



MINUTES OF THE GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION

MONDAY, AUGUST 30, 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, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, Excused: Autumn Linsmeier, Veronica Corpus-Dax

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the Agenda for the August 30, 2021, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Ken Rovinski to approve the agenda with the change to move Regular Business Agenda Items 5 & 6 before Regular Business Agenda Items 1 & 2. Motion Passed. Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain-None.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the August 9, 2021, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Derius Daniels to approve the minutes. Motion Passed. Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, 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 18-25) Public Hearing on the request to rezone the 1420 Block of S. Huron Road from Rural Residential (RR) to Varied Density Residential (R3) and Rural Residential (RR) to Conservancy (C), submitted by Jon LeRoy, Mau & Associates on behalf of Paul Kosmoski, property owner (Ald. V. Corpus-Dax).

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the floor for the Public Hearing on the request to rezone the 1420 Block of S. Huron Road from Rural Residential (RR) to Varied Density Residential (R3) and Rural Residential (RR) to Conservancy (C), submitted by Jon LeRoy, Mau & Associates on behalf of Paul Kosmoski, property owner (Ald. V. Corpus-Dax).

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.

2. (ZP 18-25) Consideration with possible action on the request to rezone the 1420 Block of S. Huron Road from Rural Residential (RR) to Varied Density Residential (R3) and Rural Residential (RR) to Conservancy (C), submitted by Jon LeRoy, Mau & Associates, on behalf of Paul Kosmoski, property owner (Ald. V. Corpus-Dax).

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Jacob Miller to rezone the 1420 Block of S. Huron Road.

Sidney Bremer stated there were people on the call who wished to speak and suggested opening the floor for discussion.

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

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

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain-None.

A motion is on the table, moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Jacob Miller to rezone the 1420 Block of S. Huron Road from Rural Residential (RR) to Varied Density Residential (R3) and Rural Residential (RR) to Conservancy (C). Motion Passed.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain-None.

3. (ZP 21-24) Public Hearing on the request to rezone 215 Elizabeth Street from General Commercial (C1) to Highway Commercial (C2) and Low Density Residential (R1), submitted by Steve Bieda, Mau & Associates, on behalf of Mirhashemi, Inc., property owner (Ald. C. Stevens, District 5).

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the floor for the Public Hearing on the request to rezone 215 Elizabeth Street from General Commercial (C1) to Highway Commercial (C2) and General Commercial (C1)

to Low Density Residential (R1), submitted by Steve Bieda, Mau & Associates, on behalf of Mirhashemi, Inc., property owner (Ald. C. Stevens, District 5).

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.

4. (ZP 21-24) Consideration with possible action on the request to rezone 215 Elizabeth Street from General Commercial (C1) to Highway Commercial (C2) and Low Density Residential (R1), submitted by Steve Bieda, Mau & Associates, on behalf of Mirhashemi, Inc., property owner (Ald. C. Stevens, District 5).

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

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, 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, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain-None.

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Sidney Bremer to approve the request to rezone 215 Elizabeth Street from General Commercial (C1) to Highway Commercial (C2) and Low Density Residential (R1). Motion Passed.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain-None.

5. (ZP 21-27) Public Hearing on the request to rezone 1414-1424 Shawano Avenue from Low Density Residential District (R1) to Public Institutional (PI), submitted by Jeffrey DeJardins, Seventh-Day Adventist Wisconsin Association, property owner (Ald. M. Steuer, District 10).

PLEASE NOTE: This items 5 & 6 was discussed at the beginning of the meeting before Regular Business Agenda Items 1 & 2.

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the floor for the Public Hearing on the request to rezone 1414-1424 Shawano Avenue from Low Density Residential District (R1) to Public Institutional (PI), submitted by Jeffrey DeJardins, Seventh-Day Adventist Wisconsin Association, property owner (Ald. M. Steuer, District 10).

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.

6. (ZP 21-27) Consideration with possible action on the request to rezone 1414-1424 Shawano Avenue from Low Density Residential District (R1) to Public Institutional (PI), submitted by Jeffrey DeJardins, Seventh-Day Adventist Wisconsin Association, property owner (Ald. M. Steuer, District 10).

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Ken Rovinski to open the floor for discussion. Motion Passed.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain-None.

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

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain-None.

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Sidney Bremer to approve the request to rezone 1414-1424 Shawano Avenue from Low Density Residential District (RI) to Public Institutional (PI). Motion Passed.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain-None.

7. (TA 21-05) Consideration with possible action on the review of updates to Article XVIII. Off-Street Parking, Drives, and Loading, Green Bay Municipal Code.

