin Luther King to the west here. This request will replace an existing shed on site, which is located approximately in this area here if you can see on the screen, just south of the athletic field. The new building will be built or constructed up near the northeast corner of the athletic field.

- Paul, just so you know, you are.

- I'm missing the site plan of the site. Again, West Point Road is to the north here. I apologize. Can you hear me? Right now? Yes.

- Okay.

- It just keeps breaking up.

- Okay.

- Yeah, you have some lag.

- Sorry. I apologize. Okay, this is a site plan showing the property. The existing shed is in this corner down here, south of the athletic field. The proposed building will be up on this location here. This is a 30X30 structure, so it exceeds that 120 square foot maximum. This is some elevations of the proposed structure. You have it showing the metal exterior here, footprint of the building. Some graphics are provided by the applicant showing the existing structure and its rough shape and the need for replacement. They propose a color palette here that's consistent with Lombardi Middle School. And in here, they're coloring out the colors. There'll probably be a two-tone color on this proposed structure. And here's kind of an example of that two-tone, the kind that look and feel of the proposed structure. Staff has notified the property owners. We haven't received any calls or questions. The placement of this really doesn't detract from the overall neighborhood, and staff is supporting this request subject to the standard site plan review and approval.

- Okay, thank you so much, Paul. So it's a 30X30 building.

- It's a 30X30 building, 900 square feet, replacing an about a 24X24 building.

- Go ahead, Commissioner Bremer.

- Thank you. Paul, one of the comments that is made is that the new building would not be visible from the main roads that go around the school property. Have you checked that out, or do we have some other way of knowing that? It looks awfully close to those roads and I'm kind of curious about that. If you put the site plan back up again, I think you'll see what I'm referring to. I did not make it out there to take a look myself, if anybody else did. The report said...

- I was just gonna say... I did not make it out there, but I did pull up the Google image of it. It does look like you would be able to see this building from West Point Road.

- Which runs along the north.

- Correct.
- Right? The west, the south, the north and all are a little bit confusing in this case. Paul, you not able to pull that up again?
- Let me try it one more time here.
- [Neil] Yeah, just give it a second. There it comes. It's up. There we go. Thank you.
- There was a comment made in the report that they attempted to put it as far south on the property as possible, but this is a fairly north location. I guess this is a question that I would want to ask Mr. Pulczynski about.
- [Cale] Am I able to make a comment on this?
- We'll get you a chance in just a minute or two, okay?
- [Cale] Sounds good.
- And that's the only question I had for Paul. Thank you.
- Go ahead, David.
- Well, I was just saying, I just, while I'm sitting here, I just brought up the Google view that Ken had mentioned, Commissioner Rovinski, and if you want I can share that if you think that's useful.
- I think it would be.
- All right. All right, can everybody see the view?
- Absolutely.
- Yep, there it is.
- Okay, so this is West Point Road. You're looking south towards the middle school, which is on the corner. The South Point, West Point. I believe the existing shed is this one back here.
- Yeah.
- And I believe, Paul or Cale, you can correct me, but the new one would be going in this location, correct? So if I go from basically the entrance, it would be sort of up on this hill, sorta in this area.
- Oh, that is helpful.
- I had a question for Paul. My question, so I did a little digging into some of the other sports facility buildings like this from some of the other schools around town, and I didn't really see like a real cohesion with the building matching up with, you know, the facade of the school, or any of the other buildings on site. Is that something that we're concerned about? Is that something that is required? You know, if someone were to put a larger structure like this on their own personal property, would it have to match the facade of their house, or is that something that is different with this type of use?
- Yeah, I think with this use it's slightly different in a sense. It's an institutional type use. You know, the personal use has a, the middle school has a bring exterior. This is a detached accessory structure, it's really more

incidental to the overall structure so I think to require masonry on a structure like this, I'm not sure it's even possible, but I think the idea or the attempt here was to mitigate that by using a color palette that's consistent with the school's logo, I guess, not so much the building itself.

- Okay, that makes sense to me. I do appreciate the use of the wing scouting on the bottom as well, 'cause that's usually where these buildings will, these metal buildings will get most of their damage and that's easily replaceable if you do it that way. So yeah, I think it's a good looking building and they have a good use for it. I'm gonna support it.

- Was there any further discussion amongst the commission or any more questions for staff? I feel like there might be, at least a petitioner would like to speak.

- I move to open the floor for that purpose.

- I would second that.

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

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? All right, the floor is now open. So if there's someone, I guess we'd like to hear, it sounded like Cale, that you wanted to speak. So if you could please just state your name and address again for the record, and go ahead with your comment.

- [Cale] Cale Pulczynski, Green Bay Area Public Schools, 2932 Base Settlement Road, Green Bay. I just wanna put this out there as full disclosure. The contractor on the building, that structure is already erected and we are fully aware that based off of the decision here, we would have to either modify that building if not approved, or essentially even tear it down. So that contractor works through a schedule that was not approved by us, so they were aware of the consequences as well. So it is visible from the road. About, I would say the top third of it is visible from the road, South Point Road, I believe, so I wanted to make sure everyone is aware of that before I left the call today. The other reason I also want to jump on for comments is the old structure, one of the reasons it's in such rough shape is being in that corner we were not able to have a camera on it for vandalism, and being so close to the wooded area, it had lots of, I would damage from nature. We would have a lots of insects and animal packs in there, so that was also difficult to maintain. So at its new location, we feel it would be much more sufficient to maintain, and then we'll also have video surveillance of that video, or of that structure to try to mitigate mostly graffiti, but also other vandalism to that building. So that's all I had.

- Thank you so much. Anyone from the Commission have questions for the petitioner?

- I guess I should follow up with my, the other part of my question that I was inappropriately addressing to Paul. Mr. Pulczynski, can you explain the comment that every attempt was made to put this structure as far south on the property as possible, that is as far back away from West Point?

- Yes, actually the structure is within, I would say maybe a foot or so of the track. So we wanted to make it usable for the track and fields, but I would say it's within a couple of feet of the track, so we've pushed it about as far as we can next to the track. There's also a walkway towards South Point Road. On the other side of that walkway is the garden, which you may be aware of. So we've pushed it basically as far as we can between the track and the walkway. Also where you see the fence line, I'm sorry, I'm not able to point to it, but there's a

fence line that runs essentially north and south. That is a pretty steep elevation change, so you really can't put any sort of building or structure on that elevation.

- And putting it on the other end of the track and field and football field area would have invited the same vulnerability to vandalism that you mentioned before. Is that correct?

- That was our thought process, correct?

- Thank you, that does explain my, explain what I was wondering about. Thanks.

- Do we have any more questions for the petitioner?

- I think now that I know it's built, I wanna see it moved six inches over or so.

- Thanks, Ken.

- Yeah, nothing else.

- All right, was there anyone else wishing to speak on this item? Otherwise I'd entertain a motion to close the floor.

- So moved.

- I second.

- Motion by Commissioner Rovinski, second by Commissioner Bremer. All those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Okay, back to regular order. Any further discussion?

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Motion by Ald. Corpus-Dax, second by Commissioner Bremer. Any further discussion? All right, go ahead with a voice vote. All those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? So then that will go through. That's unanimously approved going through to City Council, and when is that next City Council meeting? I can't math at the end of the month?

