



MINUTES OF THE GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION

MONDAY, JUNE 20, 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. Jim Hutchison, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, and Ken Rovinski.

Present: Jim Hutchison, Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski,
Excused:

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the Agenda for the June 20, 2022, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Ald. Jim Hutchison, seconded by Sidney Bremer to approve the agenda. Motion Passed.
Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, Jim Hutchison, No-
None, Abstain- None.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the May 9, 2022, Meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Derius Daniels to approve the minutes. Motion Passed.
Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, Jim Hutchison, No-
None, Abstain- None.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. Election of Officers - Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary.

Ken Rovinski nominated Lisa Hanson as Chair. Lisa Hanson asked three times for other nominations. A vote was taken and Lisa Hanson was elected as Chair.

Lisa Hanson nominated Jake Miller as Vice-Chair. Lisa Hanson asked three times for other nominations. A vote was taken and Jake Miller was elected as Vice Chair.

Sidney Bremer nominated Neil Stechschulte as Secretary. Lisa Hanson asked three times for other nominations. A vote was taken and Neil Stechschulte was elected as Secretary.

2. (ZP 22-07) Consideration with possible action on request to amend Zoning Ordinance No. 09-15, a Planned Unit Development (PUD), to permit a drive-through restaurant at 1567 E. Mason Street, submitted by Stephen Wesoloski, Midwest Expansion, LLP, on behalf of Grand Central, LLC, property owner (Ald. B. Galvin, District 4).

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

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

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to close the floor and return to regular business. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Derius Daniels to amend Zoning Ordinance No. 09-15, a Planned Unit Development (PUD), to permit a drive-through restaurant at 1567 E. Mason Street, 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. Approval of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) by the City Traffic Engineer.
- c. Approval of the draft Planned Unit Development (PUD).
- d. No less than one (1) tree and three (3) shrubs be included for each 60 ft. of John Street frontage.

Motion Passed.

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

3. (ZP 22-13) Consideration with possible action on request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a carwash facility in a Community Center Commercial (C3) District located at 1555 W. Mason Street, submitted by JJ Alaily, ICAP Development (Ald. M. Eck, District, 11).

Moved by Jacob Miller, seconded by Ken Rovinski to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a carwash facility in a Community Center Commercial (C3) District located at 1555 W. Mason Street, subject to:

Recommendation: Approval of the request, subject to the following conditions:

1. CSM submission to create a lot as described in the legal.
2. Standard site plan review and approval.
3. Applicant continues to work with City Staff to address traffic safety and circulation.

Motion Passed.

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

4. (ZP 22-16) Public Hearing on request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a two-family dwelling located at 420 S. Van Buren Street, submitted by Tim Denissen, NeighborWorks Green Bay, property owner (Ald. B. Galvin, District 4).

Chair Lisa Hanson read into record the rules and procedures for tonight's public hearing. This public hearing has been properly posted.

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the floor for the Public Hearing on the request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a two-family dwelling located at 420 S. Van Buren Street, submitted by Tim Denissen, NeighborWorks Green Bay, property owner (Ald. B. Galvin, District 4).

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

5. (ZP 22-16) Consideration with possible action on request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a two-family dwelling located at 420 S. Van Buren St, submitted by Tim Denissen, NeighborWorks Green Bay, property owner (Ald. B. Galvin, District 4).

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Jim Hutchison to request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a two-family dwelling located at 420 S. Van Buren St, with the condition to provide code-compliant parking 44-1726. Motion Passed.

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

6. (ED 22-01) Consideration with possible action on request to vacate public utility easements located at 1100 University Avenue, submitted by Patrick Skalecki, GRAEF (Ald R. Scannell, District 7).

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Sidney Bremer to vacate public utility easements located at 1100 University Avenue. Motion Passed.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Director's Report.

Neil Stechschulte presented the Director's Report.

2. Date of the next meeting: July 11, 2022

G. ADJOURNMENT.

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

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- All right. Well, hello everyone. And welcome to the Monday, June 20th, 2022 meeting of the Green Bay Planning Commission. We will start with a roll call. Chair, Lisa Hanson. Present. Vice chair, Jacob Miller is absent at this time. Alder, Jim Hutchison.

- Here.

- Commissioner Sidney Bremer.

- Present.

- Commissioner Derius Daniels.

- Present.

- Commissioner Ken Rovinski.

- Present.

- And Vice chair, Jacob Miller.

- Present.

- Excellent, and moving on to the approval of the agenda for the June 20, 2022 meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

- So moved.

- I'll second that.

- The motion by Alder Hutchison is seconded by Commissioner Bremer. All those in favor?

- [Members] Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? And that is approved, and moving on to the approval of the minutes. Approval of the minutes from the May 9th, 2022 meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

- So moved.

- Second.

- The motion by Commissioner Rovinski and a second by Commissioner Daniels. All those in favor?

- [Members] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right, and then moving on to regular business. Election of officers. Is this?

- Yep, so every, this is David with the Planning Department. Every June, we do an election of officers. The current officers are Lisa Hanson is the chair. Jake Miller is the vice chair who takes on the duties for the chair when she can't be present. And the secretary is almost always the director of Community and Economic Development. But you could assign somebody else if you wanted to, but I wouldn't recommend it unless you wanna do a lot of paperwork. So typically, what would happen is somebody could nominate the existing chair, get a second and you can vote on it. Obviously, probably wanna hear if those people are interested, but yeah, that's kind of how it goes. Or if somebody wants to make a power play, they can nominate themselves.

- Would like to nominate Lisa Hanson as chair.

- I'll second that.

- I'll second that.

- Oh god, everyone's second.

- Enthusiastically.

- All right, so got a motion by Commissioner Rovinski and a second by Vice Chair Miller to reinstate me as chair. Or, I guess instate me as a chair for another year.

- Correct?

- Is that correct? Right?

- Correct. One year, yep.

- All right. All those in favor?

- You do have call for nominations three times.

- Oh, I do.

- Another threesome.

- Sorry, my glasses are fogging up right now. Are there any other nominations?

- One.

- That's one.

- Oh, okay?

- Have something for me? All right. Are there any other nominations? Are there any other nominations? All right, and hearing none, then we will continue with the vote.

- Vote.

- Yes.

- All right. All those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.
- Aye.
- Any opposed? Man, that feels so weird. Then I guess it goes on to City Council to see if I'm approved for another year as chair of the Planning Commission, correct?
- Well, just as a information item.
- Oh, okay.
- You are essentially the chair again.
- Good.
- Can I nominate people or not so much?
- Sure.
- Okay, I would like to nominate Jacob Miller as vice chair.
- I second that. We've had a great tag team.
- Are there any other nominations? Are there any other nominations? Are there any other nominations? Hearing none, then we will go ahead with a vote to instate Mr. Jacob Miller as vice chair for another year. And motion by Chair Lisa Hanson, and a second by Commissioner Bremer. Okay. All right. All those in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Any opposed? All right. Congratulations, Mr. Miller. You are vice chair for another year. All right.
- Thank you. Happy to serve.
- And then I'd be happy to nominate Mr. Stechschulte as our secretary. I'm working on it, Neil.
- Sounds good. Sounds good, Sid. I know who you're talking to.
- I'll second.
- All right, so we have a nomination for Mr. Stechschulte for secretary. Are there any other nominations? Are there any other nominations? Are there any other nominations? Hearing none, we will go ahead with a vote on Mr. Stechschulte. And that was a motion by Commissioner Bremer and a second by Alder Hutchison to instate him as the secretary. All those in favor?
- [Members] Aye.
- Any opposed? All right, and that will conclude our election of officers. Moving on to item number two. Consideration with possible action on request to amend Zoning Ordinance number 915, a Planned Unit

Development, to permit a drive-through restaurant at 1567 East Mason Street. Submitted by Steven Weslowski, Midwest Expansion LLP on behalf of Grand Central LLC property owner.