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Sidney Bremer to hold over the request for the review of updates to Article XVIII. Off-Street Parking, Drives, and Loading, Green Bay Municipal Code until the September 27, 2021, Plan Commission Meeting. Motion Passed.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain-None.

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Director's Report.

Neil Stechschulte presented the Director's Report.

2. Date of next meeting: September 13, 2021.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Jacob Miller, seconded by Sidney Bremer to Adjourn. Motion Passed.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain-None.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Is cheap but just in case I forget anyway.
- I'll include it when I motion approval of the agenda, okay, Lisa?
- Oh perfect, thank you Sid.

- Thanks Sid.
- Easily done.
- All right and with that it's six o'clock so... Well good evening and welcome to the Monday August 30th meeting of the Green Bay Planning Commission via Zoom and we will do a roll call, Chair Lisa Hanson, present. Vice Chair Jacob Miller?
- Present.
- Alder Veronica Corpus-Dax?
- She's been been excused from the meeting.
- Oh, she has. Okay, I didn't see that on there, okay. Commissioner Sidney Bremer?
- Present.
- Commissioner Derius Daniels?
- Present.
- Commissioner Linsmeier is excused. And Commissioner Ken Rovinski.
- Present.
- Okay. Moving on to the approval of the agenda for the August 30th meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.
- I move approval of the agenda with the exception of moving items five and six up before items one and two.
- Second.
- It's a motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Commissioner Rovinski. All those in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Any opposed? And that is approved. Moving on to the approval of minutes from the August 9th, 2021 meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.
- I move to approve.
- Second.
- Motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Commissioner Daniels. All those in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Any opposed? All right, and then moving on to regular business, we will be starting with item number five, which is 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. And if Steph can give us a brief overview before we move on to the public hearing.

- [Steph] Yes, so just to give you an idea of the location, this is near the corner of Fisk and Shawano Avenue. This is the Seventh Day Adventist Church. We're viewing this more as a cleanup. It was from the petitioner, but it's going from residential to our public institutional, so that would be more conforming with their land use.

- Okay. Sounds good. So we're looking to hear from interested parties who are in favor of this proposition. Are there any- Technical difficulties. Anyone looking to speak in opposition to this item? And is there anyone wishing to provide information only for this public hearing portion of this item? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak?

- [Heather] I'm sorry, I missed the first part of it. So I live on the other side of the trail, so what exactly-

- If you could just, I'm sorry. If you could just state your name and address for the record, please.

- [Heather] Sure, it's Heather Neta, and it's 1437 Dousman Street.

- Okay.

- [Heather] So exactly what would that entail? Is that like the church, would it be closer to my house? Like it's not doing anything with the trail or anything like that, or I guess I don't understand exactly what it's looking to do besides change from residential to business.

- And Heather we'll actually get into more of the details of it on the regular agenda item. But actually this is just talking about zoning, nothing, to my understanding, nothing is moving, it's just a clean up because the zoning is improper. But with the actionable item, which is item number six, we'll have more discussion and more questions at that point. This is really just for public input at this point. So if you have any information that you want to state or anything, any statements, then that's what we're looking for at this time, but we really can't take any questions.

- [Heather] Okay.

- Anything else you wish to state? You're just kind of looking for more information on it?

- [Heather] Right, yeah, I was just looking for more information on exactly what it was going to do or if it was going to be closer to my house or what was going on, that's what I was looking for.

- Okay, all right, and when we get to the actionable item, if you have questions you can ask them at that time as well. Because generally, we to the public. Thanks Heather. Is there anyone else wishing to speak? Is there anyone else wishing to speak? Is there anyone else wishing to speak? Let the record reflect that no one came forward and this public hearing is now closed and moving on to the corresponding actionable item, item number six, consideration with possible action on the request to rezone 1414 and 1424 Shawano Avenue from low density residential district to public institutional, submitted by Jeffrey Desjardins, Seven Day Adventists, Wisconsin Association, property owner.

- [Steph] Thank you, Madam chair. So again, this is location of , it's on the city's West Side. You'll notice that there is also another church located here, this is not part of the request currently, though staff may bring separate requests forward in the future for something similar. To get an idea of the view of the property, here

is the subject property and then again, that additional church that may come forward in the future. Is it switching? Is this changing to the different maps for you?

- [Paul] This one is, yeah. Took a little bit, a little bit late.

