



MINUTES OF THE GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION

MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 2023, 6:00 PM

**In person at City Hall, Room 604 - The Harry Maier Room.
Virtual attendance is also available 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, Ken Rovinski, and Michael Poradek.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the January 9, 2023, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the November 28, 2022, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. (SV 22-02) Consideration with possible action on request to vacate unimproved portions of

roadways known as Rona Lane and an unnamed street east of Crestwood Drive and south of W. Mason Street, submitted by Department of Public Works, on behalf of the Oneida Nation, property owner (Ald. J. Brunette, District 12).

Speaker(s):

David Buck - Staff Member

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Ken Rovinski to approve the request to vacate unimproved portions of roadways known as Rona Lane and an unnamed street east of Crestwood Drive and south of W. Mason Street. Motion Passed.

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

2. (CPA 22-02) Public Hearing on request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for properties located at 3251, 3263, 3279 Nicolet Drive, Tax Parcels 22-64, 22-65, and 22-66-1, from a mixture of Low Density Residential Uses, Commercial Uses, and Park Uses to solely Park Uses, submitted by Matt Kriese, Brown County Parks Director, on behalf of Brown County, property owner (Ald. J. Grant, District 1).

Chair Lisa Hanson read into record the rules and procedures for tonight's public hearings. All public hearings have been properly posted in the Press Times.

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the floor for the Public Hearing on request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for properties located at 3251, 3263, 3279 Nicolet Drive, Tax Parcels 22-64, 22-65, and 22-66-1, from a mixture of Low Density Residential Uses, Commercial Uses, and Park Uses to solely Park Uses, submitted by Matt Kriese, Brown County Parks Director, on behalf of Brown County, property owner (Ald. J. Grant, District 1).

Speaker(s):

Jon Leroy - Staff Member

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

3. (CPA 22-02) Consideration with possible action on request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for properties located at 3251, 3263, 3279 Nicolet Drive, Tax Parcels 22-64, 22-65, and 22-66-1, from a mixture of Low Density Residential Uses, Commercial Uses, and Park Uses to solely Park Uses, submitted by Matt Kriese, Brown County Parks Director, on behalf of Brown County, property owner (Ald. J. Grant, District 1).

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to open the floor. Motion Passed.

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

Speaker(s):

Jon Leroy - Staff Member

David Buck - Staff Member

Matt Kriese - Director of Brown County Parks Department (Applicant)

Moved by Jacob Miller, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to close the floor and return to regular

order of business. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Jim Hutchison, seconded by Ken Rovinski to amend the City's Agenda of the Green Bay Planning Commission January 9, 2023 Page 2 Comprehensive Plan for properties located at 3251, 3263, 3279 Nicolet Drive, Tax Parcels 22-64, 22-65, and 22-66-1, from a mixture of Low Density Residential Uses, Commercial Uses, and Park Uses to solely Park Uses. Motion Passed.

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

4. (ZP 22-42) Public Hearing on request to rezone properties located at 3251, 3263, 3279 Nicolet Drive from General Commercial (C1) and Low-Density Residential (R1) to Public Institutional (PI), submitted by Brown County Parks Department, on behalf of Brown County, property owners (Ald. J. Grant, District 1).

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the floor for the Public Hearing on request to rezone properties located at 3251, 3263, 3279 Nicolet Drive from General Commercial (C1) and Low-Density Residential (R1) to Public Institutional (PI), submitted by Brown County Parks Department, on behalf of Brown County, property owners (Ald. J. Grant, District 1).

Speaker(s):

Jon Leroy - Staff Member

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

5. (ZP 22-42) Consideration with possible action on request to rezone properties located at 3251, 3263, 3279 Nicolet Drive from General Commercial (C1) and Low-Density Residential (R1) to Public Institutional (PI), submitted by Brown County Parks Department, on behalf of Brown County, property owners (Ald. J. Grant, District 1).

Speaker(s):

Jon Leroy - Staff Member

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Jacob Miller to approve the request to rezone properties located at 3251, 3263, 3279 Nicolet Drive from General Commercial (C1) and Low-Density Residential (R1) to Public Institutional (PI). Motion Passed.

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

6. (CPA 22-03) Public Hearing on request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for a portion of properties located in the 600 Block of Adams Street, from Park to Downtown, submitted by Department of Community & Economic Development, petitioner, and Miller Land Investments, LLC and Brogan Family Trust, LLC, property owners (Ald. B. Johnson, District 9).