- [Neil] Sorry, August 2nd, I believe. It's August 3rd, Tuesday, August 3rd. There's a City councilman, yes.

- I don't have a calendar in front of me and I'm mathing at the end of the month, then adding in seven days plus one. Okay, perfect. All right, so August 3rd. And then moving on to item number three, consideration with possible action on the appointment of Tracy Hillesheim from the Hyatt on Main to the Downtown Green Bay, Inc.'s Business Improvement District Board. I guess just...

- I can help with that.

- There we go. Wendy Townsend has a staff report for that.

- Perfect.

- Yes, Tracy has been a member of the Downtown Business Improvement District for some time. She has submitted her resume, and we'd like to request, along with the Downtown Incorporated Business District, that appointment.

- Okay, thank you, Wendy. Do we, is there any discussion amongst staff, or amongst, I'm sorry, amongst the Commission?

- Reading through her resume, I think she fits the bill for what we need there, so I would move to approve.

- All right, so motion by Commissioner Rovinski.

- Second.

- Was that a second by Commissioner Linsmeier? All right, thank you. Any further discussion? All right. Hearing none, we'll go ahead with a voice vote. All of those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? And then that will go on to City Council for August 3rd. And thank you. Yeah, thank you very much, Wendy.

- Sorry, I have no power in my house. We had a tornado or something go through I don't know if you see this, but it looks like a tree fell. So I'm outside 'cause I don't have any lights or anything. It's crazy. Thanks again. Bye now.

- All right, okay. And then moving on to item number four, public hearing on updates to article, what is that? Off-Street Parking, Drives, and Loading, Green Bay Municipal Code, submitted by Green Bay Community and Economic Development. I got the eight part, but I can't remember, is X 50? Is it 100?

- X is 10.

- my Roman numerals, all right.

- Going for 18.

- All right, well, if you, and this is David.

- Thanks, David.

- I'll just give just a quick preview. So we updated the, or repealed and recreated the parking code in September of 2019. It was always staff's intention to sometimes bring this back in 2020 to just kind of review, make sure it's performing how it should, make any tweaks that need to be done. We always do that when code is rewritten. Of course the pandemic and everything kind of got in the way, and so it has been about two years, but that is really the reason for these updates, and there's a little more than a, about dozen and a half up for discussion.

- Okay, that sounds good. And so with this being the public hearing portion of it, we'll hear about everything else and all the details on the actionable item. So with the public hearing on this update, is there anyone wishing to speak in favor of this item? Is there anyone wishing to speak in opposition to this item? And is there anyone looking 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 item number five, consideration with possible action and review of updates to Article XVIII, Off-Street Parking, Drives, and Loading, Green Bay Municipal Code, submitted by Green Bay Community and Economic Development.

- Thank you, Madam Chairman. Okay so, as I had just mentioned, let me share the screen here quick. Okay, can everybody stay just a lot of text, no fun pictures? Sorry about that. So two years ago we repealed and recreated the parking code and we did a few minor edits since then for drive-throughs mainly, but what we had done is basically inspection, community development, and DPW and engineering kind of took a look at the code. We took any suggested changes, things that have been problems or confusing, or just anything that should be tweaked in the code or wasn't performing the way we expected. And we basically came up with 14 amendments, and before I kind of get into it, what I really wanna say is that we really want this item to act as a workshop, so a lot of free flowing talking about each of the items, if there's anything that you as commissioners have noticed have been problematic in the code, to bring that up and we will jot it down and look into it. And then we would bring this back on August 9th for actual action. There is one item that we received late correspondence from DPW late today, about one aspect, and that one you might need a little bit more time to digest, I think staff does as well. But I'm just gonna go over these really quickly. And you'll notice the red, white, and blue that's on here. So the white is basically an amendment or a change that, no matter where it came from, there was no disagreements, everybody agreed with it, no problem. The blue, where it has full staff support. However, there was considerable discussion. And then the red is where there is potential conflict or controversy between staff. And we can kind of get into that. So I'm gonna go through all of them really quick, and then they do correspond, in your packet there should be a summary list and it has the page number on and the section, and then in the code itself will be the draft code that's in your packet. It will have a strike-through, red strike-through for text that's being deleted, and red underline for text that's being added or augmented. So the first one was basically to better define material exposure as it relates to non-conforming parking facilities. So that is, as somebody is rebuilding their parking lot, at what point is it considered reconstruction, and what point is considered maintenance? The code had always basically had said if you expose the base material, it's reconstruction. If you're just putting more asphalt over the top, it's maintenance. That was felt to be confusing by some contractors, I suppose, and so basically what we had, we kind of cleared it up saying, if you expose the base material at all, that is not maintenance, that's reconstruction, and we put an I.E. in there, compacted gravel. So when you think of that, the gravel underneath is like the foundation of the house, the asphalt or concrete on top is like the house. So once you expose that base, so we just defined that a little bit better. The second one, number two, is to allow snow removal equipment to be stored in parking lots or parking facilities from November through April, and that's gonna be for multifamily, non-single, or two-family uses. So if somebody's got a snowplow they wanna store in the parking lot, currently that is not permitted. This change would allow them to store it in that parking lot during the winter. The third item is removing the requirement that vehicles that are parked on private lots and single and two-family homes be licensed and registered. So our current code requires every vehicle parked on a site to be licensed and registered, otherwise it would have to be in a storage area. Now you can store things in your backyard. If you're a commercial lot, you can store them in a fenced-in commercial area, but this would be to remove that requirement. Number four was to allow permeable paver systems for parking facilities per DNR specs. So