- [Steph] Okay, I can kind of see it on my second screen so I just want to make sure we're on the same page. This is our future land use map. So as reflected here, the blue is for that public institutional or semi-public uses, so this is in accordance with that. Currently our zoning shows this the entire area as zoned for R1 low density residential. So with that, the change would allow them to go from in the R1 district, church and educational uses are allowed through conditional use permits. If we go forward with the public institutional zoning, they're allowed by, right? So this is easier for many people when they do any sort of financing, the conditional use can be a hindrance and then also it just kind of cleans up and gives a better idea of what the property is being used for. There are no proposed changes at this time. We don't have any site plans or any expansions proposed currently, but this would allow for them to take out that one step of the conditional use permit if they did want to do any expansion of their existing uses, which is church and educational. So with that, we are recommending approval of that request.

- Does the commission have any questions for staff?

- So just to clarify, it would make the zoning fit what is on the ground?

- Yes, so the actual changes in real life other than the zoning map getting updated to reflect the land use more appropriately.

- Thank you, Steph.

- Go ahead, Alder Steuer.

- Thank you, thank you, Chair. I talked to Mr. Desjardins about this as well. I also had no citizens come forward to talk to me about any concerns about this. I look at it as a clerical set up, you know, trying to clean some things up here. If you go by that area, I go on that trail constantly and the area near the trail's pretty wide open. I don't see it being any kind of hindrance to the trail or even to the houses around it. It's a pretty wide open area if they expand or there'll be maybe some areas in the future, but for now, looking at the grounds, it's pretty laid back in that sense. I don't have a big problem with it. I concur that we should change it. Thank you.

- Thank you, Alder Steuer.

- Could we pull the map up again? For the future land use?

- [Steph] There you go.

- I guess, so my question, it looks like the future land use divides that property, would this, like the entire property would be zoned PI or?

- [Steph] Yes, the rezoning request is for the entire parcel. I don't know if you guys are all familiar with this, but a lot of our comp plan stuff are blobs, especially as you get towards the East Side so we take the general intent of the comprehensive plan map, and with this, this is showing almost all of the parcels, so we would recommend rezoning the entire parcel.

- Thank you. And with that, I would move to approve.

- I wonder if we have answered Heather's questions and I'd like to open the floor to make sure that that has been the floor.
- I would second that.
- Thank you.
- Motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Commissioner Rovinski to open the floor. All those in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Any opposed? All right, and then, I guess, Heather, did that answer your question?
- [Heather] Sure, yeah, that's fine. That's good, yeah.
- We opened the floor just to make sure that you were okay. All right, thank you.
- All right, is there anyone else wishing to speak on this item or, I guess, do we have any questions for the applicant? Okay.
- Then I move to return to regular order of business.
- Second.
- All right, motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Commissioner Rovinski to move to regular order. All those in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Any opposed? All right, so we have a motion by Commissioner Rovinski to approve.
- I'll second that.
- And a second by Commissioner Bremer. Any further discussion? All right, hearing none. All those in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Any opposed? All right and then that moves on unanimously to the next city council meeting, which is September.
- September 7th. September 7th.
- 7th, thank you, Alder Steuer.
- Thank you. Thank you commission for this. Thank you.
- You're welcome. All right. Okay and then moving back onto item number one, which is a public hearing on the request to rezone the 1420 block of South Huron Road from Rural Residential to Varied Density Residential and Rural Residential to Conservancy. Submitted by John LeRoy, Mau & Associates, on behalf of Paul Kosmoski, property owner.
- Thank you, Madam Chair, can everyone see the screen?

- Nothing is on it yet, Paul. Except the sign that we're viewing your screen. There, now we can see it.

- There.

- Sometimes it's a little slow or I'm a little slow, one of the two, thank you Madam Chair. This is a request for rezoning the 1420 block of South Huron Road. That is the 30 acre parcel that is at the very southern limits of the city of Green Bay on the West Side of said road. This may look familiar, this item was, well, similar items were for the Plan Commission, the comprehensive plan amendment and what did was change some future land use designations from a business park to medium to high density residential and from wetland public open space to, or I'm sorry, business park to wetland and public open space. So this is the implementation of that. This was the rezoning of that subject area to be in conformance with that recent comprehensive plan amendment.

- All right. Thank you, Paul. So with this public hearing, we're looking to take testimony from parties who are in favor of the item.

- I'm Steve Bieda with Mau & Associates. If you have any questions of me, I'm representing Paul Kosmoski in this rezone.

- All right, thank you, Chris. If you could just state your address for the record.

- My name is Steve, Chris is my wife.

- Oh, sorry.

- 400 Security Boulevard, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

- All right, thank you, Steve and we'll probably have questions for you during the actionable item, I'm sure.

- Yep.

- Anything that you'd like to state right now?

- I'm good.