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the floor for the Public Hearing on request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for a portion of properties located in the 600 Block of Adams Street, from Park to Downtown, submitted by Department of Community & Economic Development, petitioner, and Miller Land Investments, LLC and Brogan Family Trust, LLC, property owners (Ald. B. Johnson,

District 9).

Speaker(s):

David Buck - Staff Member

Attorney Dave Dewick (sp?)

Thomas Saharsky - 739 S. Irwin, GB

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

7. (CPA 22-03) Consideration with possible action on request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for a portion of properties located in the 600 Block of Adams Street, from Park to Downtown, submitted by the Department of Community & Economic Development, petitioner, and Miller Land Investments, LLC and Brogan Family Trust, LLC, property owners (Ald. B. Johnson, District 9).

Moved by Jacob Miller, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to open the floor. Motion Passed.

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

Speaker(s)

David Buck - Staff Member

Thomas Saharsky - 739 S. Irwin, GB

Moved by Jacob Miller, seconded by Derius Daniels to close the floor. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Ken Rovinski to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for a portion of properties located in the 600 Block of Adams Street, from Park to Downtown. Motion Passed.

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

8. (ZP 22-43) Public hearing on request to rezone the 600 Block of S. Adams Street from Light Industrial (LI) and Public/Institutional (PI) to Downtown (DI) and Public Institutional (PI), submitted by The Department of Community & Economic Development, petitioner, and Miller Land Investments, LLC and Brogan Family Trust, LLC, property owners (Ald. B. Johnson, District 9).

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the floor for the Public Hearing on request to rezone the 600 Block of S. Adams Street from Light Industrial (LI) and Public/Institutional (PI) to Downtown (DI) and Public Institutional (PI), submitted by The Department of Community & Economic Development, petitioner, and Miller Land Investments, LLC and Brogan Family Trust, LLC, property owners (Ald. B. Johnson, District 9).

Speaker(s)

David Buck - Staff Member

Thomas Saharsky - Citizen

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

9. (ZP 22-43) Consideration with possible action on the request to rezone the 600 Block of S. Adams Street from Light Industrial (LI) and Public/Institutional (PI) to Downtown (DI) and Public Institutional (PI), submitted by Department of Community & Economic Development, petitioner, and Miller Land Investments, LLC and Brogan Family Trust, LLC, property owners (Ald. B. Johnson, District 9).

Speaker(s)

David Buck - Staff member

Mary Jaekles - 705 S. Adams Street - Correspondence read into record by David Buck

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Sidney Bremer to rezone the 600 Block of S. Adams Street from Light Industrial (LI) and Public/Institutional (PI) to Downtown (DI) and Public Institutional (PI). Motion Passed.

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

10. (ZP 22-31) Public hearing on the request to establish a Planned Unit Development at 216 S. Military Avenue to permit the development of multiple-family residential use, submitted by Gorman & Co., applicant, Henry Real Estate Development LLC, property owner (Ald. M. Eck, District 11).

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the floor for the Public Hearing on request to establish a Planned Unit Development at 216 S. Military Avenue to permit the development of multiple-family residential use, submitted by Gorman & Co., applicant, Henry Real Estate Development LLC, property owner (Ald. M. Eck, District 11).

Speaker(s)

Jon LeRoy - Staff Member

Gary Pond - 1474 Finch Lane

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

11. (ZP 22-31) Consideration and possible action on request to establish a Planned Unit Development at 216 S. Military Avenue to permit the development of multiple-family residential use, submitted by Gorman & Co., applicant, Henry Real Estate Development LLC, property owner (Ald. M. Eck, District 11).

Speaker(s)

Jon LeRoy - Staff Member

Neil Stechschulte - Staff Member

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Sidney Bremer to hold over the request to establish a Planned Unit Development at 216 S. Military Avenue to permit the development of multiple-family residential use. Motion Passed.

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

12. (ZP 22-41) Public hearing on request to amend the Planned Unit Development at 216 S. Military Avenue, amending the boundaries of the PUD, submitted by Mau & Associates, applicant, on behalf of Henry Real Estate Development LLC, property owner (Ald. M. Eck, District 11).

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the floor for the Public Hearing on request to amend the Planned Unit Development at 216 S. Military Avenue, amending the boundaries of the PUD, submitted by Mau & Associates, applicant, on behalf of Henry Real Estate Development LLC, property owner (Ald. M. Eck, District 11).

