



MINUTES OF THE GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION

MONDAY, MARCH 7, 2022, 6:00 PM
Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

I. This item contains Zoom information, instructions, and a link to the Virtual Comment Form.

B. ROLL CALL.

I. Members: Lisa Hanson - Chair, Jacob Miller - Vice-Chair, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, and Ken Rovinski.

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

Others Present: Ald. Lynn Gerlach, Ald. Mark Steuer

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the Agenda for the March 7, 2022, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

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

Yes- Jacob Miller, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the February 21, 2022, Meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

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

Yes- Jacob Miller, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. (ZP 22-04) Consideration with possible action on request to amend ZO 13-21, a Planned Unit Development (PUD) along the 2300-2400 Blocks of E. Mason Street (East Town Mall), submitted by the Department of Community Development (Ald. L. Gerlach, District 3).

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

Yes- Jacob Miller, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ken Rovinski to close the floor, and return to regular business. Motion Passed.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Sidney Bremer to approve the request. There was no vote as additional discussion was had between staff and commissioners and the motion was amended.

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Sidney Bremer to amend the motion, as suggested by staff, to amend ZO 13-21, a Planned Unit Development (PUD) along the 2300-2400 Blocks of E. Mason Street (East Town Mall), subject to the draft Planned Unit Development (PUD) amendment. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

2. (ZP 22-03) Public Hearing on request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the reconstruction of an off-premise digital and static message billboard in a General Commercial (CI) district, 1902 N. Irwin Avenue, submitted by Renee St. Laurent, Lamar Advertising, on behalf of TLC Properties/LAMA., property owner (Ald. K. Lefebvre, District 6).

Vice-Chair Jake Miller read into record the rules and procedures for all public hearings. All public hearings have been properly posted.

Vice-Chair Jake Miller opened the floor for the Public Hearing on request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the reconstruction of an off-premise digital and static message billboard in a General Commercial (CI) district, 1902 N. Irwin Avenue, submitted by Renee St. Laurent, Lamar Advertising, on behalf of TLC Properties/LAMA, property owner (Ald. K. Lefebvre, District 6).

Vice-Chair Miller asked three (3) times if there was anyone present who wished to speak. Hearing/seeing no one, the public hearing was closed.

3. (ZP 22-03) Consideration with possible action on request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the reconstruction of an off-premise digital and static message billboard in a General Commercial (CI) district, 1902 N. Irwin Avenue, submitted by Renee St. Laurent, Lamar Advertising, on behalf of TLC Properties/LAMA., property owner (Ald. K. Lefebvre, District 6).

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the reconstruction of an off-premise digital and static message billboard in a General Commercial (CI) district, 1902 N. Irwin Avenue, approval of the request, subject to:

- a. A site plan and applicable permit applications are submitted to the Community and Economic Development Department (CEDD) for review and approval.

- b. The sign permit application shall not be valid unless approved by the Director of Public Works or his/her designee (Traffic Engineer).
- c. The Department of Public Works shall be provided with the means to turn off a digital billboard in the case of hazardous glare, interference with the visibility or effectiveness of a traffic signal or control, or other traffic hazard caused by the sign.
- d. The owner of the sign shall maintain up-to-date contact information with the Department of Public Works. The contact information is to provide 24 hours per day, 7 days per week access to a person or persons that is/are available at all times to respond to a hazardous sign situation.
- e. The proposed signage shall meet all of the requirements of Article III, Off-Premise Advertising, Green Bay Zoning Code.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

4. (ZP 22-05) Public Hearing on request to rezone 2260 Main Street from General Commercial (C1) to Highway Commercial (C2), submitted by John DeSilva, on behalf of Hilgenberg Properties, LLP, property owner (Ald. L. Gerlach, District 3).

Vice-Chair Jake Miller opened the Public Hearing on request to rezone 2260 Main Street from General Commercial (C1) to Highway Commercial (C2), submitted by John Da Silva, on behalf of Hilgenberg Properties, LLP, property owner (Ald. Lynn Gerlach, District 3).

Vice-Chair Jake Miller asked three (3) times if there was anyone present who wished to speak. Hearing/seeing no one, the Public Hearing was closed.

5. (ZP 22-05) Consideration with possible action on request to rezone 2260 Main Street from General Commercial (C1) to Highway Commercial (C2), submitted by John DeSilva, on behalf of Hilgenberg Properties, LLP, property owner (Ald. L. Gerlach, District 3).

Moved by Ken Rovinski to approve the request. Ken Rovinski then retracted his motion so the floor could be opened for discussion.

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to open the floor. Motion Passed. Yes- Jacob Miller, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to close the floor, and return to regular business. Motion Passed.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Sidney Bremer to approve the request to rezone 2260 Main Street from General Commercial (C1) to Highway Commercial (C2). Motion Passed.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

6. (ZP 22-06) Public Hearing on request to rezone 1840 Bond Street from Low-Density Residential (R1) to Public Institutional (PI), submitted by Jim Hinze, on behalf of Bay City Baptist Church (Ald. M. Steuer, District 10).

Vice-Chair Jake Miller opened the Public Hearing on request to rezone 1840 Bond Street from Low-Density Residential (R1) to Public Institutional (PI), submitted by Jim Hinze, on behalf of Bay City

Baptist Church (Ald. M. Steuer, District 10).

Vice-Chair Miller asked three (3) times if anyone wished to speak. Hearing/seeing no one. The public hearing was closed.

7. (ZP 22-06) Consideration with possible action on request to rezone 1840 Bond Street from Low-Density Residential (RI) to Public Institutional (PI), submitted by Jim Hinze, on behalf of Bay City Baptist Church (Ald. M. Steuer, District 10).

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to open the floor. Motion Passed. Yes- Jacob Miller, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Sidney Bremer to close the floor. Motion Passed. Yes- Jacob Miller, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Sidney Bremer to approve the request to rezone 1840 Bond Street from Low-Density Residential (RI) to Public Institutional (PI). Motion Passed. Yes- Jacob Miller, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

8. (AV 22-01) Consideration with possible action on request to vacate an alley between John Street and E. Mason Street, submitted by Grand Central LLP/Midwest Expansion, Dan Pamperin (Ald. B. Galvin, District 4).

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve the request to vacate an alley between John Street and E. Mason Street. Motion Passed. Yes- Jacob Miller, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

F. INFORMATIONAL.

I. Director's Report.

Neil Stechschulte presented the Director's report.

2. Date of the next meeting: March 21, 2022

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ken Rovinski to adjourn. Motion Passed. Yes- Jacob Miller, Sidney Bremer, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Ken Rovinski, No- None, Abstain- None.

VERBATIM

- Hello everybody, and welcome to the March 7th, 2022, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission. Thanks everybody for joining us tonight. We're gonna start off with a roll call. Chair, Lisa Hanson is excused tonight. Vice chair, Jacob Miller, present. Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax.

- Present.

- Commissioner Sid Bremer.
- Present.
- Commissioner Garius Daniels is also excused, and commissioner Ken Rovinski.
- Present.
- Great, thanks for everybody showing up tonight. Next on to approval the agenda for the March 7th, 2022 meeting of the Green Bay Planning Commission.
- I move.
- Second.
- So, moved by Ald. Corpus-Dax, second by Commissioner Bremer. All those in favor, please say aye.
- [Members] Aye.
- All those opposed, ayes have it. Onto the approval of the minutes from the February 21st, 2022 meeting of the Green Bay Planning Commission.
- Move to approve.
- Second.
- Motion by Ald. Corpus-Dax, second by Commissioner Rovinski. All those in favor, please say aye.
- [Members] Aye.
- All those opposed, and ayes have it. Okay, we are onto a regular business. Let's see, consideration as possible action on the request to amend ZO 13-21, a Planned Unit Development along the 2300-2400 blocks of East Mason Street, East Town Mall, submitted by Depart of Community Development, take us away.
- Sorry about that, thank you chair, one second here. Okay, on your screen, you can see here the map of the area we discussed aside last meeting, so we should be fairly familiar with the area. This is the East Town Mall Campus. Again, we are gonna be discussing PUD amendments of the zoning it's kind of inconsequential here, and future line you chose commercial uses for this area. At our last meeting, we had discussed some amendments to this PUD that'll allow 488 in-lot to be created and developed on without the full access easement, in which this was added, or proposed to be added to the PUD as Exhibit E, showing that this access easement would be recorded through the CSM which was done, or being done, I'm not sure, I think it's finished at this point. So, this was already discussed. Everyone was generally on board with that. At the 21st meeting, amendment was passed, requiring a contiguous cross-access easement to be created and recorded, trained the land division process for all in-lot parcels. So, that was something that was a commission and sent to City Council. It was heard at City Council on March 1st, and then referred back to Plan Commission, as staff wanted more time to vet the language. Usually, when we come to you guys with PUD amendments, we have the language already created, so you guys know exactly what you're voting on and what you're consuming. That amendment wasn't like a specific section of code, and it did impact more than one section of the code. So, we wanted to make sure that we were able to get our law department to take a look at it, to make sure that it wasn't conflicting with other sections of the code, making sure that it was a fairly cohesive document for what we were trying to attain based on the conversation we had in our last one. So, basically, it was being sent back here tonight to make sure that the language is okay for what you guys are proposing. And

then, also we're looking for some clarification on the access easement, how much of it you want. So, within the language that we're proposing tonight, it's all been agreed upon between city staff, our law department, and the developer. Aside from section two, which is here with Exhibit C, requiring that some sort of a cross-access easement be done. At the last Plan Commission... We should be this entire area. So, this is what is currently approved as Exhibit C, as part of the original PUD that was approved. We had discussed maybe minimizing this to have just the frontage here with the access points up to East Mason, possibly with an extension out to Main Street here, and kind of extend the ones that are Campus here. That wasn't part of any action or resolution. Staff is still proposing that we keep the entirety of this system, so that way we can avoid maybe repetitive or ongoing zoning actions, have a little bit more clarity on where in-lots would be proposed in the future, aside from the three that are proposed now. However, we are agreeable so long as there is some sort of cross-access easement that is recorded for the protection of, at minimum, this northern portion that exits out to East Mason Street. I still feel fairly strongly that the entirety of the semi-public road should be upheld, however, I know that there is going to be the ask. So, just so you are aware, we are agreeable to some changes, but a decision does need to be made here tonight by the planning commission on how we'd like to move forward with that. However, that won't impact the language, that will be changing. So, here's how we have it proposed in the attachment that was in your packet. It takes out that 12-month requirement, which you all had proposed at the last meeting. It addresses the exemption for the singular parcel that was already created. And then, it still requires an easement through Exhibit C that we would have to have protection as far as the city is concerned. So, it won't change the language that's here. The only thing that would change is what Exhibit C looks like if we do go through with the process of changing that easement area. So, I'm hoping that that makes sense. This was discussed pretty thoroughly between our law department, myself, and the property owner. So, we're hoping that this language meets what you guys had as... What you expected to see with the amendment that you had given at our last meeting. We think that this is fair, and allows for development to continue while still protecting the city's best interests, as far as access is concerned into the East Mason Campus. So, with that we're recommending approval of that language, and are looking for very specific on how Exhibit C should look as far as that access easement is concerned.