- Thank you, Madam chairman, chairperson. Let me share my screen. Okay. Everybody see this map?

- Yeah.

- Yep.

- So the property is on the east side of Green Bay, just east, about two blocks east of the East River on the corner of Mason and John Street. The site itself shares a block with Grand Central Station Gas Station, which was developed as a planned unit development in 2015. At that time, it was discussed that commercial would expand over to John Street, and it just kind of waited until this long before we got an application. I'm gonna go through this stuff real, super quick 'cause you heard it a couple months ago. So don't be deceived by the zoning here. This is a Planned Unit Development, and you have single family zoning pretty much all the way around, with the exception as you go down past Bellevue on the south side. It goes to a general commercial. Excuse me, that's land use. And then the zoning itself of slackline designates the PUD. The red designates this request. You'll see some highway commercial zoning on the south side of Mason, corner of Bellevue. And then, general commercial, pretty much around Bellevue, and then sort of a mixed use and commercial as you continue on the south side of Mason. So this is the adjusted site plan. So you had seen, oh, in your packets, you'll have the original one that came in in March, and an adjusted site plan that came in now. And I'm gonna wait here and just kind of explain that in March 21st, the Plan Commission held this request to allow basically analysis and comments on two topics. One was traffic and circulation associated with the Planned Unit Development. At that time, there had been a traffic impact or Traffic Impact Analysis that was submitted, but we did not have comments back. And then also, there was discussion about screening John Street, and what would be appropriate buffer to the neighbors across John Street from the drive-through window and order board. So screening from John Street did talk about since the drive-through and the order board are both on the John Street facade, there were quite a bit of discussion on what would be most appropriate. The PUD requires a four to six-foot-tall fence that's impervious to sight, as well as, and I'll use quote fingers, additional landscaping. That was not defined. So the Kimball Street has sort of a buffer and screening that's been established along Kimball. John could be a new animal. It would not need to follow that four to six-foot fencing requirement. So staff had kind of looked at that. And while we like the fencing to block headlights, it is not very neighborhood friendly, so to speak, from an aesthetic standpoint, as well as vegetation would be much better to catch noise and rebound noise, would grow up higher than that six-foot-high fence or four-foot-high fence. So we are suggesting, and it is not in the PUD right now, you'd have to make this a condition of approval, but staff is suggesting additional landscape material inclusion be defined along John Street to be no less than one tree and three shrubs for each 60 feet of John Street frontage. What this would do would basically equate to five trees and 15 shrubs. So the shrubs would kind of soften that fence. They'd be on the outside of the fence, obviously. Would soften up that fence, and the trees, over time would grow up and kind of do a canopy to make a larger blockage. Obviously, vision triangles of that stuff would all have to be maintained, but that's kind of what we're recommending for that screening on John. For traffic, again, there was a traffic analysis that was completed in January. The review comments were provided back to the petitioner in March. An update was submitted at the end of May. So actually, I believe May 24th. So I believe Dave Hansen and Director Grenier are both here from the Department of Public Works. I can kind of summarize what I gathered from our last discussion. Kinda largest concern was the location of the proposed driveway on John Street. Potential traffic delays at the intersection of Mason and John, and the available gaps in traffic after the development occurs, that there would be sufficient gap for cars to get in and get out of the development site. The one thing, why I brought that up now is the one thing you'll notice on this site plan is the petitioner did move the driveway to meet code. So it originally was located somewhere in this area. He did move that. So it is now 250 feet north of the John and Mason Street intersection, which is a functional, well, it's the distance required. And then Dave can tell you what it's called, but the distance required. So they did meet that, but those other items are really gonna be a concern of, or discussion for Dave or Steve to kind of bring up. The one point I wanna make, and this is just a landscape plan. The other point I would wanna make is that, really, the Plan Commission deals with private

property issues. This is a PUD, but it doesn't go out into the street. It doesn't involve new streets. Right of way issues are generally dealt with almost exclusively by the Department of Public Works in cooperation with all of the departments, of course. So I do wanna point that out to you. Obviously, you're approving the use, and if the traffic makes the use unacceptable at this location, you could take that into consideration. But as far as allowing bigger curb cuts or moving curb cuts around, that is really kind of beyond the plan scope of the Plan Commission. So I'll just say that, and then I'll kind of leave it, kind of introduce, well, and this is the facade again. So our recommendation had originally, and still is approval of the request subject to the site plan, an applicable permit application be submitted for review and approval, approval of a Traffic Impact Analysis by the city's traffic engineer, and approval of the draft and unit development with the added condition of that landscaping language, which I do not have on here and I apologize. So I'm going to stop the screen share. And let me see, introduce Dave Hansen, who you all know in the peach shirt. And I'll kind of let him take it from there.

- Thank you, Dave. So yeah, everything that David said leading up to this end of May submittal of the Traffic Impact Analysis, I'll call it TIA just for short here. So they did submit the report, modified report. So as many of you know, I did have some comments on the initial one, which were summarized. But I really had five items that were, I guess, I would consider major items to address. As David mentioned, the driveway was the first one, and they did move it. So that changed that to a check box in my category. Now, when it comes down to gap study, I mean, there was really two things that they updated on this traffic or TIA. One was about the gap study, and one was called a sensitivity analysis. So the gaps that were presented in the study, they had talked about combined equivalent gap results. So they were talking about how many single vehicle gaps can be released. Double vehicle gaps means two vehicles going in one gap, or three-vehicle gaps. So they had summarized that that would be a total of 70, 70 equivalent gaps. And the site generates roughly 70 trips. So that was, I guess, that was what they were trying to prove was that there's enough gaps for the number of trips. What I did is I somewhat reverse engineered what they did, and everything that we do is always in some sort of units. So I look at this. These were actually collected over a one-hour period. So I actually calculated what that delay would be. So the delay, and I guess just to predicate on the delay analysis, and when it comes down to stop delay, so like a two-way stop, a driveway, wait time, and everything, the number that we are looking at is 35 seconds of delay. That's really the borderline what we call failure. So that gets you into what's called level of service E territory. So just always keep that in mind in this discussion when I reveal these numbers. So the single vehicle gap per access point is actually 32 seconds. Now, it's actually 64, but we got two driveways. You divide that by two. So the double gap would actually be about 3.3 minutes. And then for the triple gap, that's actually someone to be waiting about a half an hour for that. So doing an average delay calculation, that actually comes out to the John Street access. So the intersection itself, that southbound movement, would be at 44 seconds of delay, which is the level of service E. And then the driveway I'll call it the Shell driveway, that's the combined access. That actually comes out to 35. So it actually equals, I guess, you'd say the top threshold of level of service E. So getting back to the core of level of service in a TIA, anything that's a level of service E or worse always require some sort of mitigative measure from Public Works. The next thing is a sensitivity analysis was conducted. Now, their sensitivity analysis included looking at another store in another market. So they used a site in Brookfield to make that comparison. The store had a larger footprint. So in essence, what they did is they just found out what the rate was for that store and then applied it to this store. And just a second, the light just went off. There we go. Sorry about that.

- You're fine.