Speaker(s)

Jon LeRoy - Staff Member

Leah Weycher - Citizen

David Buck - Staff Member

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

13. (ZP 22-41) Consideration with possible action on request to amend a Planned Unit Development at 216 S. Military Avenue to amend the boundaries of the PUD, submitted by Mau & Associates, applicant, on behalf of Henry Real Estate Development LLC, property owner (Ald. M. Eck, District 11).

Speaker(s)

Jon LeRoy

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Michael Poradek to hold over the request to amend a Planned Unit Development at 216 S. Military Avenue to amend the boundaries of the PUD. Motion Passed. Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, Jim Hutchison, Michael Poradek, No- None, Abstain- None.

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Director's Report.

Neil Stechschulte presented the Director's Report.

2. Date of next meeting: January 23, 2023

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Jacob Miller to adjourn. Motion Passed.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- [Lisa] Good evening and thank you, to the Monday, January 9th meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission. We will start with a roll call. Chair Lisa Hanson, present. Vice Chair Jacob Miller.

- [Jacob] Present.

- [Lisa] Alder Jim Hutchison.

- [Jim] Present.

- [Lisa] Commissioner Sidney Bremer.
- Development Agreement Present.
- [Lisa] Commissioner Darius Daniels.
- [Darius] Present.
- [Lisa] Commissioner Ken Rovinski.
- [Ken] Present.
- [Lisa] And Commissioner Michael Poradek.
- [Michael] Present.
- [Lisa] All right, moving on to the approval of the agenda. Approval of the January 9th, 2023 meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.
- Motion to approve.
- Second.
- [Lisa] Motion by Commissioner Rovinski, second by Vice Chair Miller. All those in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- [Lisa] Any opposed? All right, moving on to the approval of minutes. Approval of the minutes from the November 28th, 2022 meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.
- So moved.
- Second.
- [Lisa] Motion by Alder Hutchinson, second by Commissioner Rovinski. All those in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- [Lisa] Any opposed? All right, and then moving on to regular business. Item number one. Consideration with possible action on request to vacate unimproved portions of roadways known as Rona Lane and an unnamed street east of Crestwood Drive and south of West Mason Street. Submitted by the Department of Public Works on behalf of the Oneida Nation, the property owner.
- [David] Thank you, Madam Chairman. So, this is part of a map of the west side of the City, part of the west side of the City, you'll see West Mason Street up here on the north, you've got West Mason Street Frontage Road, right below it. You have Crestwood Drive here on the left side of the map, Trojan Way here on the right and then Packerland just a little bit further over. So, what I'm kinda showing you in here is this is an aerial photo of the City, the blue lines are property lines, the green lines are street right-of-way lines. And the dash lines are lines that have been placed on the City's official map for future roadway purposes. So, they're not dedicated to the public, but they are reserved for roadways. Now, this area currently is all owned... Well, before I get to that, you'll see the two little yellow dashes, those are the two, the unnamed street on the south and Rona on the north. Those have been dedicated to the public as part of some type of land division that

happened over the last 20, 30 years, but they have not been improved. So, those two little pieces, they're dedicated, you can kinda see like this area right here in green, which is Brocoin Way, I believe, that is a dedicated street. So this is, sort of, before they dedicated them, they dedicate them as part of a subdivision typically, and that's what we have here on these two little sub-pieces. And I'll go up a little bit into the next slide here. Now this is just a colored map. So, as all of you know, about a fifth of the City is part of the Oneida Nation, and the Oneida Nation the City. So, this area is predominantly owned by either the Nation itself or it's in trust in the Nation's interest. So, everything you see here in yellow is in trust, and then the parcels you see in blue are outright owned by the Oneida Nation. They're not in trust, but they're owned by the Nation. So, a lot of these dedicated roadways, not dedicated roadways, but planned roadways, fall in the Oneida Nation themselves. So, Oneida is currently gonna be coming through and looking at doing some more development within this area. The one thing I will point out here, if you notice, so Chief Hill Drive, you can see is an improved road, as well as all these roads down in this area, but you'll notice there's no right-of-way lines. These are all-right-of ways. Because it is in trust, there is a different platting mechanism that the Oneida Nation uses than the City or the county or any municipality or any . Even though these roads are installed and typically maintained by the City through intergovernmental agreement, they are not actually platted right of ways. So, that being said, when Oneida comes through to do more development into this area, they do not need platted roads. So, they're requesting that these two actual dedicated pieces of roadway, which are very small, unusable, be vacated. And in that way, they will come back when they do the development with a potential new roadway pattern, and they can lay out their lots and do their development. But while these dedicated rights-of-way are in here, they cannot go over the top of it. Now, the northern right-of-way piece, there is utilities in that section. So even if vacated, the City will retain easements in there, the storm sewer, they would keep it as an easement. So, I'll get up a little bit closer. This is a survey of the unnamed street on the north, and you can see the little stub of Rona on the south. And then these are just a little bit closer shots of them. But with that, we talked with Public Works, actually they are the requesters on behalf of the Oneida Nation to vacate those streets. There is no use for them or us as a City. So, we are recommending approval of the request contingent upon the regular waiting period in-between the public hearings. And one condition, that we retain easement rights for the existing storm and sanitary sewers in the unnamed street area.