- Thank you for that rundown. Steph, in your estimation that's really what we're gonna be talking about today is Exhibit C, everything else is pretty agreed upon, there's no major issues there that we have to worry about.

- Well, it's agreed upon between internal staff, and, you know, we came to the agreement that that language does hit all the boxes that we've been looking for. We wanna make sure that that also meets the criteria, which that you all had proposed last time. Again, we wanna make sure we're just clarifying that language, that you guys had asked for that continuous cross-access created via CSM. This still addresses that one CSM that was already done., it still gives us an easement, but it's up to you guys if that language meets what you think is best for the East Town Campus. So, while we're just specifically looking for further clarification on Exhibit C, that language is definitely on the table as well, 'cause it is that amendment, but we just wanna make sure that we're proposing really exact language where we're making those amends, and get you back during the meeting also.

- Great, thank you. Commissioners, questions, discussion. Commissioner Bremer.

- Stephanie, can you put up the Exhibit C that you are recommending, and the smaller Exhibit C that you also indicated might be considered, so we can see the difference clearly.

- Sure, so this is the full already approved Exhibit C. What would be recommended, I have one already created, but I don't have it pulled open, if you wanna give me a minute, I can pull it open, but it basically just shows the Northern line, the East-West connection, and the three spokes out to East Mason Street. There is the addition of adding this portion out to Main Street, if you feel that that entrance should also have that sort of protection on it. Realistically, this whole thing is amendable. So, it's really up to you all, what you think is the most reasonable solution here.

- Thank you.

- Any other discussion, questions? Commissioner Rovinski, go ahead.
- So, the way it reads right now, no other development can happen until all of that access agreement is granted and recorded.
- Yes.
- Okay.
- But all that access is as defined in Exhibit C.
- Yes.
- We might want to change from what you have just shown us.
- Exactly, that entire easement area is dependent solely on what Exhibit C looks like. So, whatever access you think is most necessary to protect the city, and make these developments occur is how that's gonna be reflected.
- What gets lost, if we delete Exhibit C below the straight east-west line.
- Right now, here, let me show up that map again, I think that might help me clarify a little bit further. Actually, Garritt sent me... Yes, I can see you pointing. Let me pull that up real quick. I've gotta reconnect one second please. There's exhibit that shows all of the in-lot development that's already been proposed, and that I think will be the most beneficial way to look at this, 'cause then you can see the in-lots that already exist. There, okay. I told Dave before this meeting started that I was so scatterbrained and I was gonna miss something, and then I did, here we go. So, these are the current in-lots that have been approved, not through the city, but through the body of the East Town ownership, whatever that is called. For one here, is the one that was already approved and the exceptions have been made through our PUD amendment. Two and three are the ones that have already been approved through their body saying, "These are the ones we're okay with." So, what we lose by taking out this portion of that ring road would be the potential, when they go, "Team lots of really successful, we want to expand this, and then down this way, we wanna move some here. We'll have to amend our PUD again." There might be, you know, additional zoning action that's the entire road system is already in place and that whole easement exists, they could just keep dividing, so we won't have to get involved at all. The in-lots would already be allowed, the easement would already be in place. It would just be a private agreement on how many more in-lots they can create. So, you know, having this at least protects the in-lots we know will be created, and it protects the access to East Mason that already exists, that feels public, but isn't public. However, if these are removed, then if they want to add any in-lots of these portions of the roadway, or any further this direction, would it be able to do that without coming back and amending that document and our exhibits.
- So, if we were to have to come back an amendment, we're talking time for a developer to have to go through the process of amending the beauty, is that correct?
- [Stephanie] Yes.
- So, if the developer... That section in yellow, right there, if that can't be achieved, then none of the other development can happen.
- Can you ask that again, I don't think I understand what you're saying.

- Yeah, so the portion that's highlighted in yellow there, that's really the one that, when we talked last, was like the real height, maybe a year, or two, a year and a half out to even potentially get access to that. So, if the developer cannot get access to that, or get that easement and record, then none of the other development would ever be able to happen, is that what I'm understanding.

- in-lot development.

- Correct?

- That would do that.

- Yes, so, we right now have the language that it would be further in-lot development is tied to making sure that that access easement is there. But however, if they're going to this development, they'd have to talk to Kohl's anyway, you know. These conversations would have to occur to get this CSM created, and then Kohl's would have invested interest in this here.

- So, are all three of these in-lots that are proposed from the current applicant.

- That you'd have to ask him. I know these have been agreed upon by the ownership group, but I don't know where that comes from, or who has to propose those CSMs, I'm not sure how that ownership breaks down. These are just the ones that have already been approved internally by that group.

- So, as I was reading through this today, and thinking about it, I'm feeling more comfortable if what we're requiring is land that the current applicant owns, which-

- He is not the applicant, the city is the applicant on this application.

- I'm sorry, the developer then. So, the two sections of the access road there that are in blue are owned by the developer that is bringing this forward, right?

- Yes, but he does not have ownership over the entire East Town Campus, and that is what the PUD covers. Also our city attorney Lindsay Mather is here. I'm not sure if she wants to step in, and cover some of this from the city's perspective.

- I certainly can, if you guys would like me to?

- Jesse, procedurally, Attorney Mather can speak without us opening to floor, is that right?

- Yes.

- Okay, good, all right, yes.

- Thank you chair. So, as I understand it, and of course, Mr. Bader can correct me if I am incorrect, but the proposed in-lot on the Kohl's lot, and the one that's already been created by the CSM have already been agreed to by all of the property owners that third in-lot is, and again, I don't wanna speak for him, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but they're working on an agreement currently. So, in order to create that third lot, they already have to get Kohl's agreement, and input, and working together, and all of that goodness. So, whether the next in-lot that's created is number two on the Kohl's parcel, or number three on the Hobby Lobby parcel, either way Kohl's will have to be involved in reaching some sort of agreement among all of the property owners. And therefore, at the same time should be amendable to getting the whole easement accomplished, because it's to their benefit as well, should they ever wanna develop that in-lot on their property.

- Did you just reverse the two and the three?
- I'm sorry, I don't have the exhibit up in front of me,
- Okay.
- I apologize.
- The three is the one to the west, right, Stephanie?
- Kohl's one is three.
- That's the one in front of Kohl's--
- Two is the other one.
- and two is the one in front of Hobby Lobby.
- Thank you, I appreciate the correction.
- No problem, we've been looking at this a lot longer than, yeah.
- That's true.
- I'm not sure, can you say anything more, Ms. Mather about the reason the city wants to maximize this full semi-public roads?
- Sure, so any parcel that exists within the city of Green Bay, the city has to provide right away access. So, if we create in-lots, and the city does not have a way to access those in-lots, the city is responsible for creating roads, and whatever other wonderful planning steps go along with that. You guys are the experts on that, not I. So, by ensuring that we have an access easement through these, I'm sorry, ensuring that we have access through the easement on these semiprivate roads will satisfy the city's duty to provide that access. I do understand that there is... These easements do exist among the property owners. However, the city is not a party to any of those easements, and therefore, should the property owners decide to dissolve that easement for any reason, the city's interest would not be protected, and any in-lots that exist, we would have to then create roads to access them.
- Thank you.
- Does that help, okay.
- That does help, thank you. I know we discussed that at the last meeting, but I'd lost track of that piece, thank you.
- And I apologize for not being able to make the last meeting.
- Yeah, so again, I think I'd just like to reiterate that the existing Exhibit C gives us the easiest protection. It gives us the easiest, because we don't have to come back and amend anything. However, we are very much agreeable to what, I think that Garritt is proposing just that northern strip, because as they both, Attorney Mather and Garritt have said, they're gonna have to get that agreement either way. So, I think, that's the most, it's a good option. I would prefer all of the protection, but I can understand that that everything's gonna go that way. If we need to come back and amend a PUD, that's why we have PUD amendments. So, if that's the route that we need to take. However, I definitely believe that that full northern stretch needs to be protected

as this is gonna be hot development. And we also don't wanna have to wait for Plan Commission to go through and extend each of these. 'Cause those can take some time, and that does slow down development. So, I think having that existing Northern section, east to west that leads out to East Mason, is probably the safest solution at this point for all parties.

- I guess, I'm fine doing that Northern section, 'cause I thought that's what we had planned on, based on the last meeting we weren't gonna do the entirety of the property, we were just gonna do what was needed, knowing that that's kind of how we do it anyway. Like normally, that's how we do it, is we just do like what is necessary and not the entirety.

- That was discussed last time, but never forwarded on, it was a part of the amendment. It was just the piecemeal as we go, but it didn't say which sections to put together. And, isn't really like, how we always do it, because we don't have in-lots anywhere else, this is our first try at this. So, easements are different when they're not protecting public access. If there's just cross-access between two property owners, the city doesn't have to get involved at all. So, we don't really have the Guinea pig. If this is the Guinea pig, we don't have something to look back on and say, "This is how we did it last time, and it worked well." So, yeah, again, this was discussed quite thoroughly last time, we just didn't get much of a resolution on where you guys wanted to take it. There was the whole access you wanted to keep or easement.