- Don't want you guys to be in the dark there. So, anyway, when I looked at that, one of the things that we look at from the ITE perspective, now, ITE is Institute of Transportation Engineers. That's pretty much what this whole study's founded on, is a document that they published, which is called the Trip Generation Manual. And I'll just call it TGM. So when we looked at this land use in particular, the land use in the TGM actually has 61 sites. So the sensitivity analysis is based off of one site, but the TGM is very, very explicit that you only use small datasets in cases where large sample sets are not available. And if that's the case, then you should be collecting that data locally. And this is actually something that we've actually done here in past TIAs. So looking at the sensitivity analysis, it's my opinion that I really would not use a single site, especially in a market like

Milwaukee that's saturated with Starbucks, I wouldn't use that. And Green Bay really only has seven stores in the entire metro area. So in my opinion, I just don't really think that's a good comparison. And it actually goes against anything that ITE puts in their Trip Generation Manual. So looking at, those are my main points. There are other things that I don't wanna necessarily go over here, but at the end of the day, the sensitivity analysis, I'm not really, I haven't bought into that. And like I said, it goes against the ITE. And the gap analysis, we're still at a level of service E. And lastly, we just haven't really seen any mitigative techniques. I mean, what are we gonna do here in order to solve this? So, one of the items that was brought up was to install the traffic signal there. As you know, traffic signals would break that Mason Street traffic up, and then allow that traffic to go. We could program it at such a cycle length that we could get that turnover of traffic and improve that level of service E. It's been done before. It would be at the detriment of course, of East Mason Street. Now, it wasn't part of this study because the consultant came back and said they did not recommend a traffic signal there due to the proximity to Bellevue Street, which part of me would agree with. But we do have locations within our city, especially our downtown corner, like Walnut Street. We have actually spacing, I think is 410 feet between all those signals. And then actually, we've got along our Main Street corner between Monroe and Madison, those are two signals and intersections, again, 410 feet. And you have quite a bit of traffic at both of those. And we figured a way to make it work. But at the end of the day, we need some sort of way to remedy this level of service E. Now, one thing that could happen, let's say this does go in, that the numbers start to prove themselves out. You get a level of service E gets success, wait time. Two things are gonna happen. Number one, you're going to get motorists that are gonna shoot gaps that are not acceptable, which leads to crashes. Which actually, that's one thing I wanted to point back on too, is that their crash analysis revealed 10 crashes in a five-year period. I actually came up with 23 crashes. The reason that there's disparity between that is that we look at non-reportable crashes as well. Non-reportable simply means that the City of Green Bay Police Department, they have their own form that they complete, and it's not the DOT's DT4000 form. And that's all that, typically, any like a consultant, anyone that gets information from the state, they're only gonna have access to that information. And the non-reportable would just simply mean property damage only. So, I mean, there could be some serious fender benders in there, it's just that nobody got injured. So it's not gonna go on that other form. So, like I said, there's 23 crashes in a five-year period. That's significantly more than the 10 that's being reported in the TIA. So getting back to what's gonna happen, you're gonna get people shooting gaps that you don't want. And now, as part of that gap analysis that they did, one of the things that they had mentioned was a single vehicle gap was 6.8 seconds. Now, in my opinion, that's good, I guess you'd say in a perfect world where you don't have an urban environment with a lot of driveways and you're not in proximity of a signalized intersection, and there's two movements that could be of critical nature that someone trying to pull out of a driveway is not gonna see. So at this signal, you could have a southbound right, the right turn on reds. You're not gonna necessarily see that if you're standing at that driveway, the other one is gonna be the northbound lefts coming off of the Bellevue signal, especially those that are gonna be there on a yellow indication. They may be in the intersection waiting for traffic. And all of a sudden, they're like, "Hey, light's turning yellow." And they're gonna shoot that. They're gonna probably be at that driveway in two seconds. So to me, you're gonna start seeing things like that. And that's where I think you're gonna start to have problems. The other thing that'll happen is some of that traffic may say, "I'm not gonna wait on any of these, and I'm just gonna go into the neighborhood." So we probably, I think would see a shift in some of that trip distribution to the north. So, they're gonna take a right-out of the driveway, go up to Kimball Street. Either take a left, go over to Hartung, and then back over to Mason Street. Or they may take Kimball Street all the way over to Bellevue Street, and maybe just wait for the signal over there, meaning that northbound movement's gonna get more traffic at at Mason-Bellevue. So in sum, just really wanna say that I wasn't really convinced on the two items with the sensitivity gap and the gap analysis from the TIA. And there were no counter measures for the level of service E. So it really is a report that I can't approve. It goes against our policy here at DPW for Traffic Impact Analysis. The only thing that I can think of, and Director Grenier and I had a little conversation about this is I didn't really wanna just say, all right, is there anything that could be done? Like put myself in the consultant's shoes and go, is there another option that could happen? I think the only way that you're going to be able to regulate any of this would be to eliminate, there's two things. Number one, you'd have to eliminate the cross access between the Shell and the Starbucks, which there is an option in the report that goes over that. I know that's not the preference of the developer, but if you eliminate that Starbucks traffic at that Shell driveway, you're going to eliminate that gap shooting that's gonna happen. The other one is to limit your

ingress/egress to right-in and right-out, and a left-in during the morning peak. And this would actually be both at the driveway and at the John Street intersection. So in the report, you'll also see that the northbound movement as well, coming out of the neighborhood is going to experience some significant delays. So what we could do is to actually regulate that so that there's no left turn traffic coming outta there. And that way, they would be able to go right, or go to other locations. And again, this is just my experience speaking, but I think that that level of service would improve. And then more importantly, on the north end with that traffic coming out of Starbucks, I think that if they were forced to go to the right, now mind you, this means that they're gonna be basically going into the neighborhood, that they would basically not have, they won't be sitting at John Street and that delay level would actually start to improve. Now that means you probably should be looking at maybe Kimball and Bellevue Street, maybe looking at the impacts into the neighborhood. But this, in essence, that's my summary on this. And like I said, it's something that at least from Public Works Department that we cannot accept at this point.

- Thank you, David.

- Thank you so much, David. All right, so then I guess at this point, do we have any questions for Mr. Hansen in regards to the traffic?

- I've got one, Lisa.

- Okay.

- And this may not be for Dave Hansen, maybe it's for Director Grenier, I'm not sure. Is there any planned projects, construction projects improvements along Mason in this quarter, in the near future, next couple years at all, either relating just specifically to traffic or pedestrian facilities?

- There are not.

- Okay. Thank you.

- Lisa, Chair Hanson, I have a question as well. So, Dave, can you put the map back up? And maybe this is a question. So if you're entering on John Street, you go around to the double lane. Right now, do you exit back off of John Street as well?

- Am I muted? No. You well, so as you enter the site, you can either enter the site from John Street, enter the two lanes, and then you can either go back through the parking lot to exit onto John, or you could continue to the shared access drive at the gas station and exit out onto East Mason. So these are your two access points right now. I guess you could continue through this site and exit out onto Bellevue as well. If you wanted to navigate to the gas pumps. But those would be the main traffic movements on site. And all three right now, I believe are full access.

- And as this is designed, you cannot exit onto Kimball?

- No, you cannot.

- And from John Street entrance to East Mason, what would be the amount of stackable cars that could fit? I know you wouldn't wanna block that, but I know the double lane went from 11 to 14. So if it was to back up into John Street, what would that number be?

- Well, there is six. It looks like about six stacking between the pickup and the order board. And then from the order board, we're at two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Eight, you're probably looking at 16 to 20 if they continued all the way around. I mean, continuously stacked all the way through here, probably around 20 before you get John Street to the order menu. But again, once you get past sort of this one, two, three, this

four stack, this double stack of four, once you hit this area, you're starting to impact this movement on site because you're gonna start blocking off this entry lane. So, I mean, there could be one car kind of here in a strange position that would then back everybody up as well. And keep in mind, it is a two-way. So there are people that are gonna be trying to get out of this side. So I don't know if that answered your question.