- Thank you, David.

- Welcome.

- Development Agreement Unless anybody has any questions, since these roadways are unimproved, unused and unneeded by the City, I move approval.

- [Ken] Second.

- [Lisa] We have motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Commissioner Rovinski. Any more discussion amongst the Commission or questions? All right, then we'll go ahead with the votes. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- [Lisa] Any opposed? All right, and then that will move forward to the next City Council meeting that is...

- [Lisa] What is today, the 9th?

- Development Agreement The 17th I believe it is.

- [Lisa] Then that'll to the Council for January 17th. All right. Okay, and then moving on to item number two, which is hearings. This public hearing has been properly posted and public notification has been published in "The Press Times". The Plan Commission is interested in hearing public comments on the subject agenda items. We invite your comments and ask that after your name has been called, you state your address, whether you represent a group or association, whether you favor, oppose, or are only providing information

in this matter and your comments or concerns. We also ask that you confine your testimony to facts related to the proposal at hand and avoid repetitive testimony. Questions may be asked during the public hearing, but will not be answered until the upcoming of the actionable item. You must be recognized by the Plan Commission in order to speak and please address your comments through the Chair. Comments will be limited to three minutes. To speak during this public hearing, if you're in-person, you can stand up. If you're calling in virtually, you may unmute yourself at the bottom of the screen, use the raise hand function on Zoom. Physically raise your hand if you are using the video feature or press star six to unmute yourself if you are calling in. And we will now open the public hearing on item number two. Public hearing on request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for properties located at 3251, 3263, 3279 Nicolet Drive, tax parcels 22-64, 22-65, and 22-66-1 from a mixture of low-density residential uses, commercial uses and park uses to solely park uses. Submitted by Matt Creasy, Brown County Parks Director, on behalf of Brown County, the property owner.

- [Matt] Thank you, Madam Chair. So Dave, next slide please? Just a brief overview, the properties are located in of Nicolet Drive. This is between the church and . You'll see this is the areal view from 2020. In the meantime, these buildings have been removed. And this is in conjunction with a rezone, that will be the next public hearing, to go ahead and change that fully into park public uses.

- [Lisa] Thank you so much. All right, and now with this public hearing, we're looking to hear from anyone who wants to speak in favor, in opposition, or just adding their comments. Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Let the record reflect that no one came forward and this public hearing is now closed. Moving on to the corresponding actionable item, item number three. Consideration with possible action on request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for properties located at at 3251, 3263, 3279 Nicolet Drive, tax parcels 22-64, 22-65, and 22-66-1, from a mixture of low-density residential uses, commercial uses, and park uses to solely park uses. Submitted by Matt Creasy, Brown County Parks Director, on behalf of Brown County, the property owner.