- All right, is there anyone else looking to speak in favor of this item? Is there anyone looking to speak in opposition to this item? And if you're calling in on internet audio, it is star six to unmute yourself. Is there anyone wishing to give information only? Is there anyone wishing to speak? 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 actionable item, item number two, consideration with possible action on the request to rezone the 1420 block of South Huron Road from Rural Residential to Varied Density Residential and Rural Residential to Conservancy, submitted by Jon LeRoy, Mau & Associates, on behalf of Paul Kosmoski, property owner.

- Thank you, Madam chair. This is the request to rezone the subject area. The property that's kind of highlighted with the cyan color is a 15 acre parcel that's proposed there that would go from Rural Residential to Varied Density Residential or R3. There is a small out lot to the north which has power lines, it's actually owned by the City of Green Bay, that's also about four acres in size, that would be included within that rezoning request and there's also a pending developers agreement as well that would tie that property in. The piece to the south, with the wetlands and stream would go from Rural Residential to Conservancy. Again, this is the comprehensive plan showing the old recommendation of the business park. Again, we've kind of went over that briefly with the change or recent change that's pending and the current zoning of the area shows that Rural Residential. This pattern here outlined would go to the R3 and this area in the green would go to

Conservancy. This kind of shows you a future layout or lot layout of the area. And as I think I mentioned at the last Plan Commission meeting this property is really encumbered by quite a few wetlands here. So the lot lines are kind of set up to allow for some development on a future lot one, lot two and then the outlot down here below. We did notify affected property owners within 400 feet, we didn't receive any calls or questions regarding this request and the staff tonight is recommending the approval of the request as proposed.

- All right, thank you, Paul.

- Paul, the one thing that confused me, and it's what you just said, you said future development in the outlot, but the outlot is up for rezoning as Conservancy and wouldn't that preclude future development?

- It would, sure, but lot one, it's Outlot 1, so that's unbuildable area, if you can see that on the map here.

- Yes.

- So there are potentially three lots, they haven't been created yet. There was a lot one, a lot two, those are technically considered buildable with out blended areas. Outlot 1 is also part of that future land division, but is unbuildable because it's designated as an outlot. So really only one and two are buildable.

- I wanted to make sure of that, thank you very much.

- Sure.

- I would move to approve.

- I'll second.

- We have a motion by Commissioner Rovinski and a second by Vice Chair Miller. Is there any discussion or questions for staff?

- I think that there's somebody in the audience with their hand up.

- Okay.

- Then I moved to open the floor.

- Second.

- Motion by Commissioner Bremer and a second by Vice Chair Miller to open the floor. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right. And if the person wishing to speak, if you could state your name and address for the record? 'Cause I just see a bunch of black screens I don't see anything.

- I don't see anyone.

- Yeah, I don't. Yeah, I don't see a hand raised.

- Maybe I'm hallucinating. I'm not sure.

- It's okay. It's best to err on the side of caution.

- But since we have the floor open, I wonder, I would like to ask a question of Steve Bieda. My only concern about this, and I must say I'm impressed by the work that you all have done with the city, to pay attention to the wetlands and all the plantings on the campus, my only concern is our ongoing issues of affordability and housing in the area and the market rate of 900 to 1200 still is going to leave a lot of people out and I notice that there are a lot of parking stalls here, an average of, what is it, 2.6 parking stalls per unit. Was any thought given to cutting down, particularly the indoor, I assume there is some, garages in any way that would allow lower prices for some of the units?

- No, I don't think Paul considered that. Unfortunately, this is what it costs to build these particular buildings. Anything with attached garages to them are much more expensive to build with the fire sprinklers, they're much more expensive to build, and given the site, it's a bit challenging and that's why they didn't quite have their numbers fine tuned yet, I'll call it. But I do a lot of apartment stuff and I couldn't tell you the last apartment that I've seen that's new that went up for less than probably \$800 a month, even a one bedroom. Pretty tough to do right now in these, and with these market conditions, it's almost impossible to do, just because of the prices of lumber.

- Yeah, building materials are ridiculous.

- It's not just lumber, it's building materials. So.

- Thank you. I appreciate your response.

- Were there any other questions for the petitioner? Otherwise I'd entertain a motion to close the floor.

- Motion to return to normal order.

- Second.

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

- [All] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right, so let me remember, we've got a motion by Commissioner Rovinski and a second by Vice Chair Miller, do we have any further discussion on this item? All right, hearing none I'll go ahead with a voice vote. All those in favor.

- [All] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right and then that will move along unanimously to City Council for September 7th. Moving on to item number three, which is a public hearing on the request to rezone 215 Elizabeth Street from General Commercial to Highway Commercial and General Commercial to Low Density Residential, submitted by Steve Bieda, Mau & Associates, on behalf of Mirhashemi, Inc., property owner.