- It does. Thank you. And to Dave's point earlier, I know it's something he said he could recommend, but the exit off of John Street, when cars are exiting, a mitigation could be for them to only be able to turn right. Is that off Mason, or is that right off the exit?

- It's right-outta the exit.

- So you can only enter, or exit to the north, enter from the south. The one thing I did kind of, I guess, wanted to show here as well. So talking to urban planner and Dave and I talked about this as well. You'll notice the neighborhood out here is the sort of the classic grid pattern street network. This is really meant, this pattern was always meant to disperse traffic, pretty much throughout the neighborhood. Now that has buses, 'cause you're not blocking up your collectors and arterials, intersections, but it also has the negatives that you're running commercial traffic through a residential neighborhood. So I just wanted to point out that there is a pretty heavy grid around here, but Mason is by far the most traveled, probably the most traveled street in this little area, I'm guessing.

- So Madam Chair, could I follow that up with another question to Dave Hansen? Because Dave Hansen suggested that he would recommend not allowing the crossover between the Grand Central and the Starbucks. And that was one of the exits that Dave Buck suggested was available. If we closed off that crossover, would it be, Dave Hansen, possible to open and exit onto Kimball and have entrance only off of John and exit only onto Kimball? That's still gonna go through the neighborhoods, but it seems to me it's a little bit cleaner.

- I believe that would be compliant with our current driveway ordinance. Correct me if I'm wrong, Dave Buck, but they technically, since they have frontage on here, I believe would have the ability to have access off of there.

- [David] They could, the exit would probably have to be as far to the east as possible on Kimball with the setback requirement. But they could do that. I think the original thoughts here were not to have the traffic on Kimball because of that it was a residential street. However, that that could be an option. I don't know. I mean, I'm sure it would've to be reanalyzed as far as level of service. But yeah, you could do that.

- Otherwise, you have double the traffic on John, which is also a residential street because it's both entrance and exit traffic, right?

- Correct.

- Am I right in understanding that the recommendation included a sign-off by Dave Hansen?

- [David] Yes, it had the traffic engineer. I believe traffic engineer, the Department of Public Works accepting the traffic analysis that the site would function properly. And I think what we heard today and Mr. Hansen, you can correct me, but that a level service of E is not an acceptable level of service.

- [Jim] Oh, you're muted, Dave.

- Yes, level of service E is considered failure. And it's a requirement then by the TIA to come up with some suggestions to mitigate that, to improve that to level of service D or better.

- So the next logical step, it seems to me, is for the applicant to work with DPW and the director of Public Works on mitigations. Is that correct, Dave Buck?

- [David] I believe that is what DPW is recommending, that mitigation. And again, correct me Dave Hansen, but that mitigation would be, if this were proposed as is some type of mitigation measure needs to be explored.

- Correct. The final TIA must have all movements at acceptable levels of service. So, let's just say that the option that I proposed was evaluated. I mean, it can be any other option, but let's just say we had that evaluated and it came out to be level of service D or better, John Street at Mason Street, Kimball Street at Bellevue, Hartung at Mason. I don't even know if we'd even looked at far. But I'm just saying that if those alternatives were evaluated and those levels of service were D or better, that would result in an approval by Public Works.

- [David] All right, as far as internal traffic circulation goes, we like the connections between the two uses of, again, not a traffic engineer looking at the streets, but the interaction between the two uses so you don't have to exit onto the street to get back into the next business. But again, we look at it from a planning standpoint, really at internal circulation, not really impacts on the intersections. So I just threw this map up again so you could kinda see the streets again as Dave was referring to them.

- So then Dave, to follow-up on that, if you kept the flow between Central Station and the proposed Starbucks, but then added the exit to Kimball, do we know if that would satisfy it, or we would have to close the move through?

- That's a good question. You know, I'm gonna presume that they would probably want to do that 'cause I know that the cross access easement is favorable to the business because they're using linked trips within the study. Meaning that they're expecting people to be customers at both of those developments. So again, if we're looking at a level of service D or better at all access points, and if they're compliant with the existing ordinances for driveway locations, then it would be an acceptable report.

- Then I have a question as to our job tonight, we would not get an okay from DPW now. So one option is just to table it until the process of trying to find a mitigation that would be acceptable to the applicant and to Dave is done. The other possibility is to go ahead and look at everything else, and then leave it dependent on such a mitigation being found. Dave Buck, do you have any advice for us as to how we should continue?

- Well, you actually have three options. Like you mentioned, one is to approve it without any conditions. But keep in mind any site plan that comes through the city also goes through the same review. So I mean, even if the conditional use were approved, the site plan would still have to meet that condition. You can't waive that with the CUP. The second, you could approve it with the condition so that if the TIA does not become a level of service that's acceptable, the CUP is just not valid. So the use is not permitted there. The third would be just to deny it based on the submittal and the TIA. So what staff is recommending is approval of the use. So again, we're looking at a Conditional Use Permit with a condition that that TIA be acceptable. Again, kind of outside of our planning purview, but related to the use itself, which is a justification for a condition or a denial. And what I would probably recommend is I know the property owner, the petitioner is on, or he was on before. I can't see him now. He stopped sharing. You may wanna open up the floor for discussion. Up to you.

- I move to open the floor to the public.

- Do we have a second?

- Alder Hutchison has seconded.

- I was muted. I'm sorry. I seconded.

- Got his hand up.

- All right, we've got a motion by Commissioner Bremer, a second by Alder Hutchison to open the floor. All those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? All right. And then, is it Mr. Weslowski? You can go ahead with your name, I'm not gonna murder it for you. Sorry. If you could state your name and address for the record. And I think you might be muted. If you're calling in, it might be *6 to unmute. Nope.

- Can you give him those directions again, Lisa?

- It's *6 to unmute if you've called in on internet audio. That's what I've been told.

- He was unmuted for a minute. And then he muted.

- I know, for like a half a second in between.

- For half a second. There you go. Oh, well, I don't think.

- Maybe his volume needs to be turned up?

- How about that?

- There we go.

- That's good.

- That better?

- Yeah.

- Okay. I'm just trying to, okay. I'm Steven Weslowski. 2052 Cottage Road in Little Suamico. Yeah, I'll take any questions that you guys have them, as we've been working on this project for a long, long time. We quartered them. They've tried all so many different sites within the city that you guys don't get to see necessarily when it comes to your development company. We run a lot of numbers, and it sometimes gets exhausting. But nonetheless, whatever questions specific to the use and what we're looking to do and bring to the area there, I'll gladly do what I can to answer that.

- Since I motioned to open the floor, I guess I owe you a question, Mr. Weslowski. Can you simply respond to the concerns with traffic that Dave Hansen has been talking about, and give us a sense of your willingness to work on finding some mitigations?

- I am 100% committed to doing that. The reason I say that, we have been working with the departments for several months and doing all these studies. I have, I want to say about 15 different site plan scenarios that I have prepared for Starbucks to meet their needs, as well as to try and meet the code and everything else. So this is a very, very large and complicated process 'cause there's a lot of moving parts. Nonetheless, we went

back to the drawing board per se here at end of March, and came up with three or four different more scenarios that Starbucks could review. And they were very adamant on certain things, which we totally get. They have operational needs in order to succeed. And certainly, in today's climate, you don't want empty buildings and such after three, four years. So nonetheless, so we've developed that and what we have in front of you, they're, and I'm not sure, I wanna say that the latest site plan was there, but I noticed one thing that was updated since that particular drawing is that the double lane comes in, and then it goes to a single lane. So there's more. There's like a 15-foot buffer between the drive lane and the sidewalk versus that big wide strip of asphalt. So we actually got rid of a lot of the stuff there and moved the cars over, so closer to the building. But anyway, the synergies between the two different uses there with the gas station and the Starbucks, that was one of Starbucks's adamant things. That really, that was one of their caveats to being on this particular location, that they wanted that influx between the two different businesses there. And they work well together, in the mornings, evenings, whatever, people are stopping to get that. They'll go over there and get something from their store as well. But working with Dave, absolutely. We're all about it. Starbucks is all about it as well. They're chomping at the bit to get something done. They really are, and to get this going so that they don't, per se, miss timelines and opening stores as well. So, stuff is always complications and ramifications if timing isn't met as well. So we're getting close to the kind of do or don't here period. And we definitely working with the departments 100% to try and get something to go, whether it's the right-in/right-out. I apologize with the timing of this and hearing Mr. Hansen's report here. I heard it firsthand tonight as well from you, or same as you had done. So we hopefully could have worked with a few things there to maybe get a better something here, but we'll definitely take that in consideration and meet the whatever needs that we can. You're welcome.