- I'd like to, if I could make a motion to open the floor, to hear from Mr. Bader to see if he's agreeable to this.

- I second that motion.

- A motion from Commissioner Rovinski to open the floor, seconded by Commissioner Bremer. All those in favor, please say aye.

- [Members] Aye.

- Floor is open, Garritt will shoot to you.

- There we go, happy Monday again, everybody. Garritt Bader, 300 North Van Buren Street. I know you love seeing this in your agenda again. So, hopefully this is the last time we need to review it. Stephanie would you mind bringing up the Elon image we just looked at again, I'll refer to that. There we go, so, as was mentioned a couple times, we'll just reiterate here. Everything's shown in light blue are current sections that I can give the easements to, because I own those properties. That's the former mall itself, Hobby Lobby, and Petco, delineated there. Those sections would afford what I call in-lot number one and number two to have the public access as is being requested by the city. In-lot number three in red on the Kohl's parcel, is something that Kohl's can decide to do, or not do at any time. At that time assumingly then, they would be most incentivized to grant the yellow section of the easement along their property, to be able to service that in-lot. When they will do that, I don't know. As Lindsay had mentioned, I currently have a fourth amendment to what's called the Coria, the governing document among the East Town parent parcels, if you will. To add that, what I call in-lot number two. The previous third amendment we did allowed for in-lots one and three. I'm now requesting that Kohl's also allow number two. To Lindsay's point, you heard the fact that we can't get number two until Kohl's agrees to it. Assuming at that time can get Kohl's to agree to the easement, that's yet to be seen, as I promised I would do with both Lindsay and staff, I will update the request two Kohl's to reflect the addition of the easement addition in that documentation. Really, that time then it's simply a waiting game. And as much like I mentioned last time I want to, just on the couple of today is that there's no timeframe on their response because they're not incentivized to immediately respond, so I'm glad we've taken the time constraint out. Regarding the limits of the easement, what I would propose, essentially is what you see here, yellow plus blue. If the city would really like to keep going east of the blue and let your mind's eye drag that blue line east past what I call the Shopko driveway onto the backside of where noodles and smart cow are, that pH Green Bay east parcel you see there. That's possible, but again it brings in another party that has no current ties to the in-lot agreements that are in place. And that's really the biggest thing I think, to bring up in

any discussion about where an easement is ultimately accepted, because if you are the Shopko owner, if you are the Cub foods owner, that I still call that parcel, they're not to the east home parent parcels have made regarding in-lot development. So, for them there's hypothetically no reason to grant such an easement. It's not the say if they automatically wouldn't, but we always have to think about what are they gonna want of me if I ask them for that, or the city in order to do that. And if the need for the approved in-lots as is afforded by the east home parent parcels is met them by what you see on your screen right now, I would respectfully ask that we not demand that entire circulate easement that's on the Northern part of the ring road that you see here. Whether or not one wants to push to add the Shopko parcel, by the way, we can debate that. So I'm happy to answer any questions that anybody has on all this, I know it's confusing. Hopefully, this graphic makes it a lot simpler than anything else that we may have looked at so far.

- Commissioners, do we have questions? Oops, sorry, Sid, go ahead.

- Since, Stephanie has mentioned it, several points that the advantage of having the whole thing done now is that you would not need to come back and ask us for a permission for each additional chunk. I want to ask do you see any problem with needing to come back to ask permission for each additional chunk?

- I don't, Sid, because I think we need to look at what is the probability of certain other areas being subdivided and it's very low. If you look on that Southern flank of the mall property, the backside of Kohl's, the former mall, the backside of Shopko, there's nothing really back there that could be subdivided, which a public easement would be warranted to address. So, whereas back in the day, I think, if the city could redo time, they would've requested this for both the green space between Petco and Shopko, as well as ALDI, how those were subdivided without direct public access, but even this would not catch the green space property, and nothing more is likely ever to be subdivided. So, if and when more front in-lots were ever allowed, the easement along the Northern ring road would catch that, and that would in essence guarantee that it's a one-stop-shop right now for that.

- And, Garritt, am I hearing you correct? Parcel 21-126-11, the Shopko site, have you had negotiations with them, of getting that access there, or is that gonna hold things up as well?

- That never came up before. They have been reasonable people with whom to discuss many things. As I've told them a number of times, I would entertain and offer to purchase that property, but their pricing, respectfully, is not quite where it needs to be yet. They did grant me an access or an easement to be able to do the Chipotle and the cousins developments that are still open between Panera and Applebee. So, they have been reasonable. In this regard though, this is something I have not asked yet. So, they'd have to be approached, we'd have to see how they respond.

- I'm on mute, sorry, commissioners, any other questions? I can't see, there we go, not seeing other hands. Since we are open too, if anyone else from the public would like to come forward to speak on this, now it'd be time.

- Motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- Motion by Ald. Corpus-Dax, and a second by Commissioner Rovinski to close the floor. All those in favor, please say, aye.

- [Members] Aye.

- Those opposed, and we are back to regular order. Any discussion here, do we feel comfortable kind of, with what's on the table. Do we wanna go over the different options.

- What's officially on the table?

- I think we would have,

- Everything.

- We would have what staff has recommended, Exhibit C, which include the full ring, essentially. And I think, pretty much what our alternative would be is just focus on that Northern stretch. As I think, both , 'cause it would cover everything we're looking for at the moment, by just limiting that. I don't know, do we still wanna worry about the access to Maine, or the frontage on Maine.

- So, when we say the Northern part, are we talking about those three separate... We just talking about yellow and blue.

- Yeah, thanks Veronica, I was just gonna ask that as well.

- I think that's up to us, is really the question, is up to us to decide exactly how far we wanna take that. I think, it seems to be a given, the two driveways; the center and then the Western driveway are a given. I think that one in front of the old Shopko building is the one that would probably be potentially removed, or is that point for debate, I guess. I guess, does anybody intent on keeping the full ring, or have desire to try to keep that besides staff?

- I would say no on that.

- I would agree.

- I agree.

- I'm inclined to just include the blue portion. And then, should Kohl's want that in-lot on their property, then they could come back and amend. I see that Dave's waving at us right now, too.

- Dave, what's your .

- Well, I just wanted to add one comment, because the conversation is broken down to access and legality of access, and that's well and good, 'cause that's what you need to discuss. But when this was first originally discussed, and actually this is common for lots of mall redevelopments all over the country. The question you have to ask yourself is, how many of those in-lot parcels do you need to have? Because if you provide access to one, is one building in the middle of a parking lot your desired result. So, if that's the case, you only need access to that one spot. If the goal is to create a development center that has multiple spots along this ring road, then you have to have that longer easement area. So, it's not the fact that, "I don't have control of that parcel." Well, if you don't, maybe none of it should happen. That is the over all larger question, is one or two individual building sites in the middle of a giant sea of parking appropriate planning. There's issues that come along with that: circulation, garbage collection, all of that kinda stuff. So, the goal with the initial discussions on a strip ring road commercial was that that would act like a road. So, you would have multiple, you know, three or four, five over time. Now, obviously Garritt doesn't control it, if the other owners aren't interested, but that ownership will change over time. So, don't think about what's happening now, think about 20 years from now, 30 years from now, is it still okay to have one or two buildings in the middle of this small parking lot, or is it more appropriate to allow future purchasers, which it also would increase their value, to be able to add more of those parcels. And I just wanted to point that out, 'cause when you talk about redevelopment of these giant's parking lots, there is opportunity to be put one or two kiosks in there or whatever. And the traditional way of doing that is to condo them. You don't need individual lots, you can make 'em a condo, and everybody has access, because the parent parcel is a parcel. So, this is really a unique situation to sell off in-lots without roads, and it's how many you is a minimum necessary. So, again, as a Plan Commission, if that's one, then you

only need access to that one piece, if it's five, you need access to those five pieces. That's kinda the conversation. And I think the roads that went around, maybe not the one in the back, but the roads that go north-south and east-west, that's if future in-lots are ever developed along those corridors, those drive aisles, easements are gonna have to be in place for those. But if you shrink it down to be very narrow, you may never get them. So, it's sort of, you know, you're setting up the rules to say, "This is something that's permitted all over in here." Or you're setting a rule saying, "Well, this guy wants to do it, we'll just do it to the one piece." So, I'm not making a judgment, but that's sort of the overreaching thought process on it. So, don't forget that when you're considering this, it's not just access it's land development, and the fabric of what that area is gonna look like and function as. So, that's all I wanted to say.

- Thank you, Sid, go ahead.

- However, one could also argue that having that one in place is more likely to make clear to other people who might want to do number two or number three, what that could look like.

- That's true.

- I think it could go either way on that.

- Yep, I just wanted to point it out, I wasn't making a-

- Yes, I appreciate that.

- a kinda overall comment

- Apparently, this is a notion of how you get to the eventual development, by having a model home in effect in one of the in-lots, or by having the easement to make the driveway easy. And I see, we have our lawyers hand up.

- So, Attorney Mather, go ahead.

- Thank you, you just reminded me... Thank you, Commissioner Bremer, and thank you Chair. You just reminded me that there was something that I forgot to mention, which is very important to this discussion, which is that, the way that this is drafted, nothing about whatever you guys do will stop the development on the current in-lot that's been constructed. We've worked with Mr. Bader to make sure that he has the necessary permits so that the contractors can continue with the ongoing construction. And so, what we're really talking about is beyond this first in-lot that's already been created. Obviously, your point stands, I forgot to say that, and so, I wanted to make sure I made that clear.

- Right, thank you. Commissioner's how we feeling here based on all that.

- I guess the way I'm looking at it, I see room for probably four other developments, if we allowed just the blue sections. To Dave's point, I see what he's saying about really spurring some development by requiring it for all of it, but if a portion of that can't get done, then no other development can happen without that access. So, by allowing just the blue section, and sorry, I'm looking to my other screen here, I'm not trying to avoid eye contact with you guys. I'm looking at room for like four other developments, the size of the one that is already being allowed, and going to go in. So, I'm still inclined just to require the blue sections.

- Is that your motion?

- No, I'm sorry, Ald. Gerlach.