that's something you're gonna see come, a few more of those things come forward. We did a green infrastructure code audit, and there were quite a few things in there that were recommended to change to make the city more green or sustainable. So that came out of that. The fifth one is clarification on the size of wheel strips. So as a residential lot, you can have a full driveway, or you can have two strips of concrete that run up where your wheels would go. And that's been permitted in the code probably forever. You see it in a lot of older neighborhoods. It's pretty unique, it's also very sustainable. This just defines a little bit better what that is. 12 to 18 inches basically, for that size. The next two actually can kind of be lumped together and traffic engineer Hansen, Dave Hansen is here to kind of speak on these, but basically what they're both addressing are locations of driveways. And primarily driveways on arterial streets, the way it's been kind of evolved. You did receive a memo, I emailed it out to you. It's pretty technical and I think Dave will be able to explain it easier than I. Number eight was to add a maximum number of stalls to areas that don't have a minimum. So if you remember our code, anything more than 200%, the minimum requires council approval. Downtown doesn't have a minimum, so therefore it would have no maximum. So we basically just put in there that if it had a minimum, it had to follow the minimum for the use, that would apply for the maximum. And then we also switched it out, kind of based on the discussion over there and here on road, all parking lots 20 stalls or less had been exempt from this regulation, we beefed that up to 40 stalls just to give a little more leeway for a smaller business. Number nine was allowed 24 inches of additional pavement beyond garage doors. So the current code was drafted to say, you can have a driveway going right up to the garage door. The previous code and most codes will allow 18 to 24 inches on each side of the garage door, because that's the width of the garage. So this is just correcting that. Number ten, removing the requirement for a vehicle trespass "block" on residential driveway tapers, unless it becomes an issue. So our maximum driveway width for a residential lot is 25 feet wide. But a lot of times garages are 30 feet wide or 35 feet wide, or there might be a parking stall next to it. So the driveway starts to get really wide on the lot, and what that provision basically says is you have to taper it down to 25 feet. When we did the full rewrite and update to the code, one of the problems that was expressed by inspection, were people were driving over it anyway, and it was turning into mud and being unsightly. So we put a requirement in the code that there had to be some type of a vehicle block, some trespass block, whether that's a tree, a bush, a big rock, a giant garden gnome, it didn't really matter what you put there, just something that you couldn't drive over, right? Since that time, inspection felt that that was very unnecessary and should only really be needed if it becomes an issue so we did draft the code to say, to not require it unless there's complaints. So if you're not driving over that tapered triangle, there's no reason to put a block there. But if you are and it becomes an issue, then you would be required to. Number 11, basically for single and two-family open parking stalls, so not stalls in a garage, but just open stalls, we did not have a definition for size. We neglected to put that in there. It's a little bit smaller than what a commercial lot would be being that it's a residential lot, so 8X15 is pretty much the standard. Our regular code require 18 feet of depth. The reason why it can be dropped down to 15, because on a residential lot, you have a lot of overhang onto grass, so that your wheels stop on the pavement, but your car might be a little bit further out. So we just defined that. Also, if you're using a driveway, if you're on a small lot, a driveway is considered a spot for you. That would be the length. 15 feet by 8 feet wide, and that's our minimum driveway width as well. Number 12 also relates to open parking. So this could be open parking next to your garage or in your backyard. The current code requires it to be screened with a five-foot hedge wall, fence, or other barrier that's 90% impervious to sight. That was mainly put in place because of headlights, noise, emissions, those types of things for when you're parking on a residential lot, a single or two-family lot. We received a lot of pushback on that one. And one of the arguments that came up that was a pretty good argument that if you're parked in your driveway, you don't have to screen, but if you're parked next to your garage, you do. And does that make sense? And so we kind of put this one in here. That screening requirement was mainly because of rear yard parking lots, which we do not have very many of those in the city. And then of course, always the neighbors can screen their sight from a surface parking. Number 13 was removed, buffer requirements for parking lots abutting a street. Currently the code, the way it's written, it refers to buffers usually when you have a commercial use next to a residential, let's say. You have a certain distance, it's a buffer, requires certain trees, shrubs, and fencing typically, or berming. The way the code was drafted, it also put that same requirement on the street side. So that was just sort of something that is not enforced that we really can't do. You don't wanna buffer everything from the street. So we removed that buffering requirement. It still does require landscaping, however, but it wouldn't require the full screening. And then the last item was add a 18-foot

driveway throat length for multi-family and non-residential parking lots. And sort of the image to the right, which you can see here, excuse me, it says 20 feet. It shouldn't say 18. I'll fix that. But this is basically, when you're entering a commercial or non-residential, a single or two-family residential parking lot, it gives you one car-length before you start stacking into the street. So what potentially happens if somebody is backing out of one of these closed stalls, and if it's right uptight five foot setback, the person waiting for this person to back out is then blocking the street. So it doesn't happen real often, and you know, people learn to stop and that kind of thing, but the one car-length throat distance could potentially solve some problems. Also, if the lot wasn't configured this way, let's say the stalls were going parallel with the driveway, then that throat length would almost not matter. You'd have 18 feet before that drive way, let's call it 18-feet deep. So this was an addition for safety. And with that, I wanna jump back to these colored ones. I kind of went into larger detail on the license plates, and I wanted to kind of give you the reason why that, why I believe that was in the previous code. And this has been in the Green Bay code for a long time, primarily to stop residential lots from becoming kind of storage yards or hobby lots, so to speak. Somebody, I don't wanna say car hoarder, but somebody who likes to collect cars may have quite a few cars on their property in legal parking spaces because we wouldn't let them park outside that. However, the costs for licensing and registering cars will typically halt somebody from just accumulating a lot of vehicles, because they don't have any costs at that point except the initial purchase. The inspection division felt that that was kind of over reaching. I mean, some cars are parked in the backyard, you can't see them. It's very difficult for them to determine if they're registered or licensed, and once they're operable on the street, it becomes a police situation where they won't, the police will determine if they're registered, if they don't have tags or license plate. So that's kind of the thought process behind that. And six and seven, now what I have written here is a little bit different from what you received in your memo, Dave combined the two together really, and what going for is a safety situation. So he is, we currently have a distance from intersections, for a driveway it has to be at least 25 feet from the property line or 35 feet from the curb lane at an intersection to kind of give you some stacking before you get to that intersection so there's not conflict there. This is a very basic, you know, set number, and obviously the engineering in that is much more complicated, and Dave will kind of get to that in a second. And number six, that was number seven, number six deals with driveway location. So the current code requires if you're a multifamily or non single or two-family residential, and you're on a corner with an arterial and let's say a local street, you would have to locate your driveway on that arterial street, or collector street before the local. If you're a single or two-family use on that same corner, you would have to orient your driveway to the local street rather than the arterial or collector. So kind of keeping those business traffic separated from residential traffic, so to speak, even though you're at a corner. So those are for the 14 items. I did want to kind of give you a little bit of a, I don't know how to put it, a little bit of heads up about what those roads are. So a primary arterial street is intended to provide high volume, moderate speed traffic between major activity centers. This is coming out of our comp plan from the 2022 comp plan. Minor arterial is a street which augments and feeds the principal arterial system. It's intended for moderate volume, moderate speed traffic, access to abutting property as partially controlled. Then we also have, so those are arterials, those are our big streets. We have a collector street and that is a street that collects and distributes traffic to and from local and arterials. So it's taking the local traffic, go to a collector, they go up to an arterial, and Dave can probably give you some good examples. And then a local street is obviously a low volume, low speed, short length street, typically accessing residential or low impact businesses. And then in 2000 when the comp plan was done, the city was shown to have about 10% principal arterials out of all of our streets, 11% minor arterials, about 11% of collectors, and just about 68% local. So with that, I think I'm gonna defer to Dave Hansen to kind of explain the memo a little bit better, but I do want to stress at this time, it's really open floor discussion. Again, to me, I'm not an engineer and stuff can get kind of complicated. I did talk to Dave earlier, he's great at explaining it. And then staff as well has not had a lot of time to digest, so we'll probably bring this one up for more discussion on August 9th. But with that, I guess, I don't know if the Chair, if you can recognize Dave?

- Yeah, I would like to recognize Dave. I'm sorry. I would like to recognize Mr. Hansen, if you could please go ahead and give your comments.