- [Chuck] To give a larger overview of both this and the rezone here, the County Park Department... The county itself purchased this land a few years back and was working with neighbors here in the past few years to come up with a plan to redevelop this old commercial facility along with the former into a boat launch public park. The county's been working with neighbors here at a handful of different public meetings over the course of the past year to get to where they're at right now. So right now, next slide, with the . You can see what's been the hodgepodge here over the course of the years. Most of the site is parks, even though this was the old Eagle's Nest, you can see they have the commercial red in there. And then to the north and south the low-density residential. Next. This is the rezoning here in the future, but just to note that this was C I uses for the property and R I to the south. So next slide. This is what the area looks like right now. This is a street view back in November of 2022. You can see the improvements were taken down here over the course of time as the county is looking to prepare to make improvements here in this coming year. Next slide, please. With that in mind, while the Commission's not approving a site plan per se, they have provided a contextual site plan that in general would go ahead and meet the requirements here for land uses here in the future. So, the comprehensive plan is to go ahead and , try to go ahead and make the entire three parcels into one singular land use, which will allow for the facilitation of the rezone then to also have one land use. When it comes to the comp plan amendments, you'll note in your staff report staff didn't feel there were any issues here as far as . In fact, it's enhancing them with the additional park space here for users. So next. With this in mind, staff's recommending approval to change the designation from the mixture of low-density residential, commercial and parks to parks.

- [Lisa] Thank you so much, Chuck. And Commissioner Bremer, I guess you living in that general area, have you been to these meetings at all? I'm just curious if you know.

- No, I haven't. Thank you for asking. In fact, I was not aware of the meetings, so that was of great interest to me.

- [Lisa] Yeah, I know I had seen this plan somewhere earlier and I'm personally excited by it, Eagle's Nest was vacant for so long.
- [Chuck] The plan has been taken in front of the County Board.
- Right. Okay.
- [Chuck] There was some media attention to it back in September with some meetings. There was meetings at both Pelican Park, Resch Expo, and then finally at the site itself back in September.
- [Lisa] Oh, excellent. Thank you.
- And as I understood, importantly those meetings were also available on Zoom for people who lived elsewhere.
- [Chuck] That is correct. We did have one Zoom invite, yup.
- Thank you.
- [Lisa] The floor is not open, so actually only the Commission is able to speak at this time, I'm sorry. Is there any discussion amongst the Commission or do we have any questions for... Yeah?
- [Speaker] I've got a question, just a general question. Is there a stream on the north side of this site?
- [Chuck] There is a waterway , in this area, back up that way.
- [Speaker] Is that just gonna be maintained or is there any development of that? Because flooding is an issue along this roadway, I know, is there gonna be any work with regard to that?
- [Chuck] I would defer to staff who is here from Brown County to go ahead and...
- [Speaker] So, right now, this is kind of a comprehensive plan amendment. Any type of development that would happen, even after the zoning changes, would all have to meet our flood plan and our stormwater...
- [Speaker] Okay. So, this is just addressing the zoning.
- [Lisa] This is the comprehensive plan, we're on the comp plan right now?
- [Speaker] Correct. And even the zoning action which...
- [Lisa] . This plan, they'd still have to meet code, even if this was the plan shown in front of you right now.
- Okay.
- Once the zoning changes.
- [Chuck] They've put forth the effort to go ahead and bring forward a pretty substantial concept plan here throughout the past months, but we're not actually taking an action on the concept plan itself.
- Another matter of curiosity, if I might, I'm curious about the archeological artifacts that have been found and whether they've been reported to the Wisconsin Historical Society and their division of archeology and whether they've been dated?

- [Speaker] I do not have that answer.

- [Chuck] The petitioner may have that, Sid. Yeah, they could probably answer it when we get to that. That wouldn't be something we really ask them during a comp plan amendment, or even a zone change for that matter. But we would ask them when the site plan comes through.

- I understand that, but actually it is related to the intention to identify the , because that would be of public interest. It might well be a park feature.

- [Speaker] So yeah, you may wanna open the floor and colleagues could probably speak on that, if you so choose.

- So moved.

- Second.

- [Lisa] Motion by Commissioner Bremer. Second by Alder Hutchinson to open the floor. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- [Lisa] Any opposed? All right, you can state your name and address for the record, please?

- [Matt] Good evening, Matt Creasy, Brown County Parks Director. Address would be 2024 Lakeview Drive, Suamico, Wisconsin, 54173. So that is a valid question on the archeological finds that we found on site. And as one would predict, located along Lake Michigan, AKA Green Bay, it is a Native American grounds for hunting, fishing, etc. And we did have a state licensed archeologist, Kevin with the Neville Public Museum, out on site in 2021 and he found pottery, he found fire-cracked rocks and chert flakes, some thermal shads and some other pottery type of items in there. They were unable to date, but they are currently located at the Neville Public Museum in their storage facility. So that area, I'm talking off cue here, but that area is going to be preserved as parkland undisturbed in the future.