- [Steph] Thank you, a little background before we open up our public hearing. This parcel is 215 Elizabeth, which is outlined here. This is in conjunction with a parcel that's also here on Main Street, so both will be used on their site plan. The comprehensive plan has been before, you know, twice recently approved in early 2021, that has commercial for the southern half of this property and then residential for the northern part of the property, intended to be a very solid buffer between the commercial area and the residential area to the north. So we'll go through the site plan and some of the specifics on the action item.

- Okay. Thank you so much, Steph. And so we're looking to hear from interested parties that are in favor of this item. Any interested parties who are in opposition to this item? And is there anyone wishing to provide information only? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? 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 actionable item, item number four. Consideration with possible action on the request to rezone 215 Elizabeth Street from General Commercial to Highway Commercial and General Commercial to Low Density Residential, submitted by Steve Bieda, Mau & Associates, on behalf of Mirhashemi, Inc., property owner.

- [Steph] Thank you, Madam Chair. So again, we're looking at the property that's located at the intersection of Main Street and Elizabeth. For some reference, Bear Creek Trail comes out here and there's a McDonald's at the corner here. This future land use map is not accurate, we have not updated it since our last meeting where we updated our comprehensive plan, so it was previously the medium intensity retail office or housing and then we adopted, going to commercial for this portion here and residential for the northern portion, again. Currently, the zoning reflects that there is C2 zoning on the Main Street property and a little bit of the 215 Elizabeth with the rest of it being C1 zoning. So the request is to go from the C1 zoning to C2 and then also to R1 Residential up north. To display this a little bit better, here is the site plan. They were recently approved for our variance at the Board of Appeals for no five foot step back along Elizabeth Street so they could have parking for auto sales right up front. This had went before the Plan Commission in August of 2020, we had recommended denial. The City Council had sent it back for further information. At that point, the applicants and the property owner had gone through a series of neighborhood meetings and had scaled back the site plan quite significantly. So this is a reflection of that scaled back site plan, which is showing a very large buffer area between the residential neighbors and then the commercial use here, which would be a used auto sale lot. So there's an existing building here that will be maintained and updated and then from there, it's just the addition of parking, landscaping and then this large buffer area with some fencing here and I believe there are some existing fencing along the rear. I would like to note that no lights are shown on this site plan. They would have to comply with, obviously, our lighting and traffic through our site plan review, but no lights are shown currently through the site plan. And a little bit better of a descriptor for what the zoning would be, so this would all be C2 zoning throughout the southern part of this parcel, and then this would be rezoned to R1 to reflect that buffer area that's on their site plan. This is pretty rare for us, we don't typically go for split zoning with any parcel, this is kind of known as a spite strip, it's meant to keep a very large buffer. In this case though, I think it's entirely appropriate, considering the heavy residential uses to the north and C2 is a pretty intensive zoning district for us. So even if this auto use doesn't go through or gets changed over, C2 does allow for drive-throughs. So just thinking, in the future, that if this gets sold or rehabbed to a different use, we want to make sure that we're protecting those neighbors to the north as much as we can, so I do find that the R1 spite strip to the north is appropriate here. So with that, we are recommending approval of the request. We had heard from a couple neighbors, mostly inquiring. We had one that was on the fence about it, mostly concerned about traffic increase, she does live on the road to the north and I explained that the traffic entry points were both on Elizabeth Street and that seemed to calm some fears. And then also received an email today from somebody who was opposed to the request, concerned mostly about lighting. Concerned that there's going to be a lot of spillage over here, but with this type of a buffer zone, there's a 10 foot landscape buffer that's required and then the lighting can not exceed one footcandle at any property line. So we believe that through site plan review, a lot of those things will be taken care of so the zoning does seem appropriate as proposed.

- Okay. Thank you, Steph. Go ahead, Commissioner Bremer. You're on mute.

- Thank you. There. So, I have no concerns with the buffer lighting, particularly since it's a good treescape all the way through here as part of that buffer. My one surprise is, there are no sidewalks, right?

- I think there are existing sidewalks. This was just a site plan for their-

- Oh, okay. Okay, I was-

- There wouldn't be on Elizabeth, but I can pull it up quickly too. Yes, there are existing sidewalks.

- Okay. That takes care of my only concern, thank you.

- My question for staff here, I have, let's see, the site plan pulled up here, or I should say the aerial photo, is it currently gravel on the entire site and they're going to be re-establishing grass on the northern portion or will that just be planting and leaving the existing conditions?