- Thank you very much, Madam Chair. As Mr. Buck had stated, the memo was submitted to him later today. I do apologize on tardiness. I really tried to get it into the agenda packet, but last week was a very busy week

with the training and trying to keep up with regular business here. But anyway, we're here tonight, we're here to talk about it, and I don't want to spend too much time. 'Cause as David mentioned, that this is more intended to be a workshop, no real action on this. But so, if you've had the chance to read it, excellent. If you haven't, I think what I'm probably gonna do is just go over the executive summary that I prepared for it, rather than go over all six pages of it. And I guess to really start off, and I highlighted this right in the beginning of the memo, that this memo really is only to apply, or any potential change to the ordinance is applied to intersections with at least one of the intersection streets classified as an arteria, and David explained that quite well. examples that I can say locally for an arterial street would be anything that's numbered or lettered. So county highway, state highway, US highway, well, they're all going to be arterials by definition, meant to carry regional traffic. Obviously you're gonna see much higher traffic volumes on them because they're intended to carry traffic from region to region. So on our local system, those would be anywhere from Main Street, East Mason, West Mason Street, Monroe Avenue, Walnut, they all have some sort of a letter or number designation to them. Now we do have some arterial streets that are not on a county or a state system, but would be locally maintained such as Military Avenue. Military is a minor arterial, which kind of came to a surprise to me when I learned that because we actually went a road day with that back in 2010 there was a six-lane facility with turn lanes, very wide roadway and it's definitely right-sized now. But that would be one example of a local arterial. So with that being said, the whole core of this memo has to, it pertains to functional area of an intersection, and functional area really is kind of broken up into two areas. You have, well, it's not really two, there are two areas in an intersection. First is gonna be the intersection itself. So right in the middle of the intersection where all the conflicting movements take place, that's considered the physical area of an intersection. Then areas approaching or upstream from the intersection and downstream of the intersection, those would be considered functional areas. Now, the distances that define that, I wish that I could have just summarized it in a basic table, but we engineers like to make things complex so that we can just get things through the planners. No, I'm just kidding. Bad joke. But you know, as part of my professional engineering licensure, you know, I knew this was coming up and I knew that in the past, we've had issues with particular driveways along arterials and it's sometimes been a long, lengthy process, even getting to the point of legal action on some of them relative to trying to get these driveways positioned in a more safe manner, so that it, you know, obviously with Public Works, we're responsible for maintaining our roads and streets, so it's our goal and our objective to keep them safe as possible. And you know, quite frankly, I think that all of this really benefits the developers anyway, because nobody wants to have a development that doesn't have a successful customer experience. And it's my opinion that if we right-size and right-locate driveways on these very busy streets using one access management technique, I think it would certainly improve the quality of life, the safety, and the satisfaction of those developers and their customers. Now back to functional area. I explained two items. So, in the functional area, I'm just gonna give a summary, this is the area where motorists have to make numerous decisions regarding turning, stopping, accelerating, exiting, merging, weaving, et cetera. Accesses that are too close to intersections can cause serious traffic conflicts and greatly impair kind of these facilities. DPW's goal is to eliminate accesses within the functional area of an arterial intersection and not permit new ones. Now, one item that came up, you know, if you've proved this at all, when we start looking, even at Table I you start seeing some of these distances. And you know, a great question, I think, that anyone can ask and should be asking is, well, what happens when you don't have enough length? Say your property is only 100-foot of frontage, and this functional area is larger than that? Well, that's where we have to look at it and say, it doesn't look like we're gonna be able to fit that. And so I think there's a couple of different options. You have one, where you try and push that driveway as far away from the intersection, 'cause the further away you get from the intersection, at least the motorists that are impacted by the intersection, all road users, I should say, not just motorists. So we got bicyclists, we got pedestrians, we have micro mobility now with scooters. All we're saying is pushing as far away as practicable and possible from the intersection to make it, there is some advanced warning time so that these road users can make the appropriate decisions to avoid any sort of a crash. So, with that being said, in essence what I am asking for is a modification to Section 4-1698, access distance from intersections of our code of ordinances by approving the proposed modifications and additions contained in the memo. So like I said, I really don't want to go over all of the detail that's in here. It may look complex, it's actually to me, quite easy, and I know that sometimes we want things to be easy to look at tables and everything, but that's why you have a traffic engineer of the city, and that's why we're also limiting intersections. And we heard the percentages that Mr. Buck had stated. So we're really not talking about a lot

of time dedicated to this by staff. And you'll notice that in one of the calculations for D4, the queue estimation, that's something that, again, you've got a person on staff, in my staff, that can come up with these numbers. This is what we do for a living. So with that being said, there's other details. I certainly encourage you if you have not read the memo, to read it in its entirety. And if you have question, not only would be happy to answer them. And if you need some more time, I'd be more than willing to when there is action being taken on this item.

- And I would suspect that we would have Dave back next meeting to kind of get into this one a little bit deeper. It is a significant change. Right now, like I said, so your approach or your upstream, if I'm saying that right Dave, your upstream approach to the intersection right now would require a 35-foot setback from the intersection to your driveway. Again, only on arterials. This one would be varying, but to give you an example on a 35-mile-an-hour street, it would be 250 feet. So that's a pretty significant change. The exit, I think, or that would be the downstream. The upstream would probably be a little bit more, but it would be a more complicated calculation that we would have Dave and engineering staff take care of. But it would require, and we would not go through and remove driveways, but as parking lots are reconstructed or hit that threshold for reconstruction, which is not very big, it's about 500 square feet, they would then have to come into compliance unless we put some kind of an out in here or a qualifier to say, you know, full reconstruction will require the driveway to be moved, or something like that. And as I had mentioned, planning staff didn't really get a lot of time to take a look at it, so, you know, we don't really have a recommendation on it. We think it seems, we totally understand why Public Works is proposing it, for safety reasons, we just don't know what that impact would be on our, you know, primarily commercial corridors.

- So, I have two questions for Dave. Dave Hansen, sorry. The one with the knowledge of roads. Well, I guess one's a question and the other one's more of a, wondering if we could look at an example of something and just kind of do like a walkthrough of if that were done today, what that would mean for that development, if that's possible. And I mean, not holding you to anything without, I know you have to figure stuff out, but the first one, the first question, basically, this would mean that the streets coming up to the arterial street would be getting more traffic. But the idea is that the more traffic would be at a lower speed, so there would be less area of conflict. Is that what I'm getting from this?

- Correct. That, end you have less exposure. One of the points I make in the memo is that a driveway, two-way driveway on an arterial undivided four-lane roadway has 23 conflict points. And that's just with motor vehicles, that's not including sidewalks. So add that, and let's say we have bike lanes on it, you're gonna be adding more conflicts. We are in a point in our city right now where I think we are trying to encourage alternate modes of transportation such as biking, and micro mobility, and walking. And we're even seeing multi-use trails even on Webster Avenue, and bike lanes. So with all those conflict points, all we're trying to do is get those conflict points out of the areas where we see where there problems, and they're problematic. Now I know that sometimes that there may be residential or neighborhood opposition to something like this, because I think there's this presumption that all of this traffic is somehow going to go through the neighborhood. I think as long as that access from that side road is done properly at the arterial, what you're doing is actually encouraging flow away from the neighborhoods and on to that busier street, whether it be a controlled intersection, maybe there's head features at that for crossing, whatever. You wanna make it more attractive for them to do that. While at the same time, you're significantly reducing that exposure and creating a safer situation, and putting those road users in an expected location for entry enter that arterial.

- Okay, yeah, I think that makes sense. Could I bring up an example and kind of look at that and see what it would mean with this change if it were done today?

- Sure.

- Can I share my screen?

- I believe you can.