- I appreciate your attention to that. I would also urge you to consider whether or not there might be some signage that would show the materials that have been found there, and might also include a land acknowledgement which would certainly be appropriate along this much used area for indigenous peoples.

- [Matt] Very good point. We will take that into consideration.

- Thank you, that's all I ask.

- [Lisa] Any further discussion or questions? I guess we can close the floor.

- Motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- [Lisa] Motion by Vice Chair Miller, second by Alder Hutchinson. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- [Lisa] Any opposed?

- Move to.

- Second.

- [Lisa] Okay, motion by Vice Chair Miller, second by Commissioner Rovinski. Any further discussion? Hearing none, I'll go ahead with the voice vote. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- [Lisa] Any opposed? Approved. And we'll move that forward to City Council for January 17th. Next item, item number four, public hearing on request to rezone properties located at 3251, 3263, 3279 Nicolet Drive from general commercial and low-density residential to public institutional. Submitted by Brown County Parks Department on behalf of Brown County, the property owners.

- [Speaker] Thank you, Madam Chair. , so move on to public hearing.

- [Lisa] Okay, excellent. Is there anyone looking to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Let the record reflect that no one came forward and this public hearing is now closed. Moving on to the corresponding actionable item, item number five. Consideration with possible action on request to rezone properties located at 3251, 3263, 3279 Nicolet Drive from general commercial and low-density residential to public institutional. Submitted by Brown County Parks Department on behalf of Brown County, the property owner.

- [Speaker] Thank you, Madam Chair. So, this rezone will allow the to happen to make the full property itself in compliance now with CI and RI. Parks are allowed, but this will just truly make the property hold in the future. That's all I have. Thank you.

- [Lisa] Thank you very much. Any discussion or questions?

- [Speaker] Sid has a question.

- [Lisa] Oh, well go ahead Commissioner Bremer.

- Thank you. I wasn't sure whether this was more appropriately asked now or with the previous question. But I'm wondering, have there been any attempts made to figure out how to calm the traffic along here? I know that's a concern of neighbors, which you would expect, this is an incredible plan for the use of the entire City and the area, but for the people who live nearby, it is going to increase traffic along the roadway that used to be used for a lot of walking and is now almost unusable for that purpose.

- [Speaker] Right. So, when we were looking at what this property has meant over the course of time, we kept in mind that back in the '80s and '90s, until up until 2011, it was a commercial site that had traffic to it a year. So, now this becoming a boat launch, there will be more traffic impact than what has happened here over the past 11 years of the site. But it would be restoring back to what has happened and bringing activity back to the Bay. So, with that in mind, and what looks to be the property itself as far as in and out traffic. Mind you, we're not on that right now, this is a rezone, the site plan will go ahead and address that. But staff felt it appropriate for the boat launch to be there with the history of the site.

- The area is of course much more densely populated than it was when the Eagle's Nest was a commercial feature of it.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- [Lisa] Motion by Commissioner Rovinski and a second by Vice Chair Miller. Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, we'll go ahead with the voice vote. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- [Lisa] Any opposed? Okay. And then that will move forward then to City Council for January 17th. Next item is a public hearing on request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for a portion of properties located in the 600 block of Adams Street from Park to Downtown. Submitted by Department of Community and Economic Development, petitioner, and Investment LLC and Brogan Family Trust LLC, the property owners.

- [Speaker] Thank you, Madam Chairman. The property the public hearing is for is located on the southwest corner of South Adams Street and East Mason Street, just north of Cass on the Fox River itself. So, you can see it on the screen, it is three parcels currently, one owned by the Miller Investment Company, former Dean Miller, another along the waterway owned by the City of Green Bay, and the stretch along Adams Street, which is about 50 feet wide, owned by the Green Bay Redevelopment Authority. And just some background, this is the previous location of the Fox River Trail. It cut back from the riverfront down to the roadside, as the City doesn't own property along the the riverbank.

- [Lisa] Excellent. Thank you so much. All right, the public hearing, we are looking to here from anyone in favor, in opposition, or to provide comments only. Is there anyone wishing to speak? Can you state your name and address for the record, please?

- [Dave] Yeah, good evening. My name is Attorney Dave Wick, I'm an attorney for Miller Land Investments LLC, and Marlene Miller also is attending virtually, she's one of the members of Miller Land Investments LLC. And my client simply asked me to attend to advise the Commission that we are in favor of all action items related to this property that've been discussed tonight. Simple as that.