- I've got a question. I drive through that area a lot. I have family that's two blocks away, and that intersection of Bellevue and Mason already has, how should I say it? There's a lot of people jumping that they're going into a gap, but maybe they shouldn't. And this is gonna exacerbate that a lot, no matter what we do. But I like the analysis found that this situation wasn't up to snuff yet, okay? It makes sense to me that it's not because if you're heading east on Mason Street, and you're in the left-center lane, and you see a left turn light before you get to Bellevue, your immediate response is "Ugh." And that's 100%, and it happens already, it happens. It's gonna happen all the time when that store is there. And if you go the other way, it's just the same thing. When someone turns right into that gas station, when you're heading west on Mason Street, you go, "Oh," and you wanna make sure there's no one to your left. So you can get around. It's kinda like an area where either you go in there or you're trying to get through there as fast as you can. That that's just the way it is. So I don't know if we can get a left turn lane there. I mean, I am a proponent of this project. I like the project. I like the store. I like the use of it. But the one trip up is this traffic pattern. If we can get a left turn lane heading west or east on Mason Street, or some way to get a flow through there that's safer than exists. So I'm pushing the think outside the box when we mitigate this. So to not just have a no left turn or no right turn, we need something fairly substantial there for safety. We really, really do. So I would hope that the negotiations have something substantial in there in terms of safety for this intersection area.

- I'm another frequent traveler through there, and I really want to agree heartily with Alder Hutchison, but I also need to ask another question that's a minor one by comparison. But it does need to be asked to Mr. Weslowski. Does Starbucks require its mermaid on each one of the four sides? Because I believe the PUD limit the number of sides that can have signs on them.

- It does. And I believe we meet that right now, as far as where the signage is placed on the actual drawings of the building. So I don't believe that there's signage allowed on the John Street side, but the Mason Street side, there is. And the colored rendering my view is a prototypical thing that they send out for us to use. So I didn't physically create that or draw it. So it's not more of a site-specific thing. So I apologize for that, but it was more of just a color representation of what the building will look like. But the signage will definitely, 100% meet the city requirements.

- So one on the Mason Street side, and?

- And then one towards the gas station.
- Got it. Thank you.
- You're very welcome.
- Anyone else on the commission has questions for the petitioner? Or is there anyone from the public that would like to speak on this?
- Then I move that we return to regular order of business.
- Second.
- Motion by Commissioner Bremer is second by Vice Chair Miller close the floor. All in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Any opposed?
- Chair Hanson, it seems like I know we went through those options before, but I think Commissioner Bremer said it earlier. It seems like maybe we need to table this conversation. I know there's three different options. So maybe Dave Buck can direct us on the three options again for us to consider.
- Sure, well actually, so I guess there is four. You can approve it, approve it with the conditions. So if you just approve it, it's still gonna have to go through the site plan approval. But the use of a drive-through restaurant will be permitted on this location. Doesn't have to be this one, but a drive-through restaurant would be permitted 'cause that's what's the CUP would be for. But during the site plan review, that site plan is still gonna come through our regular process and probably, the same comments will come out, I would assume. So that's the first option. The second would be approve it with the condition that the TIA be acceptable. And if that is the case, if the TIA is not acceptable, the drive-through restaurant use on the site would not be permitted. A new CUP would have to come forward. You could recommend denial. And then based on the submitted Traffic Impact Analysis, and any other items you have, not just that. And then that recommendation just go on to council. And then the last one is the one that you just added, where you could hold it for a future meeting, although it is my understanding that the timeline is pretty long right now and it may be a moot point to hold it for too much longer because the applicant may lose his potential purchaser or tenant. I'm not positive of that, but it's been alluded to that it's been quite a while. So by approving it with the condition, it allows them to continue to work on it together. I mean, if nothing happens and the CUP ends up running its 12-month course, then it is what it is. Then the CUP goes away. But if, let's say this business were to go away and another were to come in that had a drive-through business. At that point, as long as they follow some of the same points that were access points that were put on here, screening and all that other PUD stuff, a different restaurant could go in. But again, during site plan review, we'd still have to do a Traffic Impact Analysis. But depending on the use, they all have different amounts of vehicle traffic and that kind of stuff.
- Well, it sounds like, Dave, you gave us all the options. It sounds like option number two, approval with the condition that it meets the TIA and it still has to go back through the city to be reviewed, correct?
- Correct. That is what staff is recommending.

- And I'm assuming also with the additional condition of a more bountiful buffer on the John Street side?
- Correct.
- I like that phrasing, by the way.
- Yep, so, well, so that buffer would include the fence, which is in the code already, and no less than one tree and three shrubs for each 60 linear feet of frontage on John Street would be the added condition to soften up that fence on the outside of the fence, obviously.
- I'm inclined to make that motion. Looks like DJ is as well. I'm inclined to second it.
- Yeah. Good. Okay, shall we do it then, DJ?
- Yes.
- I'll move that.
- Second.
- I certainly don't, if this doesn't work, I certainly don't want somebody else coming in and saying, "Okay, well, we'll do it then."
- Okay, so we have a motion by Commissioner Bremer and a second by Commissioner Daniels. Is there any other discussion amongst the commission?
- Can we just review that motion? And there's a chatter back and forth. So I make sure we know what we're voting on.
- Sure, Dave? It's number two.
- I can read this back. So would be Plan Commission is recommending approval the request subject for conditions that a site plan and applicable permit applications are submitted to the Community and Economic Development Department for review and approval. Approval of the Traffic Impact Analysis by the city traffic engineer, approval of the draft Planned Unit Development PUD, and inclusion of no less one tree and three shrubs be included for each 60 linear feet of John Street frontage. Those would be the four.
- Okay. All right, so the motion by Commissioner Bremer. second by Commissioner Daniels. All those in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Any opposed? All right, and then that will move forward to City Council, the next meeting, in July, or is there one next Tuesday?
- It would be next week.

- Okay, so 28th?

- Yes.

- And I want to thank Dave Hansen for his excellent work so far on this, and wish you well along with Mr. Weslowski in working out the mitigations that might get us what we want.

- You're welcome.

- All right. Moving on to item number three, consideration with possible action on request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit for a car wash facility in a community center commercial district located at 1555 West Mason Street. Submitted by J.J. Alaily ICAP Development.