- Question please. One question that is probably a rhetorical question; I don't know whose vision of the final development, the long term development of this property is supposed to be driving this. I'm not pretending that I know, I just don't know. But, a more practical question, what is the downside of doing, you know, creating all of these easements and this ring road all the way around as I think staff is recommending, what is the downside of doing that?

- Time, mostly for a lot of owners at this Campus, and it would take time to create an easement. Other than that, it just allows public access and protection.

- Lynn, is that what you are recommending, to take the time and accept the difficulty, and do it that way, or am I a misunderstanding?

- Yes, that is my proposal. It was already approved in November of last year with the full ring road access. Removing that very south side along the back would absolutely be fine by staff, if we're looking to only provide access to in-lots with that access easement. But yes, I think that it is worth time to do a full dedication at this point.

- And so time is the biggest factor that's, okay, thank you.

- Well, I think it's both time and as I recall, pragmatics, whether or not Kohl's will ever come forward and say, "Okay, I'll grant you the easement." There's a possibility that that could just be permanently blocked. And if we require that easement it to go forward, then we're permanently blocked as well.

- So, to go with that too, and kind of to Dave's point, and this might not be a popular question, but then, why wouldn't we look at making all of that just public road instead of easements, if we're really looking at redeveloping here.

- Do I go ahead and-

- You're going to-

- Oh, I'm sorry.

- Oh, it's okay. I was gonna say you're going to summon the wrath of Steve Grenier really quickly, if you'd asked that question.

- There is a provision within the PUD that already exists on the minimum width, in the maximum width of these easements, in case we ever did wanna pick them up as roadway. So, if this were to be super popular, and all of a sudden we feel like we need roads throughout this development, the easements would be recorded at a standard at that point. So, that is something that we think about for easements, especially if they're cross-access easements on a parcel like this, to make sure that we do wanna ever pick them up as roadway. However, I do believe that Lindsay is correct, that Steven might pop on right now and yell at you for that. It's a fair one though, but yes.

- It's an honest question, yeah.

- Money is

- It's essentially your preserving support.

- saying we would have to take care of it, right?

- Exactly.

- Yes.

- It goes to all the Gerlach's point here is if the vision of all of this, then is that something we should look at, or just allow the development that's already kind of in play with the blue sections.

- I think that's a great point, Ken, that we're lacking a, you know, what we're used to a lot of times when we're doing these things, which is a master plan of some sort. So, we're kinda trying to figure it out without that guidance that's there. And it's also just a very complex, difficult situation due to how many different owners, certain people are involved. So, it's gonna be very difficult, I think, to find an exact perfect option that works for everybody, or doesn't involve a lot more work as well. So, I don't mind, I'm on the side of, what can we do to try to get this as right as possible within the current... What's in front of us, not get too hung up on what's gonna happen 20 years from now, because, face it, 20 years ago, a retail environment looked very different than it does now, and it probably will at 20 years from now as well too. So, I don't wanna get too hung up on trying to think that far out, 'cause this is probably gonna be a very dynamic development. And I think, we need to be able to give some ability to let it be dynamic, and let it evolve, because we just don't have any idea what this is gonna look like. So, that's my only concern, I don't wanna just cage ourselves so tightly that, you know, we've seen more movement on these properties in the past two years than we had in the prior 10, at least if not more. I mean, I think we gotta be a little flexible, and I don't mind coming back and discussing this again in a year or two, if we have to do that. That's just my opinion though.

- Yeah, I think, I'm kinda beating around the bush here and I'm gonna make a motion to approve for just the blue sections, to require just the blue sections to have access agreements.

- Let's get that motion noted. Director Stechschulte, I did see your hand up, so, I do wanna make sure we get to you as well too. But Steph, would you be able to bring up that, or Dave who's ever running the PowerPoint with that image, just so we can make sure we have our motion noted here.

- And since the motion needs a second, I would second the motion.

- Okay, and just to clarify, Ken you're talking just the light blue coming off of that middle entrance.

- Correct, it would be access agreements to parcels 21-126, 21-126-7 and 21-126-17, and then the newly created 21-126-7-2, which I think is already part of the CSM.

- I appreciate your details. Okay, so, motion by Commissioner Rovinski, seconded by Commissioner Bremer. Do you wanna go to the director since he did have his hand up before the motion.

- I'd like to hear from him.

- Yeah.

- Good evening everybody, just wanted to throw in. I appreciate staff's work on this in terms of providing a nice thorough connection across the whole entire easement on that point. You know, I do think that by just doing the blue section, you know, I think the reason we're having this discussion in the manner we are having it for this particular parcel, is because it didn't get taken to care of at land division. Really everything else going forward on this site and other sites we'll be requiring that as part of our land division process. So, before it even gets to this point, we're gonna be able to say, "Hey guys, we're not accepting land division, unless it's giving us that easement connecting back to wherever it needs to be." And I think, the previous language that I think, Stephanie had presented in terms of making sure that it's contiguous back to another access point that allows the access that we're looking for. That will be addressed at any, not only on this site, but for really any large format site, or where there's an in-lot development gonna be looked at in the future. The proper spot, I think where we would prefer to take care of this is really at that land division point, so we know that

connection is right in there, right away when we know we get to CSM, and before it even comes... We were in a hurry to help with this one, so the PUD kinda moved out ahead a little bit on some things, and then, I think, the land division came in behind it a little. So, I think things got a little out of order just in terms of trying to keep things moving. So, that's why we're having that conversation, you guys are right now, and it's why it's a little tough, because it doesn't make make sense. Normally, it will be happening at the land division. If so, I think this conversation will be avoided in the future because that'll be simply a requirement as any future land division off these parcels, or in the future. So, I do believe that that Commissioner Rovinski's motion is probably gonna solve the problem, the immediate problem, and I think in any future concerns, you know, we certainly would require that at a future land division at that point.

- I just wanna clarify something here too. So, if you are making this amendment to exhibits for the blue portions, that's definitely doable, but then there's no language proposed in the PUD, requiring that a cross-access easement be extended, as new in-lots are created, that language is not in the PUD right now. I can pull up that language if you'd like to review that as well, 'cause that would not be a part of it currently. 'Cause if Exhibit C is all we're using for the easement area, it would only show that blue portion then, and nothing else would be required to have that. So, would you like the language again, in case you want to adjust.

- Please, I think we were presuming that that would be there.

- You to get to the solution that you're looking for, we would have Exhibit C be edited to the blue, and then add language here in section C, stating that all additional in-lot CSMs would be required to have a cross-access easement, that the city is a party to find an interest in that language.

- Yes.

- I agree, and I would add that to the motion non-staff, thank you.

- And I'll second that as well.

- I just wanna make sure we all understand what's gonna happen the next CSM that comes in.

- Yes.

- Yes, thank you so much for calling our attention to this.

- Okay, good, thank you for that clarification as well. So, we do have a motion in a second on the floor. We'll take a quick look here, see if you have any other discussion, otherwise I think we're ready to take a vote. No hands, all right. So, motion by Commissioner Rovinski, seconded by Commissioner Bremer. All those in favor, please say aye.

- [Members] Aye.

- Those opposed, and motion carries.

- With again, thanks to the staff for their patience, and working through all of these options with us.

- Thank you all to all of you for that. So I assume the patient's part.

- Guess what guys, we got a public hearing on our hands. And this we are moving on just to make sure we're following here, is this agenda item number two. 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 asset after your name has been called you state your address, whether you represent a group or association, whether you favor oppose or

only providing information on this matter, as well as your comments and concerns. We also ask that you combine your testimony to the facts related 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. To speak during this public hearing; you may unmute yourself at the bottom of the screen, use the raise hand function on Zoom, physically raise your hand, or if you're calling in it is star six to unmute yourself. You will now open the public hearing on agenda item two, which authorize a Conditional Use Permit for the digital and static message billboard in commercial district located 1902 North Irwin Avenue, submitted by Renee St. Laurent, Lamar Advertising on behalf of TLC properties, LAMA property owner, that was a mouth fault. Paul, give us a quicker run down here.

- Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is a request for Conditional Use Permit for off-premise advertising sign, that has a multiple message for digital panel on one side. 1902 North Irwin is highlighted and read on the map here. North ruin runs north and south heading towards bay beach. Parcel I also adjoins I43 here. The wildlife sanctuary is just to the north as well. If you see up here because there is not only a static message, but there is a multiple message signed here that has certain requirements that have to be met under the Conditional Use Permit.

- Great, thank you, Paul. We will move on to the public hearing portion of this. So, if you are at the meeting on this particular item, we're gonna start with those who are in favor. Again, raise your hand in Zoom. Physically, star six to unmute yourself. Looks like we have, Renee, right? Please state your name, your address, and your comments. You are on mute.

- Renee St Laurent of 1800 Scheuring Road, De Pere, work with Lamar advertising, also TLC properties. The sign is existing right now. We would have to reconstruct it in order to hold the digital face, but it would be in the same position, the same location, same size. The only difference is one side would be digital. The other side would be as it is now. I just wanted to kinda clarify what was going on there, and if anybody has any questions, please let me know.

- Great, thank you for your comments.

- [Renee] Thank you.

- Anyone else in the audience. Again, look for those who are in favor to start. Not seeing any, we'll move on to any that are opposed. And finally, anyone looking to just provide information only. Not seeing anyone. Anyone wishing to speak on this matter? Is anyone wishing to speak? Oh, I'm sorry, Mark.

- For clarification, sure. Are you supposed to ask three times on a public hearing?

- Yep, working my way through it.

- Okay, sounds good, thank you.

- Yes, is anyone else wishing to speak? Is anyone wishing to speak? And is anyone wishing to speak on this matter, all right. Hearing none, let the record reflect that no one has come forward, and this public hearing is now closed. Moving forward on the agenda, to agenda item number three, this is a consideration with possible action on a request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit for the reconstruction of an off-premises, digital and static message billboard in General Commercial district, located 1902 North Irwin avenue, submitted by Renee St. Lauren, Lamar advertising on behalf of TLC properties, LAMA property owner. Paul onto you?

- Thank you, again, Mr. Chair. The property, yes, highlighted in red here, this is a vacant lot as the applicant stated, there is an existing billboard sign on the property, both east and west facing with a static message. To the east is a vacant piece of property kinda bleeds into the right of way for I43. Southeast is kind of a light industrial type use. Parking lots at the Southwest and there's restaurant across North Irwin just to the west.