- Okay. And I do want to apologize ahead of time because I know this one, there was some things workings with the city that came to mind 'cause I go here often. So, I don't know if you can see my screen now, but the Grand Central Station on East Mason and Bellevue Street?

- Check, we can see it.

- Okay. So I'm just, I'm looking at this distance here from the intersection to this driveway here is 189 feet. And if I'm correct, I believe this is a 35-mile-per-hour. That would mean this driveway opening wouldn't be allowed per the new code.

- That's no, that's not my... Well, number one, that is a 30-mile-an-hour zone, so it would be 200. And you can tell, I believe that's two parcels 'cause I believe they were supposed to expand to the west. So what I'm seeing right here would be actually compliant with what I'm proposing. They just moved that driveway access as far off from the intersection as possible. So, I don't see any problem with that. Ideally I think we'd like to see access off of Bellevue. Like let's just say, let's consolidate the driveways from. Now, sometimes logistically on the site it may not make a lot of sense. Let's just say for this situation, you have tanker trucks that come in on a regular routine, and they have to get around somewhere. They're not going to be out of that same access, so two access points for this type of land use is probably more realistic. So quite frankly, other than potentially there being a shift to the Bellevue Street access location, the one on Mason Street, I think would have been compliant with what I'm proposing.

- Yeah, if this were two parcels, that would fall under what David was talking about before that it's the furthest you can get functionally. The other thing that, if I can add something to this, if there were a development on this green space, that driveway also would have to be pushed as far to the east, I guess, as possible. And preferably if, putting words in David's mouth, preferably you'd exit onto John, not Mason.

- We're kind of talking about that if there was a new development in that green space, that it would have to have their exits out to John Street. Or does it, 'cause we're talking local arterial versus...

- Right, the ideal would be for them to go onto John Street with the proposal. However, if they were on Mason, they would have to try to get the, I guess that would be upstream distance, whatever that would be, from that intersection back.

- That's also a tough example as well, because we worked, as part of a plan unit development for that property. So even though it's two parcels, the intent is that that'd be a shared driveway on East Mason Street to reduce the conflict. So I don't think we'd want access to John street or to Kimball, because those are residential streets, the intent was to consolidate as much as we could.

- You're saying that in the future, that it's possible that that green space will be able to utilize that driveway on East Mason? I guess it doesn't matter, but I'm just thinking for future, I mean, not this specific property, I understand.

- For this specific property, they won't have to.

- Right, okay.

- That's okay. Just it's sometimes difficult to compare apples to apples, oranges to oranges, just, you know, every situation is a little bit different.

- And that's the point that I wanted to emphasize as I saw it in the draft in here, there is reference to working out particular arrangements for particular circumstances. And I noticed Dave Hansen as you repeat, the issues on here, you're often saying, "Ideally we would want it this way." It's almost as if what we're talking about with

your set of numbers or your tables is that we want to move as close to that direction as is feasible. Am I understanding that correctly?

- Correct, yes. If you can match the numbers then great. That's ideally what we want. And if you cannot, based off of limitations, of the size of the parcel, as in the frontage, then you just have to just push those driveways as far away from those critical intersections as possible.

- So we're looking for a language here then that would say as close to X or Y ideal as is feasible for any particular circumstance.

- Equal or as, yes.

- It ultimately means if they can't meet that, they're gonna be coming back to us to ask for permission to maybe do, like Paul said on this example it was a PUD or some other kind of arrangement with the city that allows it.

- Well, they could request a variance based on a hardship through the Board of Appeals. That's always ability to do that with the zoning code, but yeah, we would have to draft the language to be flexible.

- Yeah, yeah.

- But again, it is a big shift from the existing.

- Perhaps now in the August 9th meeting, David, you could look at whether there's room to make that language more flexible, or build in the notion that there is some negotiating that needs to happen if the ideal can't be met.

- Yep, and I can, for August 9th, I'll work with Dave to get maybe a couple examples and then we'll talk language.

- Real quick question. Just a quick question. Would you say, based on, I know this is a big change, is this more restrictive or less restrictive than the current language?

- This is much more restrictive.

- I'm sorry, what was that?

- It's much more restrictive.

- Okay, so it's much more restrictive, but that is being done to eliminate risk?

- Correct, that's the argument.

- Increased safety maybe, is a better way to put it.

- Okay, my next question is what has the risk been in the past that we need to put a more restrictive program in place?

- I'm not sure how many accidents are caused. I don't know if that's something we could figure out caused by that distance or not.

- Yeah, if you don't mind if I can interject, I think it could be very hard to quantify that within the city, you know, the exact distances that these have come across. I can just tell you anecdotally, when I'm doing safety

reviews at intersections, I can tell you that the predominant crashes or the locations of crashes is closer to the intersection. Further away you get away from an intersection, the less crashes you find. So all I'm trying to do is just, one by one here, trying to make all of our intersections safer. And we've been actually, through the traffic impact analysis process. A lot of larger developments, I mean, this is just standard. This is what we do. This is access management 101, this isn't something that's been derived you know, within the last 5, 10 years, functional area has been something for a very long time. And to be quite frank, on all state highways, it's mandated by state statute that this is implemented. This isn't even a question on state highways. When I say state highways, I know I'd mentioned before, you know, the lettered and the numbered system, but a majority of those highways, I should say the numbered ones, the state highways, are what we call a connected highway system, where we, the city, are actually the custodians of that street right away. And the state in essence, pays the city to badge it and you know, have it be constructed to particular standards and so forth. So there are, not everything would be required of a connecting highway, as in a state highway that is completely under the jurisdiction of the DoT. All we're trying to do is just, in locations and opportunities, I really wanna look at this opportunity because there are so many developments where I see them just right out of the gates. It's like, why would you put that driveway that close to here? I mean, you're just asking problems. And we've seen it. We've seen it in multiple areas. I mean, I don't think, I could probably give each of you 20 seconds and you'll come up with one or two locations where you go, wow, why did they put that driveway? That's really not a smart location. And all I'm really trying to do is just one by one, from the year 2021 on, just trying to make this a better and safer place for everyone and have a better, quality life.

- So if I could follow up on that comment, I can come up with one example right away, and that's Wally's Spot. And the new Popeyes. Lisa's laughing because I just kept asking, "Are we sure this is okay?" Did the plan for the new Popeye's fall within the parameters that you've sketched out for us here, David? Is this an example of why you applied this sort of reasoning?

- Well, this proposal is more focused on, I'd say corner lots. That's what I addressed as such. As you know, the Wally's Spot location is not a corner lot, it's one off from it.

- By the way, yeah. But as access management, it happened to be in concert with this proposal, as in that driver really was pushed away from the main Mason signal as far as possible. So yes, it would be compliant with this.

- Okay, that gives you a way of understanding the usefulness of the parameters that you're setting up here. I would have understood more quickly, the reason for accepting this as a safe arrangement had we been using, had we been talking in terms of these parameters. Thank you, that's very helpful to me.