- I would ask the applicant for that kind of information, I believe the existing condition is like very, very bad concrete, so it's probably turned into gravel at that point. Given what's on the site plan, it shows that it will be grass, seeded and grassed with landscaping on it so whatever's on their site plan is what they'd be adhering to, but I think that if you wanted it to open the floor and ask Mr. Bieda he might have a better answer than I have.

- Nope. I'm good with that. I just, I'm having a hard time reading the site plan, but I got closer to my computer and I see it now, it says remove unused blacktop, reseed with grass. So sorry, I just had to look closer.

- It's a pretty small site plan.

- My other question for staff, I wasn't part of the Plan Commission when this went through the first time, the initial concerns, you don't have any initial concerns that were brought up originally, it was mainly just so that buffer would be there.

- Yes, most of the initial concerns came with over parking of the site, multiple access points, possible expansion of the building that may encroach into, like having more lighting available, but really it was that it was full parked up to that northern property line. So now that they have a quite extensive buffer zone on their site plan, which you know, is impressive to look at but I think really that zoning, that R I zoning, is going to protect those northern properties in case any redevelopment happens. So that really has quashed any of the concerns that any staff members have.

- All right. Thank you. With that I don't have any other concerns.

- Lisa, as long as it's not you that's falling over we're okay with that.

- Technical difficulties. I guess I see a couple of people, just a couple of names in the audience that I don't recognize, I'm just wondering if there are people that want to talk and if we need to open the floor.

- We just came from a public hearing where no one said anything. So unless there's a concern I would just move to approve.

- Second.

- We're quickly. Sorry, I know we have a motion on the floor but it like Georgiana is trying to speak. Sorry.

- I see her as well, but we need to open the floor before we can do that.

- Right, she was trying to speak while you do that. So I guess I'll follow, I'll do a Sid and ask that we open the floor at this time.

- All right. Thank you.

- I'll second that.

- All right, thank you. So a motion by Commissioner Daniels, second by Commissioner Bremer, all those in favor.

- [All] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right and Georgiana, did you want to speak? If you do, if you could just state your name and address for the record.
- But you will need to unmute yourself and if you are on phone that requires that you press what, Lisa?
- Star six.
- Star six.
- She was on video but I think we called her out and now she's run away. I guess, is there a public wishing to speak on this item?
- I wanted to ask Madison if she could unmute her if she has that power.
- I, she looked like, someone was unmuting her 'cause I saw it unmute and then it would mute again, so.
- [Madison] Yeah, I'm kinda trying to and I don't think she wants to talk.
- Okay. All right, sorry. I saw the same thing you did Commissioner Daniels, it looked like she wanted to talk so, if she doesn't want to talk that's okay.
- We can see her face now. If you want to talk, Georgiana Baenen, if you could put your thumb up and we'll make sure you have a chance to.
- No, she's outta here.
- Okay. Good enough.
- Motion -
- I second.
- All right, motion by Commissioner Rovinski, second by Commissioner Bremer. All those in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Any opposed? All right, so we have a motion by Commissioner Rovinski, any further discussion?
- Do we have a second?
- Not yet.
- I'll second.
- I'll second.
- And a second.
- Sid got there first.
- All right, is there any further discussion? All right, hearing none we'll go ahead with the voice vote. All those in favor.

- [All] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right, that moves on unanimously then to the September 7th City Council meeting. And then we've already done five and six, so moving on to number seven which is, consideration with possible action on the review of updates to Article XVIII. Off-Street Parking, Drives, and Loading, Green Bay Municipal Code.

- Madam Chair, David Buck is still working on that with Dave Hanson and he's asked that that be held until the September 27th Plan Commission meeting.

- Motion to hold the items.

- Second.

- by Commissioner Bremer to hold the item until the 27th meeting. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right, then that will be held until two meetings from now?

- [Paul] Two meetings, yeah. Correct.

- All right, and then moving on to Informational Director's Report. I saw it. I didn't get to read it, but I saw it.

- I sneaked it on you guys right before the meeting every time, I know I do that.

- You do that so we can't ask you any questions about it 'cause we haven't had a chance to read it yet, Neil.