- All right. Thank you, Madam Chair. So I'm just gonna hop right-into this because similar to the previous agenda item, this was already presented at Plan Commission, and I can kind of run through the backgrounds sent back to Plan Commission as well. So initially, we have been working with the applicant on a car wash located on the corner of Sixth and Military on the west side. So that would be this pink section right here. And then the entire parcel is the Old Green Bay Plaza area. And then of course, the buffer on the outside was the 200-foot notification area. So back in, I think, oh, I have it right here, Plan Commission for April 25th, we rezoned this to C3 from C1. That would allow a car wash on that corner with a Conditional Use Permit. So initially, this was proposed internally with our city traffic engineer, Dave Hansen, who is still on the call, and Steve Grenier. We've been working with safe ways to address the driveways, the right-in/right-out curb cuts, and then also demolishing the existing Sears building. So since then, there have been some changes that I can run through as well because there is a new proposed concept plan that we would be working with in the future. So you remember seeing some of these renderings of the car wash. It's called Club Car Wash. So it's fairly upscale, says the applicant and the owner of the chain. So the future land use, as you can see, the entire area is still designated for commercial, and really using that military corridor for auto-oriented. We've got the Burger King down here, and then also a dealership for cars as well. The current zoning is still being, I guess, converted into the C3 in the corner. And we did bring up that we wanted to clean up these as well, so that it would entirely be C3. So this is the new concept of the entire parcel, but I do want to really focus in. This is the parcel, the portion of the parcel that we are focusing on to allow a car wash with a conditional use. And we can always come back to that too if we wanna see it because initially, we did have the applicant supply a right-in/right-out entrance on Military. And since then, that has been taken out. And if you look at the full concept, if I can just go in a little bit more, the new entry would be a little bit more north. And then, there's another proposed as well. And then you have the CVS as well up here. And then an alley, or there is an access point from West Mason, and also off 6th. One of the issues that the city traffic engineer, and I know he was not available for the last Plan Commission meeting where this was approved. We had also some issues. He wrote a memorandum with the 6th Street just to comply with code, and then as well with the Military. Back to PowerPoint here. Whoops. All right, so, so a lot of our conditions from the first time this was approved was focused on working with our city traffic engineer. Initially, they had completed, with TADI, a Traffic Impact Analysis in April, and then just recently, completed another one in June just to look at safety, timing, everything like that. And you can feel free to ask the applicant as well, or Dave Hansen, their feedback, comments on the newest report as well. And again, this is just the corner on 6th and Military. And another look at some renders. So as a planning staff, we are still recommending approval of a Conditional Use Permit, CUP. We would want that CSM still created that would describe the legal description and create a new lot on that corner. We would have to go through the standard site plan, review, and approval. And then the applicant would continue to work with the city staff to address those traffic, safety, and circulation issues. One of the main reasons that this was, I guess, put on held and sent back to Plan Commission was that council felt that the Military Avenue Business District voiced some concern that they wanted to be a little bit more involved and understand the general concept of this entire site. So internally and externally, staff has met and discussed with the Military Avenue Business District. Since then, they have supplied a letter of support. And they believe that the corridor plan, which our Public Works and our city traffic engineer are referencing for a lot of right-

in/right-out curb driveways on Military Avenue is a little outdated. That's what they voiced in their concerns and in their support for just a safe circulation, and allowing a Conditional Use Permit for that car wash.

- Okay. Thank you so much, Madison.

- Welcome.

- I was concerned that this was gonna be an item that we were maybe gonna have issue with, but this feels very clean. So I really appreciate all the work that all the business owners and the applicant have put in because it seems like everyone's on the same page 'cause I don't see any people in the audience to talk. So is there any questions for staff or any discussion?

- I would recommend opening the floor for Public Works. I know Steve Grenier or Dave Hansen might wanna speak out about some of their concerns.

- I don't think we have to open the floor for either of those individuals.

- Okay, thank you.

- It's a good suggestion. So let's do that. Ask Dave and Steve if they would speak on anything they would want us to consider here.

- I can start off. Steve Grenier, Department of Public Works director. I was one of the individuals tasked with developing the access restriction plan back in 2009 that we are referring to. So Public Works staff spent a good number of weeks meeting with property owners on a block-by-block basis to help negotiate cross access agreements between those businesses to limit the entire corridor, which actually begins down south of 9th, closer to Biemeret, and runs all the way up to Dousman. We stopped the access plan short of Bond. And what we did there was, the attempt was to co-locate a single larger access point, unless there were existing access points that were grandfathered in that we couldn't get the property owners to negotiate away, which is why you have the CVS entrance and one other on the north end of that block. And I know there's been some discussion, some folks have said that that access plan reflected the Sears building being there. I can tell you, it did not. If you look at the entire corridor, approximately 1 1/2 miles of that corridor, we took the same approach on all the blocks, regardless of how they were set up, big box or a variety of small condo type arrangements. And again, what you see is a drop lane that's large enough, not only to accommodate vehicles making the turn into the facility, but also provides refuge for city buses. And then the city buses also provide kind of a buffer and an acceleration lane for traffic exiting the Military. So there was a lot of thought that went into it. I know that the developer has come back with a revision to the site plan. My disappointment is although the right-in/right-out that's being proposed has moved to the north to fit the functional area that Dave Hansen has talked about. What they did was they then disconnected it from what's been referred to as Driveway A, which would be the fully functional, fully directional driveway at midblock that's in front of the current Sears building that used to be connected in the prior site plan. And they've now disconnected that. We have not had a chance, and I think Dave will speak to this. We've not had a chance. The TIA was only delivered to our office on Friday of last week, so we've not had a chance to dig into that with any type of any type of depth. However, just taking a quick review on some of the conclusions that were raised, even TADI has indicated that there is no substantive differences between how the intersections work with that southernmost driveway or not. So what we're seeing is an absence of, we're not seeing any kind of need here. It's more of a desire, and it's in direct conflict with the controlled access that we've attempted to establish out here. I'm not surprised it's Military Avenue Business Association is endorsing this because what that will do with that endorsement, if we are not able to show that there is any kind of difference between this business and any other business along that corridor, if they're auto-oriented businesses, that opens the gate for any other business along Military Avenue to request direct driveway access out to Military Avenue. And what we will wind up with, or what we stand the at least the opportunity for is making Military Avenue look more like West Mason Street or Oneida Street and , where you have a proliferation of driveways directly discharging out onto the street, which is

exactly what we were trying to avoid. So at this point, the Department of Public Works still cannot accept the right-in/right-out, even though it has been relocated to be beyond the functional area. It's inconsistent with the access plan that we developed back in 2009. Contrary to what the Military Avenue Business group has said, we do feel that it is still a valid access plan. There's been substantial development and redevelopment along the Military Avenue Corridor. And that development has occurred consistent with the access plan that we developed back in 2009. So in our opinion, we're showing that not only does that controlled access plan work, but it does also allow for that redevelopment as long as it's taken into account from day one. So with that, then I can turn over individual traffic items for Dave's consideration.

- Well, Steve, I think you pretty much hit on most of the points there. There really isn't a lot for me to add, other than I will certainly take a look at the Traffic Impact Analysis that arrived on Friday. But if the conclusions are exactly as we're interpreting them at this point in time, I certainly see an absence of need. And so with that being said, I really cannot support any sort of additional access points, even in the absence of a Military Avenue Corridor plan. Now, here we are current day. We have the plan in place. It's been working. As Steve said, we've had this since 2009, and we've had a lot of different developments. And it's a different corridor than it was when we reconstructed it. And not once have we added an access point. And to me, it's working. And to preserve the functional classification of this roadway, which is a minor arterial, that is definitely one of the goals that we have from a traffic engineering perspective, is to maintain that safe flow of traffic. That access is not a priority on a minor arterial, but rather, it's that somehow regional flow of traffic from one end of the corridor to the other, and that those access points remain at the intersections and at the plan midpoint access points that we put into that corridor plan.