- You're welcome. But one other example I kind of wanted to, I think that, to me, it was, I guess this was the initiating project that, you know, this really became important with groups over in University and Webster. As you probably know that there is a left turn in if you're going westbound into that clinic, but you see how far away from the intersection it was. Well, that was not exactly an easy thing to have happen. I prepared a memo that used a lot of these principles, and it literally got down to the legal end of it, where we're meeting with attorneys and things like that. And to me I'm going, well, this is kind of a no-brainer. And they go, no, this isn't a no-brainer. We want this open here, we want full access, and you know, all that. And really, we just really don't think, and the thing that really surprised me is that it was a clinic for their employees. I'm trying to make it... I'm actually trying to work with you on this. And so I think once I kind of said that, they kind of got the idea that, yeah, I guess he really is thinking about us. And I'm thinking about everybody. You know, this is kind of a, it's an equity situation to be quite frank, that all road users and customers are, you know, we're putting them in a safer situation as much as we can.

- Yeah, thank you.

- I guess, so this is all coming back to us on the 9th, so right now we're just kind of talking it out, kind of getting our feeling for it. I guess, was there anything, this was specific to the item... Sorry, I'm having technology problems. My phone, tiny little phone here. Hold on.

- So yeah, this one's specific to item six and seven. However, all 14 of the potential amendments are kind of, if you have any questions with any of them, major concerns that jump out. If there's something in the current code that you've noticed over the last two years that have been problematic from a planning perspective, I can't think of anything off the top of my head that I have that's not already in here, but between now and the next meeting would be the opportunity. And really, we want to hear anything new you have, or like this item, any requests. So I have, you know, we're gonna come up with a couple examples, some flexible language, and maybe take a look at what some of the surrounding communities are using, you know, for that one. But if you have the same type of concern with any of them, bring them on up.

- All right, so about item three specifically, requiring them to, I don't have a problem with that, requiring people to register stuff, but I mean, how do you Or is it just, I mean, what happens when you have somebody who has just a bunch of cars without plates on them, not moving, sitting there? Like how do we regulate that? Is that a complaint, is that something that would go through, it's too hot, I'm sorry words are failing me. Inspection. Is that something that you could complain to the city and the inspectors would come out, but what are the regulations for that?

- You could. Right now if there were excessive motorcars, as long as they're legally parked and licensed, they're okay to be there. So you can park them on your front lawn, you know, but if they're in the driveway or legally parked in the backyard or in any of your open parking spots, but they would still have to be licensed and registered right now. With this change, the same thing would apply. You still couldn't park on your lawn, you still couldn't do anything like that, but they wouldn't need to be licensed or registered. So if the car didn't move for five years and it was licensed every year, you could have it. In the scenario that you just mentioned, if it didn't have a license plate, it could just sit there the same. So I mean, really that licensing and registration is a way to make it financially difficult to stockpile. If they're not being moved.

- Yeah, 'cause for example like I have a property where I have a tenant who has had a car that's sitting for two years and if I got a letter from the city, they got a letter from the city and they've kept it in compliance and registered and licensed. It's just one car. I'm very aware of it, but then I think about my friends who live next door to people who, they just continuously are bringing cars that aren't licensed, aren't plated, and they're just sitting there, and they're on the parking pad, but I don't know. I guess I just don't, I'm concerned. I don't have a problem with people, you know, like my tenant, who I'm aware of her one vehicle, the one vehicle in the parking lot that's sitting there, but 'cause it's a big lot, but when we're talking about in a very residential and you've got a bigger driveway, I mean, I have a huge driveway. I could just, I just, man, I just, I guess I'm concerned that inspection is gonna go out there and if we put this in there, that there's not gonna be any kind of way for them to, and you can't really put a limit either.

- The vehicles don't need to be, with this they don't need to be licensed, but they would still need to be you wouldn't be able to just have cars like on blocks.

- Correct.

- But if they're on wheels, and just sitting there and not moving, we can't regulate that, right?

- Correct.

- If they're on blocks, yeah, absolutely. But if they're just dead vehicles with all their parts, like we can't regulate that if there were--

- We wouldn't be able to make the determination if they were operable or not.

- Right.

- As long as they had tires and windows.

- Sorry, would there be other, like with your example there, if there were rodents or something going in and out, or like excessive trash or any debris piling up on it, then that would be a city inspection issue, and that's when they would be able to come out and clean up the nuisance. What you're saying that this is that the license and registration doesn't really matter until you actually hit the road, basically.

- Correct.

- Then it's a PD issue and not city inspection.

- Right.

- I guess whether they're licensed or not, it doesn't make a difference.

- Right, I guess my, again, and I mentioned it just before, I think, and it's only my thoughts on it, the reason this was put in was to stop vehicle hoarding. You know, the probably, I don't know if everybody knows, I know of several people that love auto auctions, and they go buy three or four cars, park them in their driveway, and never look at them again until they junk them or whatever. Maybe that's just my friends. But if they had to pay 75 to \$125 a year to license them every year, they wouldn't store them there potentially. I think that is the reason that provision was put into the code. I can't say that for certainty, but that's what I think.

- So my question for the code, is there a limit to how many cars can occupy like a square footage of a driveway, or like you could literally put cars right next to each other. As long as they're not a nuisance, they could be literally stacked next to each other?

- Correct. So there's a bunch of different determinations. So they have to be in a legal parking space. So that's driveway, garage, one open space next to a garage, or a rear yard parking lot. And that's if you're coming and going, you know, a multi or two-family might have a rear yard parking lot rather than garages. The other provision in the code, and it's not in the parking code, is if you put vehicles on pavers in your backyard, you can store pretty much whatever you want in the backyard on pavers. That's really a provision that was put in place for RVs, boat trailers, snowmobile trailers, that kind of stuff. So that's where you can park anything and everything, and even, you know, a single-family house could have five driving age people, there I'd have five cars and if they have legal spots for them all, okay. If they have too many cars and not enough room, they have a problem where they're gonna have to, it's gonna be an internal problem for them.

- Is there a way of defining what a legal spot would be? You know, if your driveway, like I can fit four cars in my driveway and still be able to open the doors and get in and out, I could probably fit six if I stack them, but to define that like a parking stall is a 17X8-foot area, you can only fit a certain amount of cars per driveway based on square footage. Is that something that could go in the code?

- Well, the code, with these changes, would make a parking space eight feet wide by 15 feet deep, so that's your dimensional regulation for a parking space. And then yeah, if you could fit them in your driveway, if your driveway is, you know, 15 feet long, you can only fit one car, it's two-lane, fit two cars. Yeah, and that is all defined in the code. What's a legal space? Technically a driveway is not a legal space, but you can park in it when it leads to a legal space. That makes sense?

- Yeah, so in other words there are provisions in here that limit people from just piling cars into their driveway.

- Correct, except for the rear yard. The backyard has pretty loose regulations on storage.

- And that is spelled out in the code that it would have to be in the backyard?

- Correct.

- Because I think it's the, the front yard situation, Lisa, that you're especially concerned about and just the whole business of what's unsightly, do we have any language about that in the code?

- That's a very judgmental opinion on what's unsightly. I mean, a rusty car to one person is a beauty to somebody else.

- So is it possible to add, to put numbers to that? No more than X number of cars for any period of time that exceeds a week in front of the front line of a house in the setback from the street?