- But you can always ask me anything, Sid. If there's anything on there that, I tried to highlight the, certainly the categories of the projects in there. You know, I think most of the items are simply updates, nothing too dramatic from anything that was on there before. I did want to point out a couple of new ones that were added from last time. 200 North Monroe, folks remember that project's been approved. Staff has kind of starting to work with them on the phase two environmental that will be required for that site, just to kind of get that cleared and done. So I don't think the developer was quite anticipating, maybe some of the contamination that was on there, even though we've got, had conversations on it, but for whatever reason, they didn't seem to recall everything that was on that site. So staff is working with them to kind of proceed on the phase two. So that project is still on track and it was just an unexpected, a little bit of extra environmental work that's gonna need to be done in terms of planning for the remediation of that site before they proceed on the project. The important one I think I really wanted to highlight that will eventually be coming to this body is 216 Military Avenue, this is the former ShopCo building. We're working with HJ Martin on the site there. They have a desire to kind of use a temporary use for some storage in that building, warehousing is not generally allowed in that zoning classification so we are actually meeting with them tomorrow and actually trying to figure out a way, if there's a way, we could do a combination of a planned unit development plus a development agreement that would ensure that that was just a temporary use on the step to a larger redevelopment of the site. So we feel staff was certainly doesn't have a recommendation at this point, but we feel if it is done in the context of a deadline with a future redevelopment of the site, that it would be something we could consider for the site. But that is, obviously, subject to a whole lot of different criteria and certainly coming through the RDA first in terms of see if they're interested in any project on the site and then obviously to the Plan Commission and Council then for specific zoning action. So watch for that, certainly in the coming months. We think it is a great site. We've talked to at least one developer who has worked and kind of done a projection on the WHEDA tax score credits for this site and then this is one of the highest scoring sites in the city, so Sid, Miss Bremer, fingers crossed, if we can maybe get a project here, we think this

would be a great site. So staff is in discussions with HJ Martin at this point on hopefully future use on that site. Let's see if there was anything else under there that was really new and exciting. Pretty much just kind of just continuing to plug along on most of those other projects. Happy to answer any questions, either right now, or if you have any questions as you do get to read it, please feel free to certainly shoot me an email, I'd be happy to answer as well.

- And actually I just figured out how to be able to read it while we are also on screen, for the first time.

- Excellent!

- have we been doing this. So I'm-

- You're in trouble.

- It's not a problem, guys.

- I want to go for an ice cream cone.

- Neil, I do got a question on that now that I just, as you're going through it, has there been an, I guess, two questions an inventory of maybe these old big box retail stores in the city, just to kind of know how many we have and if there's going to be options to redevelop them, and has there been anything learned, either from this or maybe other cities too, on how to these old big boxes that are kind of sitting there empty?

- Yeah, great question. Mr. Miller. I don't know, I'm not personally aware of an absolute, like here's a report of here's where they all are, but I know if you talk to Dave Buck and Paul Neumeyer, they can bam, bam, bam, and just rattle them straight off, and Steph, and they were all various staffs worked on them in various capacities as they go through. Certainly kind of keeping an eye on that, certainly from everything from, an assessing level, on a dark store level, on a statewide issue, is certainly the one key issue on getting some of these sites reused. I think staff's position, I've been pretty supportive of at this point, in terms of, like I said, in this case, really not allowing that temporary use there, I think Plan Commission probably knows better than anybody, temporary uses have a sneaky habit of becoming more, not so temporary uses, in terms of as they move forward. And we certainly are looking at, there are some unique things going on. I think in terms of what looked at, that what Garritt Bader has been doing with East Town Mall and certainly the commission's probably for calling that one in terms of maintaining the retail front of those buildings and then using the kind of the more industrial user in back. But there's no visual, you can't tell there's an industrial use back there, really kind of a unique approach to those kind of larger format buildings. I think that certainly has some great possibilities on that. So there's some lessons to be learned from that and possibly allowing some things in front, maybe some additional development in the front to screen that building if it was to transfer it into that. I think long-term, we probably still see the redevelopment of those sites is probably the avenue we want to see happen on a majority of them. I don't think that that sort of creative reuse is always feasible, but again, it takes a pretty creative developer, Garritt's obviously a guy who certainly fits that bill, was able to really pull it off and I think do a really viable project that looks nice, fits in with the neighborhood, and has minimal conflicts with the area for what they've done. So certainly, taking a look at that and the comprehensive plan update, as we get ready to kind of get launched in that this fall, I think that's probably would be a great specific topic to dial in on as we go through that process and really identify a lot of those large... The temporary use is not just a large format building issue. We've seen smaller buildings wantin' to do the same thing, just use it for temporary storage kinds of things, but obviously the biggest ones that certainly catch everyone's eye, I think, are the large format spaces that are vacant. So for now, I think we're, I appreciate staff's approach to these. I think we're on the right track on these in trying to either not allow that sort of temporary use or if we do allow that to be very, very strict on the timeframes and ability to end that use when a project would come forward. But we're open to other ideas if anybody's got them.

- All right.

- Sorry. I did have one question. Can you expand on the Baylake Bank Building and the future use, or what is the pie in the sky vision for that?