From a comprehensive brand perspective, this is a commercial district in the current zoning against complaint with the comprehensive plan recommendation. The current property is Air and General Commercial. There is again, some light industrial zoning to the Southeast and to the west. Within the C1 district billboards are permitted again in this case with the multiple message sign, the CUP is required. This is kinda a Street view of the existing billboard. As you can see, we're kinda looking east or Northeast at the intersection of Radison and North Irwin, with the off-premise advertising with the billboard, there are certain standards that are specified in our zoning code, actually in our sign code, chapter 30, I should say. Those are detailed in my staff report. There's also conditions that are included. You know, the seven standards that we use for condition, we use permits, our staff believes that all those conditions are being met as part of this application. In the case of the Markle message sign, there is a mitigation plan that's required. And what the applicants done is they've removed two existing billboards, they've been raised further down on north Irwin, near Eastman avenue. They get credit for those billboards that remove, I think, basically, six points, they needed five. That enables them to provide this west facing facade with a digital message panel. The east side remains static. We did notify effective property owners, it might took one call in this case, informational call, just about what was behind the request. Staff is recommending approval of the item. We do have a few conditions here, I can go through real quickly. The first one is a site plan and a permit application. We have received the application, but we'll have to complete that once the CEP moves forward. Item B, the sign permit application shall not be valid unless approved by the director of public works, or typically the traffic engineer needs to review that. C, also involves public works, the means to turn off the digital billboard, in case of a hazardous situation. Again, with public works with item D, that public works maintains contact with the operator. And finally, item E, would be that all signs meet those requirements kind of really specified in the report, all the standards for off-premise advertising and the multiple message sign.

- Thank you, Paul, commissioners, any questions?

- So, for clarification, if I could Paul, on the map that, well, no, on the Street sign, Street view you showed us, you were showing us the current Lamar billboard, correct?

- Correct.

- Where the side that was facing toward us is the side that is facing west. And it would be the digital side, reconstructed digital.

- That is correct.

- And the side that we couldn't see would remain as it is a static board, right?

- That is correct, yes.

- Okay, and it is west facing and east facing, later on, you refer to north and south, and I got a little bit confused.

- Sorry.

- West facing is the digital side, that faces basically, the exit off of the Frigo bridge, heading to the east.

- Eastbound traffic would see that, yes.

- Yeah, okay, thank you.

- Any other questions, comments for Paul.

- I'd make a motion to .

- Motion on the floor from Commissioner Rovinski, and a second by Ald. Corpus-Dax. Any other discussion questions before move onto a vote? Nope, all right, all those in favor, please say aye.

- [Members] Aye.

- Aye, and those opposed, and motion carries. Let's see, so, that one does move on, I assume, right, to the next City Council, that'd be April, not April. I'm sorry, gosh, my head's... Not next week, the week after, right?

- I think it's March 15th is the next Council.

- Okay.

- Yeah.

- Thank you. Okay, moving on agenda item number five; consideration on a request to rezone-

- I think you have to do the public hearing first.

- Did I skip one, I did, I'm sorry, thank you Sid.

- Sure, sure.

- I'm sorry, you're right. At agenda item number four; public hearing on a request to rezone 2260 Main Street from General Commercial to Highway Commercial, submitted by John DeSilva on behalf of Hilgenberg property's LLP property owner. Again, this is another public hearing, if you do wish to speak with your address, whether you represent a group or association, whether you favor, oppose, or only providing information, as well as your comments or concerns. So, we will open up to public hearing on this item. Again, if you are on the phone, it is star six to unmute, otherwise raise your hand and we'll call on you.

- And first of all, Stephanie.

- Yes we'd like such.

- I'm sorry, yeah, go ahead. I'm sorry.

- That's okay.

- Today is crazy. Thank you, so, this slide is 2260 Main Street, it's on the city's east side. This is Main Street here, ENS road that wraps you out here, and the east side Walmart is just off the screen to the south to feel while your eyes through the site. Most of this entire block is on C1, including this parcel here, which is turning 260 Main Street. They're requesting a rezone to C2 to allow for auto sales.

- Thank you very much, Stephanie, I apologize my poor order on that, so, okay. We will move on to the public hearing aspect of this. So, those who are in attendance today, we'll start with those who want to speak in favor of this item to come forward. Looks like John DeSilva got your hand up? Yeah go ahead.

- [John] That is correct. Again, I'm just a young business man just tryna go ahead and start a new business. I understand that this location used to prior be a enterprise location for rental cars. So, it'd be a similar setup, I do have some photos of what I would like to have a as an illustration of what the cars may look on the lot. If you guys wanna take the credit out.

- John, quick, just before you go too far, give us your address, and if you are representing any-

- [John] I apologize, my address is 3187 High Country Courts, Suamico, Wisconsin, and I am representing myself.

- Perfect, I think, we'll have another opportunity here to maybe call you if we do want some additional detail or photos, for now, I would just contain you to any comments or anything that you'd wanna say right now.

- [John] That that would be it, yeah, thank you.

- Looking for anyone else that is wishing to speak in favor. Any opposed that would wish to speak. And information only. Ald. Gerlach.

- I have a question about procedure here. It just occurred to me that I have a constituent who called me, who is unable to access the meeting. She has neither a computer nor a smartphone. And she asked me to speak for her. And I don't know if this time to speak is when the floor is open or later on to speak as her alder.

- I think you could, since you are the alder, I believe you'd be able to comment on her behalf, well, either now, I think, or in our regular order.

- What do you prefer?

- You're already on the podium, so, why not now?

- Okay, this is Janice Vanboxel at 1116 Guns Street, and she is not necessarily speaking for or against it, but has some questions and concerns. She has lived at this property for 60 years, and she tells me that on the property, in question, there is a structure that was her in-law's home that they actually lived in. Her concern is that the trees will be cut down, and that the grass is going to be removed, and turned pavement, and she is worried about it for aesthetic reasons. So, I just wanna pass that on to you.

- Thank you for sharing those comments alder, very much appreciate it. So, before we wrap us up looking for any other comments on this particular. Again, this is the request for re-zone 226 Main Street from General Commercial to Highway Commercial, which will be taking the item up next. Anyone looking to speak on this item? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? See, noting with the record reflect that no one has come forward, and that public hearing is now closed. We'll now move on to agenda item number five, which is consideration with possible action on a request to rezone 2260 Main Street from General Commercial to Highway Commercial submitted by John DeSilva on behalf of Hilgenberg properties, LLP property owner.

- Great, thank you, vice chair. Again, this is a subject property here, as you can see, it does have quite a bit of Street frontage. It's got Main Street here, then Guns Road on its north side, and then further on the west side of the property. So, a lot of street frontage here. The zoning surrounding it is generally C1. There is some C2 as you get to the other side of Main Street and some R3, the restaurants to this back neighborhood here, but generally speaking, the entire area is C1. So as far as future land use is concerned, almost all of it is for some sort of a commercial use. There's some housing that's called Fort back here, some industrials, some residencials, it's kinda of a splattering of an area. It realistically could use a pretty thorough neighborhood plan, or a comprehensive plan update, 'cause this is a lot of conflicting information on a very small area of town. So, I just try to keep that in mind when I'm making recommendations here. This is most recent Street view that we have. As noted, this is a car rental place. Cars are vacated, car rental place, I'm not sure. There is quite a bit of right of way surrounding here, which is what you see in the green space. And then, there is an existing building and parking lot. As noted in my initial update, this is being requested, so the applicant can use it for auto sales, instead of auto rental that is not allowed within the C1 district, it is permitted within the C2 district. So, I think that I'm gonna stick with the map here to kinda show and give some perspective. So, as we were saying, a lot of this is zone C1, but the land uses are quite varied. There's multifamily, single family, some commercially

zoned single family here, there's a bar directly to the south. This is farmland here, and on the east side, Walmart. This is land that's in near Bellevue that's gonna be potentially developed in the next year or two. The East Town Campus is further off screen here. And then, there's quite a substantial rental neighborhood in this corner here. So, a lot of different things happening in this very small area. However, I just wanna concentrate mostly on the block here, 'cause it's kinda primed for development. All of this right now is zone C1. However, it could hold multifamily in the future, different types of commercials, mixed use development, potentially. Most importantly, I think, this is a great candidate for C2, because C2 is our Highway Commercial district, and Main Street is probably the one just highway that we have going through town. There's a lot of Street frontage here. And this seems to be one of the heavier uses already in C1, that auto rental. It would adapt fairly well to a C2 use of auto sales. However, when we're making zoning recommendations, we wanna keep all different types of uses in mind. And, I think, that with the amount of Street frontage that it has and the amount of payment that already exists on this site to have car sales, or even if this were to be abandoned, and become something that had a drive through facility, which is allowed at C2, that would also be an appropriate use, given the location of this. There was some consideration from some of the neighbors, I haven't heard from them directly, but Ald. Gerlach, let me know that there was some, you know, maybe aesthetics would be an issue, or impervious surface coverage. The difference between C1 and C2 is minimal, or even non-existent. So, the impervious surface coverage is 80% maximum for both of those zoning district, so, that wouldn't change at all. They would still be required to have some of that green space. They won't be able to go to full impervious coverage with the C2 zoning. So, realistically, the only thing that changes would be the uses that would be allowed. So, again, that auto sales, drive through facilities, those sorts of things that are a little bit higher than they would be allowed in the C1 district. We generally try to not do spot zoning. To me, spot zoning is a spot of commercial in a residential area, or a spot of industrial within a commercial area. This is all commercial, so, it's just increasing the uses that would be allowed on something that has a lot of frontage. So, staff seems to be, you know, we're recommending approval of this because it seems to be the most cohesive use that you could possibly have with something that has this much Street frontage. Along with that, everything that has auto sales has additional requirements when it goes through our site plan and review process, those were noted in your staff report, but just to go through them briefly, the lot area has to provide permanent, durable, and dustless paved surfaces. So, that has to be maintained for anything that has auto sales. Regular access to outdoor of sales and display shall not be closer than 30 feet from an inner section of any two Streets. So, any traffic conflicts should be resolved with that one. Repair should be conducted within a completely enclosed building. So, if there is any sort of repairs to be done on those cars that cannot be done outside, and a minimum lot area should be 1500 square feet and the site plan should show the layout of the vehicles for rent or for sale. So, there are some additional things on how far regular site plan, the site plan would cover that impervious coverage. So, kinda a long way to say that of C2 would be appropriate here, given the surroundings as they are, and the surroundings as they would be in the future.