- We could do that. I mean, you can do that, however that might have some pretty heavy negative effects especially for very small urban lots that don't have any other place to park the cars. So again, a household with five drivers on a ranch that can fit them in the driveway, but there's no place else to put them, if you limit that to three, those people can no longer utilize their parking spaces and their driveway for their household. So that might have some very, I suspect that would have very negative consequences, and Paul would probably, he staffs the Board of Appeals, I think he's seen quite a bit of this kind of stuff, especially with the one-lane, you know, fifties ranches just have very little parking.

- Then I won't ask for the addition of something like this.

- But I mean, we will probably look into anything that you want us to and give you a recommendation next meeting, but that one, off the top of my head, I think that would be pretty vicious.

- Well, I guess my question would be, is there a kind of number that there would be a pretty good consensus that it has become a mess? Like if you had eight cars crammed into a driveway? I don't know, I don't know the answer to that question, but I am curious and Lisa's example's raised that for me.

- Right, and that does get very difficult because you know, every driveway is unique. If you have a two-lane, 100-foot deep driveway, it's gonna have much different impact than a smaller one. If you have a large lot, much different than if you're in a tight, urban lot. But the hard part is to make a code that's that dynamic, it almost becomes judgemental.

- That's helpful.

- And some people can argue arbitrary.

- I mean, the big thing.

- And enforcement could be an issue as well, I would think. Right, David?

- Oh definitely, because cars come and go all the time, you'd have to be out there all the time to see who's there.

- Yeah, good point.

- So, and I mean, one other thing I am going to point out with any of these code changes, they can always be changed back if it becomes a nightmare. So not that we wanna be changing code all the time, but we try to vet them out as much as possible, but just like these 14, you know, there's always room for improvement, even in a new code.

- I mean, I think the only thing that we're doing in the change, it doesn't have to do with the number of cars or anything, it's just taking away that they have to be registered and licensed. So, we're probably the vast majority of people who are just having, you know, one car that's sitting or an old car, like I have a 85 but it's in storage, I haven't had plates on that thing for over 10 years. So it's just taking that money away, and the vast majority of people probably aren't hoarding cars?

- Probably not.

- Is that what we're hoping?

- Well again, most of these codes are written for the worst scenario you can think of.

- Right. Okay. I dunno, part of me always wants to take away the fees that are involved in things, make life easier for people. But yeah, I don't think the vast majority of people are hoarding cars. That takes a lot of effort, I feel like.

- You'd be surprised. you can hoard motorcycles too.

- All right, were there any other points on this one or any other things, any of the other, of the 14 that anyone had discussion about so that they can take us back? I know this wasn't on there at all, but I still want weekend parking on the streets. I wish it was there on Fridays and Saturday nights. You could park overnight on Green Bay city streets.

- I have a question on number 10, but Lisa, I agree with you. And I would extend that to just parking on the streets in general overnight. It works in a lot of other cities, Dave Hansen. Sorry, that was more DPW, it wasn't just you, I'm sorry.

- This is zoning. We don't deal with the streets.

- All right, I agree on this.

- Yeah, question for number 10, and I realize this is one that isn't highlighted at all, but I just wanted clarification. When you say like taking this out, if there's an issue we'll just do another code change, or is it something that can be offered like inspectors would offer it as a solution where if this becomes a problem with people driving over that area, inspectors, you know, it gets reported to them and then they would say, "Hey, just put this up and it'll solve your problem."

- Correct. So the way this is drafted now, wish I had turned some lights on and wore my glasses, but so the way it's worded, if fallen to be driven over and in a deteriorated state, the city may require the installation of that vegetative or other block. So we have it kind of down as an administrative. So if you get consistent complaints, it's all muddy, it's rutted up, the inspector can order it to go in. They're just not ordering it to go in at the offset, because what they found was the majority of people don't go over that area and they keep it nice. Again, it's always for the outliers. And in this case, that's drafted right in there and the language change.

- Okay, no further questions.

- All right, cool.

- Do we need a motion then?

- Well, staff is recommending that you, Staff recommends that you hold the item to the August 9th Plan Commission meeting for action, and we would need a motion and a second to hold--

- So moved.

- Second.

- So a motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Commissioner Rovinski to hold this until the August 9th meeting. Is there any further discussion?

- Hearing none, we'll go ahead with the-- I was laughing at DJ, sorry.

- I thought that too. All those in favor of holding?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? All right, so then this will come back to us August 9th. Moving on to Informational: Director's Report.

- Good evening, commissioners? Good discussion this evening. So thank you for all your efforts on that. I emailed a Director's Report, a written report to everyone here. Sorry for the late time just before the meeting. And also if you didn't see that, certainly take a look at that. Obviously staff continues to work on a host of projects that are in the pipeline right now. So we're trying to focus on the larger ones, it's certainly not a comprehensive list by any stretch of the imagination, but certainly obviously, you know, staff can address any questions of anything that are on that particular list. So if anyone would like me to go through that, I will, otherwise I will just be happy to answer any questions. Looks like Commissioner Daniels may have a question.

- Yeah, thank you. I do have a question. So it happened to, it's great when you have two phones so you can look look at the report on one phone or be on the other one. I did look at your report. Again, full transparency, cause it's my neighborhood, but I did see that there was something, that I think is item two or three to relieve the TIF on park projects, on the Whitney Park project one year before, 'cause I'm assuming that's because half of the project is done and so they're asking for those accommodations even though half the project is done, is that correct?

- Yeah, essentially this is, the phase that was completed was actually what they had proposed in the development agreement. But the way the TIF agreements generally work is when the project is completed, obviously they get their occupancy permit. Then the following January 1, that project becomes fully assessed as a completed project. And then the actual first tax payment, property tax payment on that is the following year, which is then usually the income stream where the TIF payment happens. Well, in this particular instance, they missed the cutoff of the year. Project was essentially done at the end of 2019, but they didn't get the occupancy permit until like two afterwards, so they were substantially completed and assessed and as such they were asking if, because they had, they did actually generate increments, even though that one-year delay was in flight, if they could actually receive a partial increment payment one year earlier than essentially was established in the agreement. So essentially it was, mostly there was adequate cash flow so staff recommended it. It's recommending approval on that, and that's going to the RDA tomorrow. We understand their, I think their occupancy is actually extremely well right now. I think even the, I think the apartments are largely leased up. I think their condos have just recently, the condo aspect of the project has just finally recently mostly sold. Like there maybe was one unit left, if not entirely, so we would actually anticipate them bringing in the next phase, probably within, within probably hopefully either this fall or early next spring.

- Thank you. That was gonna be my next question. If you released the funds now, would that give them incentive to not complete the rest of the project? Or are they assumed they will complete the rest of the project?

- I think that the market and their overall investment that they've already got on it is gonna be plenty of investment, Commissioner. And I think they're gonna be coming pretty fast with that next phase.

- Awesome, thank you.

- I just wanted to add in a little observation. I was driving over the Mason Street bridge, which thankfully that's, yeah, yep. There was a sailboat that was actually docked over by the shipyard. So excited to see, it was cool to see that and I'm like, oh, oh no, there aren't docks yet. But yeah, I'll wait for that to go through, so I'm glad to see that that's on the report.