- And one of the things I do wanna make the commission aware of, when we've been referring to the controlled access plan. If somebody's going to look for a written document like a comprehensive plan, you're not going to find that. The plan that was adopted was the physical road design plans that showed how the access was being restricted, and how those cross access agreements were being laid out. So the physical construction plans, as they were developed during the lead up to the reconstruction in 2010, those individual plans were brought through committee and then approved by the common council, along with oral description of what the intended objective is. So if you're going back looking for a bound copy of a plan document that came through our planning department, you're not going to find that. But what, interestingly enough, one of the things that Mr. Hansen found as we were doing some research on this subject, was as part of the Smart Growth 2022 plan, planning did identify that on major traffic corridors within the city, there was a recommendation that assess limitation plans and implement those. This is one of the first of those plans that was actually developed and implemented. So what we were doing was consistent with the provisions of the comp plan.

- Okay, and now, just for clarification, we're talking about the right-in and right-out for the future development that is slightly north of the property that we're talking about today, correct? 'Cause the site plan for today, they've taken out that access and they're saying in the future, they wanna put it further up, but is that, am I understanding that correctly? Yes?

- Yeah.

- Okay.

- So tonight, we are really only looking at allowing a car wash in this corner with a Conditional Use Permit.

- Okay, 'cause they did take that right-in/right-out from last time we saw this, but they're talking about the future development and the whole development that is coming. We're not necessarily, I'm not enunciating this well.

- You are. You are. DPW has no fundamental issue with the CUP allowing the car wash. It's when we get into the conditional approval, which requires an approved TIA and an approved site plan. Again, those curb cuts are

not under your jurisdiction. Those are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Works, and potentially on appeal to the Improvement Services Committee. We're just simply letting you know that we will be voicing objection to the curb cut in the future so that you have that information as you deliberate the CUP itself.

- Okay. All right. Thank you so much for that information, Mr. Grenier.

- And going to, Madison, could you put that back up again please?

- Oh yeah. Sure. Just let me know if you want me to zoom out or anything.

- If you could just zoom out slightly. Okay, and then pan down a little bit. There you go. Perfect. That, right there is fine. Okay, so what we're looking at, we'd spoken under the last item about potential mitigative measures. What we would consider, DPW would consider as a potential mitigative measure where that newly proposed right-in/right-out is, would be to eliminate that right-in/right-out. Then Madison, if you could hit your cursor back to the right just a bit. Okay, nope. You went too far just with the little connecting road that comes up, that runs kind of north/south here.

- [Madison] This one?

- By the driveway that we would not like to have.

- [Madison] Okay. Here?

- That north/south paralleling Military Avenue. If that were to continue all the way up to where it says to the north with that full access, just make that one TN, and utilize that driveway that has full access, we would consider that acceptable. That would be a continuous cross access arrangement between all of the various parcels, which is consistent with how we've approached the rest of the Military Avenue Corridor.

- Okay. All right. Thank you so much for that.

- So on the recommendation from staff, are we covered on our basis there for DPW's comments here? There's no additional conditions we need to add based off the staff recommendation?

- Yes, you are correct.

- In that case move be approved.

- Second.

- Motion by Vice Chair Miller and a second by Commissioner Rovinski. Is there any further discussion on this item?

- I would like to have one other question answered, and I think, probably, Steve Grenier is the one to do it. How do you get in and out of the car wash if it is being built first?

- There is currently a pretty wide open, there's sort of a defacto alley that exists that runs north/south down the middle of the block that comes in off of 6th.

- Okay. That's all. I know what you mean.

- Okay. So that would be one way in, and they're going to have to demo at least part of the Sears building to build the car wash 'cause that's going to occupy some of the space where the auto center and the rental center

and pickup counter used to be at the rear of Sears. So as that building comes down, until development occurs north of the building, that will be a larger open area that temporary access could easily be made available to gain access to the one driveway in the center of the block, the mid block.

- Thank you.

- Okay. So we have motion on the floor by Vice Chair Miller and the second by Commissioner Rovinski. Is there any further discussion? Hearing that, I'll go ahead with the vote. All those in favor?

- [Members] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right, and then that item will go forward to City Council for the June 28th meeting. And moving on to our public hearing. This public hearing has been properly posted and public notification has been published in the "Green Bay Press Gazette." The Plan Commission is interested in hearing public comments on the subject agenda items. We invite your comments and ask that after your name has been called, you state your address, whether you represent a group or association, whether you- Or only providing information in this matter, and your comments or concerns. We also ask that you confine your testimony to facts related to the proposal at hand and avoid repetitive testimony. You must be recognized by the Plan Commission in order to speak. And please address your comments to the chair. Comments will be limited to three minutes. We will now open the public hearing on agenda item number four, public hearing on request to authorize a conditional use permit for a two-family dwelling located at 420 South Van Buren Street. submitted by Tim Denissen, NeighborWorks Green Bay property owner. And if staff-

- All right, thank you, Madam Chair, I can give some background on this. So yeah, this is located on 420 South Van Buren Street, and is in an R1 district. However, it is currently being used as a two-family dwelling, which would not be allowed to continue being used as this and comply with code, unless this has a Conditional Use Permit. And this was put forward by NeighborWorks. They purchased the property in 2015, and have been working on plans to renovate, rehabilitate, and improve not only the existing structure, but also adding to the neighborhood itself for affordable housing. They were, the city staff let them know that they are currently not complying in the R1 low density residential district, and they would need a Conditional Use Permit to continue to have this structure. It was also noted by the applicant that since the late, or sorry, early 1970s, this has been a two-family dwelling, and there's a driveway as you can see, and a garage in the back. And the applicant is on the line as well, if he would like to add any additional information.

- All right. Thank you so much, Madison. And then with this public hearing, we're looking to hear from anyone who's looking to speak in favor, in opposition, or providing information only. Again, if you could just state your name and address for the record. If you're calling in on an internet audio, it's *6 unmute yourself.

- Yeah, I can speak to this. Tim Dennison project manager at NeighborWorks Green Bay. My address is 838 Brookridge Street, Allouez. And I'll give you just a little bit of a history. There's a lot more history with this property than development, but I'm gonna stick to development. We purchased it in 2015, mainly because it's adjacent to our Farmory building. We had visions of having use in that project. So we continued to rent it. We did some modest renovations just to make it safe and sanitary and decent. And we rented it for a few years. And then last fall, well, last year, we decided to make a big change. We were working with Green Bay Public Schools, the Bridges program and their renovation team. And we thought this would be a good property because it needed a lot of work, and there wasn't a lot of funding available. So we could maybe make it work as a very nice property if we went down that road. So we decided to go down that road. I applied for a permit for two-family renovation with the City of Green Bay. It was approved. We started the work. Then when we got to a point where we needed mechanical and building rough-in inspections, the train kind of went off the track. The city informed us that the building was not compliant. In their records, it was a single family. And I'd been in this game long enough. I'm quite the fossil that I know the cabinets are Merillat from the 1970s. The dormer has two roofs on it. So the it's been a two-family for a long time. So what we'd like to do is continue the renovation and seek residents to occupy it.

- Thank you so much for your testimony, Mr. Denissen. Is there anyone else wishing to speak on this item? Go ahead, Mr. Halvorsen.

- Hi, good evening, Madam Chair and members of the commission. My name is Noel Halvorsen. Also work with NeighborWorks Green Bay, whose address is 437 South Jackson Street. And thank you for your time. This evening would hope that we could continue to operate this building in the manner to which it has been accustomed for almost 50 years, and just have it officially recognized and permitted by the power of the City of Green Bay, so that instead of offering one unit for modest income households, we can offer two units to modest income households 'cause we all know we've got a significant housing crunch going on right now. Thank you.

- Thank you so much for your testimony. Is there anyone else wishing to speak on this item? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Let the record reflect that no one has come forward, and this public hearing is now closed. And moving on to the corresponding actionable item, item number five, consideration and possible action on the request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit for a two-family dwelling located at 420 South Van Buren Street, submitted by Tim Denissen, NeighborWorks Green Bay property owner.