- [Lisa] All right.

- [Dave] And I'm available for questions.

- [Lisa] Excellent.

- [Thomas] My name's Thomas Sarky, I represent, I don't know, my family interest, been in this town since 1919 in the Harvard Commission and whatnot. The property itself is wonderful. I'm glad they're redeveloping it. We get dust all the time coming into Cass Street, and my other tenants complaining that it's not improved. I can tell you Downtown there it probably needs a light at night for people who are using the river trail, for safety and security. The additional trees on the side of the Water Department are gonna provide areas for people to hide or whatnot in winter without lighting. So, I would appreciate it if the Council took into consideration the total improvement around the Water Department, this parcel, and the river trail when they're doing things. I know it seems like we're doing that by rezoning it, but I would like to see a more comprehensive plan in some way to be able to gestate whatever project's gonna be there forward. We've sat on the property for a number of years. I've watched the trail develop over time, that seemed like it was a sustainable plan for the long term. And the private property use that's gonna be, or that's been proposed there, has now sat vacant for a long period of time and it looks awful for the rest of our community. I would appreciate that something's done and that we work to gestate whatever needs to be done forward. But keep into mind the consistent pattern we have of the river trail and the other improvements along the way.

- [Lisa] Thank you so much. 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. Moving on to the corresponding actionable item, item number seven. Consideration with possible action on request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for a portion of properties located in the 600 block of Adams Street from Park to Downtown. Submitted by the Department of Community and

Economic Development, petitioner, and Miller Land Investments LLC and Brogan Family Trust LLC, the property owners.

- [Speaker] And actually the Brogan family does not need to be on there.

- [Lisa] Oh, I'm just reading...

- [Speaker] I know, I know.

- [David] Okay. So again, this is a comprehensive plan amendment. It'll be followed up with the next item, which would be the zone change, very similar to the Nicolet Drive which you had just seen. So again, this is made up of three parcels on the southwest corner of Mason and Adams. If you've been out there... So, you'll see the parcels actually run into the river themselves, even though the bank is not quite out that far. And you'll see Cass Street, if it were to be extended, runs right to the river as well. So, these are the properties itself, it's a little over three acres, 3.9 acres actually, almost four acres in size, and three ownerships of three lots. Can I zoom down? This is an aerial photo if it's current condition. So, to the north is what was referred to as the central business district, there's some commercial offices, some , a redevelopment site. And then the elevated Mason Street to the south directly along the riverbank is basically open space. As you can see, there's not a lot of room, but the Fox River Trail also runs along the South Adams Street right-of-way to the east. Directly across is the Water Department, public institutional use, the water utility. And then beyond that is a mix of singles, two families, primarily singles, but low-density housing. I'm sure you've all seen the site itself. This is a little dated one, but this is a view from Mason Street looking down Adams Street, so you can see in here the trail was actually on the other side of the road at this time, it was relocated here. And this is the former warehousing that used to be on the site. Again, this is looking at southwest from the corner and so you can see this is the property in question itself. This shows the trail's location at that time, 2017. This is looking directly down, or looking up Adams Street, looking north, so you can see Mason Street. This is the former warehouse property and Water Department. This view is looking southeast, Water Department is here. And this is directly south, you can see that low-density housing, and you can see the Cass Street intersection here. As far as the comprehensive plan goes, the future land use plan shows this area for full parks purposes. And what I'll explain is, it's called out specifically in the comp plan as special park area five. When you get into the comp plan and start reading special park area five or four or three or two, they get into a lot more detail. So, with this one, this park area is actually for the entire length of the river frontage down to Porlier Pier in the comprehensive plan. And when that was taken into account, as you can see in the comp plan they take generalization. So, you're doing a comp plan land use plan for the entire City. So, they show this area for all parkway, but they qualified it by saying it should have a linear walking trail, pedestrian trail, multi-use. So, when you see the requested comp plan change, you'll see that that intent is still there. The zoning for the property is currently a conservancy on where the trail was sitting. Back not that many years ago, the City used conservancy zoning whenever there were trail uses or any type . That that has shifted over, public institutional zoning was adopted, and then shifted over that, but you'll see that's conservancy, The area along the river and on Mason is on public institutional, and the remainder of the site is currently zoned light industrial. As you can see, that light industrial zoning continues down the site. So, what's being proposed here? First, on the left-hand side here you can see a preliminary CSM, or certified survey map, this would combine all three parcels and then re-split them, basically running about a little over 50 feet from the high water mark of the river. So, that high water mark fluctuates a little bit with the height of the river, but the and such holds that. So, they're calling that one, that is being recommended in the comp plan change to be parks or public land use. And then the remainder of the site, which would be lot one, which is little over two acres... So, this is about 1.1, 1.2 acres, and you'll see what's in purple is designated to be a Downtown land use. So, as the comp plan recommends a linear park area, the frontage along the riverfront and riverbank accomplishes that. As we get comp plans or land use requests, that's when we dig into these areas a little further. The City had been talking with Dean Miller, who unfortunately passed away recently, for the last couple years, two or three years, and negotiating ways to get the river walk along the riverfront and develop this property after the warehouses went away. So, if you've been out there recently and you saw it, you probably haven't seen it on the pictures, 'cause they're dated, the river walk was actually relocated along the riverbank right now and it was removed