- Yes, thanks, Commissioner. It is one thing that Matt Buchanan and my staff has been working very closely with Stantec, our consultant, calling them the phase one infrastructure improvements essentially that will include a lot of the waterfront amenities, the trail, and so forth, that we'll get in there. Certainly having some sort of marina or aspect of that will be a nice thing certainly to have. I think we're also making some improvements to Light Park right now. I think Public Works is looking on that area as well. So we're really are improving that section of the river. It's gonna really have some nice docking opportunities for them. I think mostly for the public, some private, but most of it will be public access, I think. So we are excited to see what impact that's gonna have on the area.

- I was excited to see one sailboat, so I can't wait to see the whole project.

- I have to say, though, I am very excited about the bridge being done, 'cause I watched it when it got stuck. Like I was driving past I'm like, I'm not going there.

- We were very fortunate that the failure was not as catastrophic as it was first anticipated. And I don't know if Mr. Hansen has any more information on it, but it is functional, it's working now. Certainly it still has some useful life concerns, I think going forward, as do a couple of the other bridges in town, but right now, knock on wood everything's working and we're moving traffic just like we hope to be.

- Yeah, that was rough. 'cause I lived downtown like five blocks from the river. So like every time you go somewhere, all those bridges, all the traffic was horrible. So I'm very happy it's all good now.

- It was bad enough then all of a sudden we had a couple of scheduled ships come in too during that time. And then all the bridge, it was awful. Yeah. So, but it's Green Bay, where at least we know if it's gonna go back down and get back to normal eventually, usually folks are okay with that. But yeah, leaving that one up stuck for as long as it was was a bummer, and hopefully it won't be, hopefully it's back fixed and we won't have to deal with that here for quite some time.

- All right, thank you so much, Neil. All right, and so now we're going to discuss transition to hybrid in-person/virtual PC meetings.

- I guess one thing we're looking at on this, obviously staff is continuing to evaluate exactly what our options are here going forward. Most folks are aware that the City Council has gone back to a hybrid format in terms of actually meeting in the council chambers, but actually still participating on Zoom. So far that seems to be working fairly well. I think most folks are still, you know, are comfortable with that situation in terms of technology and it working. Obviously we continue to monitor the health numbers and things that are out there and we're not seeing some great trends out there. So certainly one of the concerns, there's two really main factors, I guess, that we look at as we go forward. One is certainly being able to maintain some degree of social distancing. So we have to make sure we're probably back in the council chambers, the largest room,

making sure we're spreading folks out to the extent that we can. The other one is a technology issue in terms of being able to record the actual meeting, in terms of when we're doing that. So I think that's why council chambers is the primary location of when we would wanna have to do that. From a staff standpoint, it's certainly, we're certainly capable of going either direction at this point, either continuing the virtual mode or going into a hybrid mode where we think some members would probably still choose to attend virtually. Certainly with members of the public, that's the other challenge in terms of, you know, if we have people show up to a meeting, how do we manage those folks in that space, in a distancing environment and so forth? So we are continuing to still evaluate that. I think we, you know, I think it was really kind of Commission's what your desire would be, if you would like us to try to attempt a hybrid, a meeting with some in-person attendance, we could certainly look at doing that and attempting that, but certainly I think it is really up to the discretion of the commission at this point. Does anyone have any preferences one way or the other, I would ask.

- I guess I don't have a preference one way or another. The only problem is when it's 90 degrees out, my air conditioner's in my bedroom, and City Hall, there's air conditioning everywhere.

- This is true.

- I'm good with it either way. I would say if there's any hesitation from anyone else, I'm good with staying online, but I'm comfortable meeting in-person. Others are, I'm fully vaccinated.

- Yeah, I prefer--

- I'm staying virtual.

- You wanna say virtual?

- As in I'm fine staying virtual, but if people wanna meet in person, I'm fine with that too. So I can go either way.

- So we can certainly, we'll continue virtual. If folks wanna think about that, we can bring that back up and have let's say, I guess, without a clear consensus, we'd say we would stay virtual until such time as the Commission would like to meet in-person again. So again, it's entirely up to this body when you would like us to attempt to try that and make that work.

- I guess my one concern about virtual is how difficult that makes it for people who want to speak with us. And the hybrid sounds like they would still be on the virtual side of things.

- Yeah, even with the situation, I think Commissioner Bremer is if the, even if someone showed up to a meeting, in a hybrid format if someone from the public showed up to a meeting and wanted to comment, we would still have to have them either on a laptop or something so they could actually be connected still via Zoom, even though they were there in person so anyone else who was connected virtually could still hear them and they could participate that way. So that is the one wrinkle in terms of just, you know, folks in the public. I think in council, I don't believe we've had too many. I don't know if we've had anybody show up in-person, Ald. Corpus-Dax, have we seen anyone in person? I don't believe so. We haven't been tested on that yet.

- It all depends on whether or not you've got a real controversy, right?

- Exactly. Right. You know, we in Plan Commission, we get some interesting ones every now and then, folks might wanna come talk to you guys.

- Yeah, can you imagine the Popeyes conversation in-person and virtual? That would have been a lot. Yes, that would have been a long night. Absolutely. It tested our IT infrastructure to say the least. Absolutely.

- It's already a long night. Let's do it both ways.

- I'm the one still in Chambers.

- I'm assuming you had some scheduling to work out to them, just for all the different commissions.

- Yeah, in term of obviously, if everyone needs to use that same facility, we just need to make sure we're on a night where we don't have conflict. Obviously we're selfish, we think I would be the first one to say, Plan Commission is ordinance-created, very statutory required entity that we're gonna take priority over some of these other folks. I'll see how much that six-months-on-the-job muscle, that it really makes any difference or not. But yeah, it's a great point, Commissioner Miller. We gotta make sure we don't have any conflicts.

- Yeah, I mean it kind of sounds like maybe virtual might still work, especially going into the fall, like it's the time for more illness, and I would just think that it's, you know, if anything happens then it's gonna get worse at that point. But I think from ease of being a Chair, I think in person would be easier for me, but I'm handling it -ish. So I think virtual is okay.

- I just imagine being in person, I will say at my time on the Commission, the seat, I have never been, I've been virtual the whole entire time, so I know, you know, Ken, and Jacob, and Lisa, yeah, it's been virtual the whole time, so I don't even know...

- You don't have anything to compare to, right?

- You have no idea what we look like from the chest-down.

- That's right. Actually I didn't see Syd the other night, I think at State of the City, I think I saw Syd, that's right. So,

- Yeah. I've seen Ken, so I've seen a couple of folks out there, but yeah, it is a little unusual.

- I saw Dave, I saw Dave one day, yeah, Dave Buck one day, and I waved at him, he was like, I don't know who that guy is. And he waved back.

- Also he kind of does one of these like, "Oh, wait a minute. I know who that is. "There he is." So I guess for now we will continue virtually, but I said at this point, I'd say really at any time the commission would like to decide to go back to, or to turn into hybrid form, staff would be happy to accommodate that. Oh, that's June 21st. All right, so date of the next meeting is August 9th, 2021.

- And that's said, I move to adjourn this meeting. No second?

- Second.

- What in the world?

- I'm like what? No, I don't even know who gave that.

- Ken.

- All right, so motion by Commissioner Bremer and a second by Commissioner Rovinski to adjourn. all those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.
- Aye
- Aye. You guys all stay cool. It is hot out there.
- Yeah, take care, everybody.
- Thanks, everybody.
- Bye.
- Watch out for those variants.