- Yeah, well the original vision that is adopted actually in the authenticity plan is actually the removal of that building. That's actually what's currently adopted right now, is actually taking that building down, extending the one street through there and creating some open space as part of that lot there. For a variety of reasons there's roadblocks, mostly financial ones in place, in terms of what the costs would be to that. I think we've seen Spring Lake Church has expanded in that quite a bit and done some considerable investment in that space. I think there's been other tenants, that this is a condo building. There are probably, I want to say there's 14 or 15 different owners now in that building, so it's not just one owner anymore. So one of the things we've kind of been working with, one of the primary owners there, Paul Belschner and BASE Companies, is trying to figure out, how do we really evaluate this building going forward? There's been lots of folks who've kind of anecdotally saying, oh, we can't, there's no way we can add anything, add layers to the building. There's no way we can activate the roof and screen the mechanicals, or it's too expensive, just kind of randomly throwing out some numbers, you know, how much demolition would cost, but I haven't seen an actual engineering or architectural report saying if you're going to knock that building down and get that site back to site ready conditions, this is what it would cost. Here's the detailed cost estimate. So I'm kind of coming up with that. If there's going to be renovations to the inside of the building to a residential use or other use, what exactly would need to be done, what would that cost be? So the intent by kind of having this architectural study done is to really get real numbers in terms of evaluating what those options would be and actually have actual cost estimates done by a professional architect or engineer to tell us really how to evaluate those options and what's feasible and what's not. What can physically be done and then financially what it would take to get that done. Obviously the RDA owns the parking lot immediately adjacent to that as well. We've had that out for RFP in the past. So we're actually asking, at the same time, to maybe do some soil study work and other things on our lot, as well as the city owned, the RDA owns, at that same time. We figure, if we're going to have a consultant out onsite evaluating those things, we should do both the architectural and the soils work at the same time. We figure, worst case scenario, just gives us more information for when we send it out to RFP and when we can actually provide more accurate data to a prospective developer looking at the site. So we're still evaluating kind of what the future would be. The adopted plan says knock it down. The current owners have expressed some concerns over being able to do that and not being financially feasible. Of course, unless the city would come with a rather sizeable check, obviously, and make that happen, which we certainly would have to consider and if we are going to consider that we need real numbers to really take a look at that. So hopefully, does that answer your question, Commissioner Daniels?

- Yeah, it does. Thank you. I just know we've been talking about the need for additional housing in the area and I know, as a former downtown renter, renting downtown is very, very desirable, but the pricing downtown, relatively speaking, is probably not. So just thinking about, has any housing options been looked at, but thank you, you did answer my question.

- Yeah and specifically, Commissioner Daniels, we are, I think one of the uses being considered for, at least part of the second floor, would be residential use. So we are actually asking them to tell us what sort of window, if we added windows back in, if we needed to do pipe, run pipes, what would it need to take things to get things to code, to have multiple residential units in part of the building like that. So that is absolutely part of the architectural scope we're asking for in terms of those improvements.

- Well, I'm not sure if, correct me if I'm wrong, but when we did the plan for that area, that was before the Schreiber Building existed and so we wanted that building down and the grid returned back to a grid, but then Schreiber built and so now that part of the comprehensive plan kind of not as, I guess, viable, because we're not going to tear down that Schreiber Building.

- We hope not.

- No.
- That would be bad. Yeah. That's one we definitely want to see, we'd like to see hanged on to.
- Unless the city wants to come with a sizeable check-
- Oh that would be like building, I guess, it's probably as old as the mall. I mean, I worked there at the Boston Store in the early 90s, so.
- Yep, absolutely. And you know, it's an interesting prospect in terms of trying to redevelop, obviously. We're talking about big box stores, this is an example of, we're looking for a creative solution maybe to keep it going here. It'd certainly be much more easier and simpler to do if there was one owner, but there's not one owner, we know there's multiple owners. So there's certainly some challenges to figuring out, the best option, to redevelopment or what's going to happen there. But yes sir, I think, in order, before we really proceed on that, we kind of need to know what the actual, we need some real professional opinions on what can actually be done to the building and what's would those actual costs would be related to that for us to really make some evaluations on that. So we'd like to get that done here yet this fall.
- So reading further down, is that probably why the Adams Street lot RFP got pushed to October from September?
- That is one of the reasons. Yes, sir.
- Any other ? Well, thank you very much for your report, Neil. I'll enjoy reading it after the meeting is finished.
- Any other questions, please feel free to drop me an email. Happy to do it. So.
- Will do. All right. So it looks like the date of the next meeting is September 13th, 2021.
- Motion to adjourn.
- Second.
- Motion by Vice Chair Miller, second by Commissioner Bremer. All those in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Any opposed? All right, we are adjourned. Thanks everyone.