- Thank you, that was very detailed great report, questions? Commissioner Bremer.

- Thank you very much, Chair. Stephanie, just following up on the concern our neighbor that Ald. Gerlach mentioned. As you said, the amount of impervious surface required would not change, the requirement would not change from C1 to C2, but currently the property has quite a bit more lawn, and of course the trees that are not required under either C1 or C2, is that correct?

- Sort of, they stand the same maximum. So, the maximum that you can reach is 80% of your lot. I don't have the statistics on what the current impervious coverage is. However, they wouldn't be able to exceed that 80%. However, without a zoning change, the current donor can also expand to up to 80%. So, there are some, you know, they have to have green space, that's required all of our lots in the city, but yes, I don't know what the exact number is on the existing building footprint with the parking that they have.

- Okay, thank you.

- Question for Steph, if the impervious pavement right now is above the maximum, by changing this, would they have to remove any, or was that grandfathered in?

- That's a really good question for our zoning administrator, Paul Neumeyer. I'm hoping that he's listening in, I'm not sure.
- Yeah, I mean, it's an existing condition, it can remain, I guess you could consider grandfathered in, or nonconforming, but there's not a requirement that would have to be changed in any shape or fashion.
- Thank you, Paul.
- Thanks, Paul, I don't think that it exceeds 80% though, there's quite a bit of green space there.
- And this would allow the amount of the green space to be limited either under the current zoning, or the proposed zoning. It could be cut back.
- The requirements are the same for both zoning, commercial zoning districts, yes.
- Any other questions, comments for staff.
- Motion to approve?
- Just a moment, with that in mind, just so we have some clarity about what is likely to happen, may we open the floor, I'd like to move to open the floor, so that we can ask the applicant, what is being planned?
- I'll withdraw my motion.
- Thank you, Ken. So, motion from Commissioner Bremer to open the floor.
- Second.
- I think I heard a second, was that you, okay? And a second by Ald. Corpus-Dax to open the floor. All those in favor, please say, aye.
- [Members] Aye.
- Opposed, none, floor is open. I think, we will start off then with John DeSilva if you did wanna come forward, I think commission had a couple questions for you.
- [John] Absolutely, what do you have?
- Great, and I think this is where your pictures come in very handy.
- [John] Sure.
- Because I know that Ald. Gerlach is eager to see what you have planned for this.
- [John] Absolutely, and I appreciate her concern. As of right now, I am not the owner of the property, and I will not do any reconstructed of any registration that's currently on there. The pavement layout that's currently there, it's gonna be sufficient enough to hold the amount of cars I have, and I would display that here, my next drawing here. So, I have two drawings.
- And you might wanna turn on your video, so that we can see.
- [John] Absolutely, lemme see, I apologize.

- You're speaking to a technical.
- There I am.
- Yay.
- Okay, and I'll share my screen. Can you guys see this correctly.
- Right now, we're just seeing you.
- Okay, I apologize, I'm not a Skype professional here yet.
- If you have the option at the bottom of your screen, it should be a green icon, it says share screen. If you don't have that, let us know, we can give you the permissions.
- Okay, can you guys see my screen now?
- Nope, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes.
- Okay, okay, so, this is my drawing of the lot, and hopefully it's the layout that you guys are looking for. But as of right now, it's the exact same pavement that's currently there with my car desires, of how much inventory I would like to keep on a lot. There's more than enough room on this lot, currently as it stands, it won't be any added pavement needed at this time. And I'll show you how it'll possibly look on another photo here. This is a photo that I actually photo edited, so you guys can see how possibly the cars will lay out, currently with the current visitation that's currently there, utilizing the exact payments of the previous drawing that I have here. So, same layout, showing those same exact cars, how it would look. Again, it wouldn't be much different than when it was previously had, when enterprise was there.
- So, you're planning to keep the structure that is there, formally a home, looks like not the garage that used to be next to it, but the home itself, and then all the grass and the trees as well?
- Yeah, as I recall, as I visited the property recently, and I'm not sure if Mrs. Hummel, currently had a current picture of it, but I know there was once a tree cut down, it wasn't due to my request, but I know that, that tree is currently gone. Outside of that, any other vegetation that's there, I would not seek to go and get anything else removed, if that's a concern.
- I would think that would give her some comfort.
- Absolutely.
- All right, I can just stop sharing. Any questions on this photo before I let it go.
- Yeah, commissioners, Ald. Gerlach, any other questions?
- No, thank you very much, that that was very helpful. I will have a comment to make to the commission after we close the floor.
- Thank you.
- Thanks you. Thank you, John. We are open,

- Welcome. So, if anyone else from public does wish to speak, now will be that time. Otherwise, chair will entertain a motion to close the floor.

- So, moved.

- Motion by commission Bremer, seconded by Ald. Corpus-Dax to close the floor, all those in favor, please say, aye.

- [Members] Aye.

- Opposed, and we are back to regular order. Ald. Gerlach?

- I just want to make you all aware of why I am so worried about impervious surface. I don't know if you, I mean, you've been at this a lot longer than I have. Maybe you realize that flooding is a huge, huge issue in district three. That just smacked me between the eyes, as soon as I got elected, I didn't know about this, and all at once, I had to deal with it. And Matt Heckenlaible our utility manager, and I dealt with this for months in district three. And finally the plan, which was an extensive plan, was put on the shelf, and I was told that it would cost more than \$30 million just to deal with the flooding issues we have now, because of all the impervious surface. That whole area is nothing but pavement and rooftops. And as we go forward, I know it's so easy with these little things to say, "Well, that sounds like it's not gonna be a problem." And the next one sounds, "Oh, maybe he'll just add a little bit of pavement." And I know, I'll be long dead before this is a problem. But, I just think we have to think long term about what we are doing to this part of town, and be very careful when we make individual decisions about these things. Now, I'm not worried about this one, this sounds like it's gonna be fine, but just keep in mind that it doesn't happen often, but when it happens, it's uncontrollable. I was going to ask for all the \$27 million of ARPA funding, all to be given to district three for flood mitigation. Until I was reminded that even that wouldn't be enough. So, please keep that in mind in the future, and thank you.

- Thank you for those comments alder. And, I think a lot of us share those same views, and are certainly aware of it. So, it's certainly good to hear from an alder too, especially the one represent the district, so, thank you. With that, Chair will entertain a motion if we're ready to move on.

- Moved to approve, motion to approve.

- Second.

- Motion on the floor from Commissioner Rovinski, seconded by Commissioner Bremer to approve. Any other discussion before we go to vote? All right, all those in favor, please say, aye.

- [Members] Aye.

- Aye, those opposed, and motion carries. This will now also move on to City Council on the 15th, next Tuesday. And we'll move along to a agenda item number six, this is another public hearing. This time on a request to rezone 1840 Bond Street from low-density residential to public in institutional, sorry, submitted by Jim Hines, on behalf of Bay City Baptist church. Madison, would you give us a quick preview of this?

- Yeah, for sure, one second. All right, so, this is the location, 1840 bond Street, and parcel number 6-60-1 on the west side. This entire parcel is owned by Bay City Baptist Church, and I'm a also going to show something else as well. Bear with me one second. All right, so, I think this helps show a little bit more the parcel itself. Currently this is zoned R1, which is low-density residential. There is a church Bay City Baptist, which owns all of it down here. Parking lot there's soccer fields in the back, and then they also own this entire portion back here. There is also, I believe still, very, very intermittently used railroad, which ends further south. But a lot of this land was actually farmland before. And then, when the railroad was put in, it just became kind of unused,

very water based, high water table, and not very developable, what I've heard from adjacent property owners. I did wanna say that David Debuch reached out to me, and him and his family own this property to the north. As well as, I've also received information from Mark Steuer, alderman regarding this property adjacent property owners within the 200 feet were notified and request, and some of them, I think we're just inquiring what is the difference between what does it enable? I know that the is also a residential district as well as this. And, I think a lot of people were just concerned are there any future developments going on? What does this allow? So, I would recommend opening the floor, and I know Jim is also on the call. So it might be helpful for him to answer any questions as he is applicant. And then, if any other adjacent property owners have questions about the zoning request, I can also step in.

- Thank you, Madison. We'll be going into the public hearing portion of this. Just a couple reminders as we get started. Please remember to state your address, whether you represent a group or association, and whether you favor, oppose, or only providing information on this matter, as well as any comments that you may have. Please limit the comments to three minutes. If you are on the phone at is star six, to unmute yourself, otherwise, physically raise your hand, or use the raise hand function in Zoom. And with it, first with any of those who are in favor of this item, I ask you to come forward. Not seeing any hands. Again, if you're on the phone, star six unmute. I will move on to any opposed. How about any providing information only. Does anyone wish to speak on this item? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Brian, are you raising your hand there? You are on mute, you have to mute yourself, if you do wanna.

- Actually, you can go to Bob first, I wanna hear him and I'll speak after.

- There we go. Bob, go ahead, start with your name and address.

- Bob, you're on mute.

- There we go. Okay, my name is Bob Rowell, I'm live at 716 north Taylor. I'm just concerned if it's gonna do anything with our land value, being that they're gonna rezone that to... That different zoning, if it's gonna do anything to my property value.

- I think we'll try to answer those questions in the next item here. Now, we're just taking the comments. So, we'll try to get answers to those questions as we move onto the next part of this. Unless you have anything else, Brian, we can move on to you.

- Actually, I think my comments go for after that. It's just that the church hasn't been very good on water mitigation. I mean, the way when they built their parking lot, they build in a creek that was only there for the spring, but every spring, my backyard now floods, and they haven't handled drainage for the parking lot very well at all. Now, if they wanna start doing more creating of roads, the other parcel, and stuff like that, what they've this guys doing, I'm worried about water mitigation and the factor that they haven't been doing that very well at all. So, about property values that I was worried about, but let's see how the rest of it now, I'll probably speak after.