- [Madison] All right, thank you, Madam Chair. Moving forward, our future land use within our Smart Growth 2022 plan has this as low to medium density residential. So this would align this Conditional Use Permit, allowing a two-family dwelling. As you can see, it is surrounded by mostly residential. And then if you look at the current zoning, it is all low density residential, R1 single family dwelling. And then we've got some commercial as you can see just to the southwest. So staff is recommending approval of this with the condition to provide code compliant parking. That would mean two cars in the driveway or outside, and two covered or under a storage unit or in a garage. And this just helps us with our two-family dwellings not using too much street parking. Staff believe that this is also a cleanup on the city side as well, and even in the Brown County database, it did have a single unit. So we're just looking towards cleanup as well.

- Okay. Thank you so much, Madison.

- I would make a motion to approve.

- I will second.

- So motion by Commissioner Rovinski, a second by Alder Hutchison. Is there any discussion on this item? All right, NeighborWorks, everything that I've seen them do, they do good work. I looked at the property that was next door to this over 20 years ago. And that's been a two-family for a long, both of those are two families for ever. So I know that they're gonna do a great job on this property. So I'm excited to see it.

- And I would just say to echo that, Chair Hanson. I walk by that neighborhood as kind of part of my neighborhood. And I was wondering why the remodeling was taking so long, and now I kind of know why. So I definitely know that the work that's being done, it looks like it's gonna be a great addition to that neighborhood.

- All right. So I guess going now, I have motion by Commissioner Rovinski. Second by Alder Hutchison to approve with the parking conditions. All those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? All right, and then that will move forward then to the next City Council meeting for June 28th. And item number six.

- Thank you.

- You're welcome. And then moving on item number six, consideration with possible action on request to vacate public utility easements located at 1100 University Avenue, submitted by Patrick Skalecki, GRAEF.

- Okay, I'm gonna share my screen again. All right. So this is an action item. Again, there is no public hearing. As you can tell, the 100-block of University Avenue, this is known as Golden House. The application for the easement discontinuance was put forward because they are completely reconstructing and improving the existing parcel and the existing structure on the lot. So it's very hard to see, but there is a faint 10-by-12 public utility easement that is going to be in the way of their future developments. So that's why they are asking for the easement to be released and discontinued at 1100 University Avenue. They have big plans to reconstruct, and they cannot until this easement is released. This has gone through an agency review internally and externally, with over 20 different agencies, including Public Works, Public Service, AT&T, Water Utility, Parks and Rec, New Water. Nobody voiced any concerns or objections. And it's just a very odd utility easement that is no longer necessary, but is still listed on the plans. We wanted to help the applicant to have permission to continue building. Our future land use does designate most parcels along the East River as park or open space. However, in our current zoning, this parcel Golden House is listed as office residential. And you can see the parcel itself adjacent, you have a lot of residential and then, you've got the East River. And then other parking, commercial business, single family homes. You've got a real mixture, but Golden House does stand out with its OR. As you can see, this is to the right way where the utility easement is currently located. And this is what they're asking for a discontinuance. And you can see again, right here. And again, no objections, no concerns, no questions from anyone. And staff is recommending approval of the request so they can continue with their construction.

- Motion to approve.

- Thank you so much.

- Oh, I did have a question on it.

- Oh, wait.

- Oh, I didn't have a question. I just wanted to make a comment on our preliminary Plan Commission agendas, which we shoot out several months in advance. Because the East River Trail is being installed, there's a Certified Survey Map and a cleanup rezone will be coming for basically that whole stretch. Just so you know. Just wanted to throw that in, in case you were concerned with the zoning.

- Thank you.

- All right. So do we have a motion?

- The motion stands.

- Motion by Commissioner Rovinski? Is that a second from you, commissioner?

- Second from me.

- Okay. Any further discussion? Hearing that, I'll go ahead with the vote. All those in favor?

- Aye.

- Yay.

- Any opposed? All right, and then that will move forward then to City Council. Moving on to informational director's report. Mr. Stechschulte.

- Good evening, plan commissioners. Let's see, unfortunately, Mr. Buck turned his camera off. I did want him to, just everybody to take a good look at him and know that he is keeping his sanity as our interim zoning administrator, at least for the time being. Staff has been pretty busy making up for Paul in his absence. But we are keeping the ship floating and moving things forward here as we go. We have had a couple of interviews already. We've had a couple promising candidates. So looking to get that filled sooner rather than later. But say so far, so kudos to staff for kind of taking on all the other duties that Paul has done, has been divvying those up and keeping things moving forward. So I'm working on basically at least three new TIF creations that we'll be bringing forward probably through the Redevelopment Authority, then coming on to City Council. Two of those are downtown. One of them will be out in the Grand View Industrial Park. Folks remember seeing that with Carnivore Project for that area. So it's relating to those. Just a note of those. We have kept those a little smaller than we have in the past, just because of the uncertainty in the economy, trying to mitigate any changes in value going down. We actually have occasions where, obviously, in this type of market where real estate is so valuable, if there is some sort of hiccup or a bump, those values can drop and actually make it harder for the TIF District actually to work. So Dave and certainly, and other staff has worked very carefully to kind of craft a smaller, very risk minimal types of TIF District that we'll be bringing through the Joint Review Board here, starting this Thursday and starting that process formally. I guess, one other important note, we have started, almost done with a request for proposals for the JBS property that was donated to the city. Working on trying to figure out, been a very intensive process, trying to do some visioning and figure out exactly really what that property can hold on it. Trying to balance things like certainly housing, obviously getting some creative housing for JBS employees and other employees in the city. Really kind of a destination community park has been a priority of the mayor, in addition to, I think, an urban farm, an urban agriculture concept that we're trying to work into the site and adjacent properties. So this is not gonna be anybody that just your normal developer down the street could probably jump in on. This is gonna have to be kind of more of an urban planned, very urban concept to get started. And then hopefully, bring along a developer who can follow through with those. So looking forward to bringing some updates forward to the Plan Commission as that process proceeds forward. And with that, I'll be happy to answer any questions on any projects if anybody has any. DJ?

- I do have a question, and I'm bringing it up again. We had a Whitney Park Neighborhood Association meeting of last month, and it was brought up again that MKE Vue that they do not plan on building anymore town homes. So I know this was, I mentioned it several, several months ago. So FYI, from what the neighbors in that association are hearing is that there's no plan to build the remaining six town homes for that property. So just as a FYI, 'cause I know they received funds for the project.

- Yep, and I think we're keeping an eye on that valuation, DJ, and in terms of their actual development agreement, and have at least had a preliminary conversation as to what, certainly with this kind of uncertainty with costs and so forth, it's probably even less likely than the first time they mentioned it to us. We are certainly working with them, having kind of an ongoing, not very active conversation with them, but certainly, when they come up on an annual request for their payments that they're due, reaching up and asking them if they're willing to entertain another developer or what, then when. So we certainly have not, staff has certainly not abandoned the additional development on that site, but knowing that developer may not moving forward with it, we may be trying to find somebody else to help finish that project. Good question.

- Thank you.

- All right.

- Anything else?
- No. Thank you for Neil.
- Thank you.
- I'm sorry, my words are not working today. I really apologize. So we'll just move on. The date of the next meeting is July 11th of 2022.
- And with that in mind, I move that we adjourn tonight.
- Second.
- All right, motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Commissioner Rovinski for adjournment. All those in favor?
- [Members] Aye.
- Any opposed? All right. See you guys in July.
- Thank you, everybody.
- Stay cool.
- Bye, all.