- Sounds good, and Brian, sorry if I missed it, did you provide your address as well for the record.

- Brian Nighorn, 706 North Taylor Street in Green Bay.

- Appreciate it, thank you. Anyone else from the public looking to speak on this item? And just a reminder too, we will be taking up the actual item after this, and we will have another opportunity to answer any questions if they do come up. Does anyone else wish to speak on this item? Is anyone else looking to speak on this item? Is anyone wishing to speak? Hearing none, let the record reflect that no one has come forward, and this public hearing is now closed. We'll move on to agenda item number seven. This is consideration with possible action on a request to re zone 1840 bond Street from low-density residential to public institutional submitted by Jim Heinz on behalf of Bay City Baptist church. Madison, go ahead.

- Great, so, as I said, the property is in the pink parcel and the adjacent property owners in the red were notified. It was also published for any kind of public notices in public hearing for those that want to come and speak. The current zoning, like I said, is R1, low-density residential. This is an adjacent school as well. And I believe that the church has a Christian school also located on their facilities. So, in general, the current land uses that are going on on this parcel, do not comply with our current zoning. This would be more of a public institution, which allows for a variety of things, not major developments, but more just public, not privately owned. So, they have soccer fields in the back. They also have a school parking, religious institution, and this is our future land use. Now, I know our comprehensive plan is due for updating as well, so this is a chance when we look at our future land use and what are the changes that have happened within the last decade or two decades. As you can see right now, this is semi-public, and that is the church and the parking lot, and just any kind of educational, public civic centers. And then, as I said, there is another school, a public school just east of it. And then, it is mostly surrounded by low-density residential. So, one of the main things that I wanted to stress was the differences between low-density residential, which would be R1. And we can go back to, let me just look where that is. As you can see, this is what it currently is, and this is a rezoned application to clean up as well because the city recognizes that, especially in the Southern portion, there is not low-density residential. And that primarily is single family dwelling, and the odd to family dwelling, if it is for, or meeting our housing and affordability goals and at a limited capacity. So, some of the major differences I would say are the... PI does not allow for any kind of major developments, unless they are community-centered, neighborhood-centered, libraries, cemeteries. This was a very cold day. I could barely get the sign in, so I laid it over here, and then the maintenance people brought it in. And then, David Buck did tell me, I should take the winter signs out. But here is the Bay City Baptist on a very sunny day. So, as you can see, this is from the back, this is, is their parking lot, and this is the field out behind. And I know it's very, very small, but there is a huge patch of trees, and as some of the property owners stated, it is very wet back there. And yeah, this is the back to it. So, to my understanding, when I have spoken with the applicant, there is no major developments in this rezoning application, more so, there could be some minor additions to the existing institution, and then, that might shift the change in the soccer field in the back. But staff is recommending approval for R1 to PI to comply with our current zoning code, and any kind of future use, if that is to change would have to go through Plan Commission as well, and council. And also, if there is any developments that take place, those would have to our criteria for plan or for PI, which would mean any kind of signs, lighting, just any overall setbacks PI generally, they can have shelters, picnic areas, playgrounds. Those are mostly things that would not, well, it would not be allowed in an R1 district, and an R1 district would primarily be residential, and the applicant has kind of stated that that's not the direction that they are going in right now with that adjacent land. So, we just want to consolidate, enter the entire parcel into PI.

- Got it, thank you very much, Madison, on that. Commissioners, any other questions, comments? I also see Ald. Steuer here as well, if you wanna kick us off, go ahead.

- All right, thank you, chair. Again, this is district 10. I met with Mr. Rowell a couple of times recently, this past week and sometime ago I had talked to Mr. Nighorn as well on maybe another matter, but I have met both of these citizens. And as you can tell, I don't know if folks, one of the exhibits is the orthophoto, is there a way to people to take a look at that, or can Steph bring that forward?

- I can, did you-

- It is the orthophoto. No, it's the oblique photo. I mean, actually, well, it was one of the photos. I think, it's taken from a side view, kind of angle. It's one of the photos.

- Okay, let me pull up. So, from-

- It's an aerial photo, it's a colored aerial photo. So, it's one of the exhibits. If you just flash through 'em, you can kinda see it.

- Is it future land use or is it-
- It's an ariel photo, it's an aerial photo, the colored aerial photo. I think it says orthophoto.
- Yep, it's Madison, it's in the packet, this is Neil.
- It's in the packet. orthophoto.
- Sure.
- Yeah, looks like 1, 2, 3, 4th link down under number seven there.
- Can that be shared, I would think it could.
- Yeah, one second.
- That's the fourth photo down or orthophoto, it says.
- Fourth of photo?
- That's not it.
- Hold on.
- I dunno what I gotta do here.
- alder, I can get it up here, hold on, I think I got it. Help Mrs. Neil, hold on, let me see here. I think I just had it up here. Let me try to see, the right one here. orthophoto, get it to the right page so I can do this. Let's see.
- If we have to use the other photo we can. The orthophoto shows it well.
- Yep here we go, I think I've got it here.
- Yeah, that's it, that's what I needed. Okay, if you could keep that up on the screen.
- Thank you, Mark.
- Sure.
- All right. So, anyhow, maybe just zoom a little bit on it, but you know, I think you can see it pretty well. And Mr. Rowell's home is at Taylor, you see the home with the swimming pool, he's at that area, he's the one right next to it on the right of that. And then, I think Mr. Nighorn is next to him. So, those two there's five homes along that stretch. So, over the years that I've been on council we looked at the, I don't know if you can see an arrow, but the wetland type area to the north, which is owned by Bay Baptist. We found out that like 2/3rds of the land was actually more like wetland. And I don't know if staff can tell me if, you know, and I realize it's a little bit north, but the fact is Bay Baptist does own that area. And I just wanted to know if there was any delineation that the DNR or anybody did on that piece of property. We've had several developers over the years, come in and try to look at condo development, and things like that, and it just seems like it's too much, the water table's too high, or it's bit of a wetland. So, can anybody help me on that, as far as what the DNR may have may have done, or if they did anything on that, as far as delineation.

- To the, sorry, I heard somebody else talking, I don't wanna speak over them. I just wanted to remind everybody, this is a rezone just for the current land use, the maintenance would be held at a different meeting and discussion and-

- Okay, I was looking this for clarifi... Yeah, that's fine, Madison. I was just looking for some clarification. I can stay on topic. I was in Mr. Rowell's kitchen, and took a look out the back window, and just looked at the property of the church, and you can see it's a soccer field and such, I guess, the big thing that his concern was, and I know for property values, but also looking at, you know, as far as RI, if you have an RI zone, you can always develop and put homes there, if you have access, I didn't see a whole lot of access there, but you could conceivably somehow some way get residential back there, if you had the access to it. But the PI, you know, the public institutional, that, I guess one of the concerns was that, okay, if you rezone this, then there's always the ability to extend or build another pride there. I mean, once you rezone it, that's it. So, I was wondering if you could clarify that. I mean, it's kind of a roll of the dice. You don't know, according to the church, it sounds like they just wanted to do some things with the soccer field and maybe some minor adjustments. And I know that that could happen 5, 10, 15 years down the road, but once you're rezone something, then that's it, it's permanent. So, I just wanted to hear your take on having RI there, you know, the impact that would have, if you had homes there versus a PI zone, which is what it is, and I realized that a lot of other areas of the city that have structures like this for schools, et cetera, are slowly being changed back to PI, you know, when you have the situations come forward. So, can you help me on that a little bit?

- Yeah, I can answer that to the best of my knowledge, and then, Steph can jump in as well. Any kind of park or school located adjacent to single family residential would not lower your property value by any means. In fact, most parks adjacent would increase your property value. From local knowledge, and I can also look into this and get back to you, but I don't believe that that land especially close to the railroad is developable just as you said, with the water table. So, again, I can also look into that and get back to you, but I believe that the church or the applicant has any desire to develop that land.

- Okay, that's fine, I think that answers it pretty well. I'll let other folks chime in and if I have another point, I'll make it a little bit later, so, thank you, Madison.

- Thank for the comments alder as well. Commissioners, do we have any questions either for staff, otherwise.

- Just , am I right in understanding that, if there were water issues in that area, it would be possible for the church to develop it. They would have to go through a site planning process that would check that, is that correct? So, we're not giving them cart blanche to put a set of town homes up there, for instance.

- Well, I think there's a point here that you we're tried zoning. There is another detail about the site plan, if that's what you're asking about other details about building out the site, that'll be further looked at by staff. They're just not known at this point, 'cause we don't have a proposal before us necessarily.

- I was trying to get some clarity for Ald. Steuer that we would be going through a whole process of checking out what might be built on this land, and if it was deemed to be a high water table, or problematic that that would not be something that we would permit building on.

- That would have to be verified. I guess, we can't speak to that at this point.

- Okay.

- Typically, most rezoning applications, they are granted if staff agrees with the decision, and the Comprehensive Plan Alliance and future land use, but any further steps, the rezone is granted upon meeting future potential site plans, developments, or anything along the lines in the future.

- Thank you.

- Commissioners, any other questions, comments. I think, we probably have a little bit of desire to open the floor as well here too.

- I mean, just one more comment, I've been doing for other religious institution, maybe had one on Packer land a few months ago. I think, the city's just doing their due diligence here to clean up these sites where they have split zoning. It's tough for me to... We can't really speculate, 'cause the current property owner has split zoning. So, city staff finds it appropriate. It just, I don't know, I'm inclined to approve it.

- Yeah, I think what's important to point out, and which Madison did was that site plan review is part of it, and it's a pretty thorough one, more thorough than we would normally see on a lot of other projects as well too. So, plus the water issues, which are kind of well documented as well, too. Just looking at a map here, there's no way for that water to go really. So, it's probably kinda pooling in the lowest area, which I'm guessing is there since all the development around it. So, there would probably be some significant work that need to do to get anything that would be built above that water table too. So, I think there's some good fallbacks here that, there's probably not an expectation, there's gonna be a large scale development there. I think it's a safe assumption, but I wouldn't be too worried myself either. Commissioners are comfortable, we can move on with staff's recommendation too.

- I'd actually like to hear from... I would like to have the floor comments if you wouldn't mind.

- I move, most of the people here who wish to speak.

- Motion from Commissioner Bremer, second by Ald. Corpus-Dax to open the floor. All those in favor, please say aye.

- [Members] Aye.

- Aye, the floor is open. It does look like the applicant did hop on. Sorry, if I missed you there before. I think it'd be a good place to start is with the applicant, Jim, if you wouldn't mind coming forward.

- Sure, I'm just here to answer a few questions, if there are any. Jim Hinze, 2509 Martha Ave. Alleyway. So yeah, I'm just representing the church here, and we are rezoning this, and really it's, per the city's request as Madison kind of alluded to there. So, just cleaning up the zoning here. So, yeah, no big developments on the horizon, we have a small addition that they're looking at doing, some locker rooms off the back, but that's on the Helen Keller side. The new property, or the property of the north at, you know, 10-year plan, maybe moving a soccer field that direction. We have had it, you know, we've looked at it in terms of the delineation and you're absolutely right, there's a lot of wetland over there, it'll never be developed to any great extent. So, yeah, it's, I guess, pretty straightforward in my mind.

- Ald. Steuer.

- Yes, thank you, Mr. Hinze for coming in. I was just wondering, you said some locker rooms and things like that toward the Helen Keer side, is there a tentative, you don't have a site plan for that. Do you have any kind of a sketch, or at least an idea for that. I realize we're talking about a rezoning, but you know, one of the questions is, for clarification purposes, is there anything that you have that you can show right now?

- I don't have anything with me today. It's basically, addition straight off the back of that gym building, and the storm water management will be part of that as it pertains to that addition. So, they addressed as part of that site plan.

- Well, that would be important. And I think, only because, you know, like I said, some of the adjoining land owners do have some issues with water pooling, and I don't know if has something that the church has worked with the owners on something like that to look at, has that ever been addressed?

- I'm not sure to what extent, you know, all the impervious surfaces have been addressed, and it's all road towards the retention ponds at the start of Ethea, in front of the property, but the area in question is really where it drops off the side of the parking lot, and then kind of leads into the neighbors, you know, the backyards, those end up at the same elevation. So, the church has the same issue along the edge of that parking lot where mowers get stuck and water just sits, because there isn't any good way to route it off the property. At least is the way it stands now.

- Well, I think in the future, that might be one of those things that I'd talk with public works or water department about for future reference, but I think, that may be addressed at another time, but I appreciate you coming in today, thank you.

- In case we have any questions for Mr. Hinze before we move on.

- Nope.

- I appreciate the comments. We are in open sessions, so, anyone else that did wanna come forward to speak at this time, now would be that time. Not seeing any hands, or anybody on the phone. So, last call here, is there anybody that did wanna come forward, otherwise I'll maintain the motion to close the floor.

- Solved.

- Moved.

- I think Ken got it first.

- I think, Ken will move, I'll second. Motion by commissioner of Rovinski, seconded by a Commissioner Bremer to close the floor. All those in favor, please say aye.

- [Members] Aye.

- Aye, all those opposed, and we are back to regular order.

- I'd make a motion, approve the request.

- And I'll second that.

- Motion from Commissioner Rovinski, seconded by Commissioner Bremer to approve. Ald. Corpus-Dax disappeared. There we go, okay.

- Can I make one more comment, Chair?

- Yes, absolutely.

- All right, thank you, thanks, chair. You know, after looking at the photos, and the land use, and I live fairly close to this area as well. So, I feel that, you know, the city is doing due diligence, in doing cleanup of these zoning areas throughout the city. There was another one that was done at seventh day Adventist, you know, sometime ago on Shawna avenue in my district. And, that seems to be going pretty well too. So, I understand the citizen's concern, you know, it's like anything else, anytime you make a change, even if it's, you know, for

the good, you know, we things out. So, I'm in favor of this as well, and, you know, go ahead, move forward, thank you.

- Thank you, alder. Motion on the floor from Commissioner Rovinski to approve the staff's recommendation, seconded by I'm sorry, was it Sid, right, yes. By Commissioner Bremer. All those in favor do please say aye.

- [Members] Aye.

- Aye, and any opposed, motion carries. That will also move on to City Council next week, Tuesday the 15th. And, let's move on here to item number eight, agenda item number eight, it's consideration with possible action on a request to vacate an app between John Street and East Mason Street, submitted by Grand Central LLP, Midwest Expansion, Dan Pamperin. Madison, if you could give us a preview, or work through this item, sorry.

- Yeah, me again, they saved the best for last. I think, hopefully. Let me pull this up for you. So, one of the differences with Ali Vacations, as you can see, we don't have a public hearing. The public hearing is actually held at City Council, and this is an action item. So, we had an application for 1567 East Mason Street. This is John Street and East Mason right here. This is the parcel and this is the alley that they would like to vacate. Grand central LLC owns both of these parcels, and the only adjacent property owners that are notified for any Street or alley vacation are the ones directly on either side, or north, or east, or southwest, whatever they're touching. So, basically, the owner wants you to just compile, and in any alley vacation, it would just be absorbed into each property. As you can see again, this is the current R I, except for this down here, which is commercial. I believe, there is a hard here, Skin Robins, and a shell station right here. The future land use is low-density residential. And again, we're just focusing on the alley vacation. As you can see you here, they even drew it all in together that they would absorb it. This is the corner, the Street view. And we are approving... Our staff is recommending approval to request the vacation. I do wanna also, I know this isn't a public hearing, but we do send out a internal and external agency memo. So, DP, Utility, AT&T, anybody that might have an easement or any issue with this alley being vacated would have the opportunity to share any kind of input or output. And nobody has any facilities during or amongst that vacation, and they don't have any concern, or objections, including perks. And then, also the fire department, police department, nobody needs that alley to utilize.

- Great, appreciated that. I don't mean to speak for everyone, but I think I'm in favor of a vacation of any type, so, this sounds good. It doesn't look like we have anybody else besides staff, and the commissioners left here. so, I don't think we need to open the floor for anything. So, I'll entertain a motion.

- Motion to approve.

- Motion by Commissioner Rovinski, was that Sid for the second, or nope. Ald. Corpus-Dax, sorry, for the second. To approve all those in favor, please say aye.

- [Members] Aye.

- Any opposed, and motion carries. With that, I think we're onto, where did my agenda go? We're onto the next thing, whatever that is. Informational, director of support.

- Thank you, Mr. Chair, I'll be brief. Folks, obviously, you probably saw our News last week, we had the governor in town announcing that the city was fortunate enough to participate in, one of them was a \$5 million neighborhood investment grant to assist with the redevelopment of the JBS property, which we're very excited to move forward on that, and get some things going there. We also were part of the team working in cooperation with Brown county on the \$15 million grant to help acquire and plan for the redevelopment of the UPS Polium site, which will be the future home of the coal piles. So, that's a very important first domino, and essentially to try to get that entire process moving forward. Position and redevelopment of that site will

allow C. Reiss Coal, still in agreement, needs to be kept in place in the county, but the intent would obviously to be have C. Reiss begin to offload their coal at the new location site, and then, spend down the coal at the existing site downtown. So, an important first step, we're excited to see that happen. Not all good news, for the neighborhood investment grant money, we had applications in for the shipyard, the public market, and some affordable housing projects that did not get funded. So, we are gonna continue to look for some assistance to continue those projects as we go forward, Started the unique collaboration exercise, and multi-week process on the JBS site with third center for leadership, that the mayor has been involved, kinda reaching out to about 50 different partners, including folks like NeighborWorks, the YWCA, Salvation Army, the school district, all kinds of folks, in terms of kind of identifying opportunities, hopefully to partner on this project as we go forward. Just this quick update, staff's currently working on... We have five active development agreements that we are working on trying to bring through EDA and RDA over the next several weeks. So, we're seeing a lot of activity, which is good. See, one of them is a reworking of prior agreement, two of them are new agreements. One was just an EDA tonight for an industrial development that we're looking at out on the east side. So, we're seeing good activity, really across multiple sectors at this point, which is good news, considering the pricing of what materials, and labor, and everything else is being out right there right now, we're very happy to still see a lot of projects still moving forward. And I think, the last thing I just wanted to make a note on Dave Buck, Paul Neumeyer, myself, and the mayor attended a workshop on zoning for affordable housing that was sponsored by the league municipalities. So, it was an interesting perception. I think, we probably could have put on a majority of the seminar, but there's also some good ideas and hearing from some of our colleagues in terms of some of the issues on how they're dealing with things like accessory, dwelling units, lot widths, different density controls, those types of things. So, it was interesting to kind of network with some of them, and hopefully be bringing some of that forward. Probably a Plan Commission, hopefully even sometime later this year, some ideas on how maybe make some adjustments to make that a little bit of an easier task. So, that's my report tonight, Mr. Chair, if anybody has any questions, I'd be happy to answer any.

- Much questions, Ald. Corpus-Dux, go ahead, no.

- I don't have a question, but I wanted to say that it's been a pleasure working with all of you over the last four years. I'm pretty sure this is my last plan meeting, so, it's been great to get to know everyone and work with you guys. Maybe I'll see you again, I dunno, but it's been awesome, it's been a great experience.

- We hope-

- If we were together, I would've baked you a treat.

- You can mail it.

- Home delivery?

- Great.

- Thank you--

- It's been great.

- for all you've contributed.

- Thanks.

- It's been fun, hopefully, off to a better life, better things.

- Yeah. I'll be busy with soccer, so.

- Fair enough. Great, unless there are any questions we'll enter a motion to-
- I think, Mr. Rovinski might have had one. Go ahead, Ken.
- No, I'm good.
- If you got it, go ahead.
- No, Ald. Corpus-Dax, do you wanna make the last motion?
- Motion to adjourn.
- Second.
- All right, final motion by Ald. CorpUs-Dax to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Rovinski. All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Thank you everybody, thanks Veronica.
- Bye, thanks.
- Good night.
- Night, night.