from the Adams Street right-of-way, ideally the City likes to keep river walks on the river. So that has taken place. There's a Development Agreement with the Millers, basically swapping land and paying for the construction of the river walk, which has already been constructed. So, this would be the recommended future land use, public along the riverfront and Downtown near Adams Street. Staff feels this is a logical extension of the central business district to the north. It is directly across the street from the Water Department, which is not necessarily a commercial-type use, but a commercial-type use an office and public use. And we've stopped that request down at Cass Street, so it doesn't go any further to the south. If you look like further out here... If you look as you go to the south down Cass, this is something we'll have to look at eventually, or down Adams, something we'll have to look at eventually. But is buildable, the water is very high, there's a setback from the waterway, Redevelopment Authority holds spots along. So, we're not addressing that right now, we're really just addressing this 600 block. So yeah, with that, staff is recommending approval to reflect the amendment to the City's Comprehensive Plan for the portion of the property from Park to Downtown.

- [Lisa] All right, thank you David. So now, just out of curiosity, can you remind me again when we completed that comp plan?

- [David] The comp plan? 2003.

- Okay.

- So it's old.

- [Lisa] Right, 'cause the coal piles it says are park. And with that site, 'cause it's been now a couple years now, was there remediation that had to be done to the site? Or was it just, I mean, the toxin, as far as development, that is taking this kind of time?

- [David] So, what had kind of happened is the structures were removed, the site was graded, the trail was put in. A Development Agreement took place between the City and the landowner to do a land swap, and the payment for the trail. Any type of environmental actions that would happen, would happen if and when development were to occur.

- [Lisa] Oh, okay. So, that hasn't been done yet, okay.

- [David] No, there's been testing but nothing extensive, you know, like you'd be digging and doing more intense environmental research.

- [Lisa] Okay, that answers that question.

- [Speaker] David, I need to refresh my memory, when we had the last proposal that was... That was probably what, three years ago, the actual being proposed on there? Was that done with a PUD? I'm just wondering why we didn't clean it up with the comp plan and zoning at that time.

- [David] Well, I believe that that came through, if I remember correctly, as an informational item, but that was going through the Redevelopment Authority to do the Development Agreement, and so they wanted to run it through the other bodies of the City to be aware of what was going through the Redevelopment Authority. Again, the Redevelopment Authority isn't technically part of the City, but they kind of are quasi. So, that was just basically to run it through the Plan Commission and Council before they entered those talks. But at that time the landowner did have a design for a multi-family and a mixed use building with a bunch of riverfront amenities and outdoor spaces. From the City's standpoint, we would love to still see a project like that come forward, but at this time it's not on the table.

- [Lisa] Was there any more discussion amongst the Commission or questions for staff? we might need to open the floor?

- Motion to open the floor.

- Second.

- [Lisa] Motion to open the floor, second by Alder Hutchinson. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- [Lisa] Any opposed? All right. And then if you can just come forward and state your name and address for the record again?

- [Thomas] I just had a couple more questions. Thomas Sarky, I own 312, 314 Cass Street, I'm very familiar with the waterfront area. My first one would be the concern underneath the bridge, in a darkened area like that, if a building project were to go up, that we would require some type of lighting for safety and security purposes. I would think for anybody using the trail at night, especially coming around the corner where that street would be, those would be my concerns. The other concern is, you know, most of the lots down there are sand, so I don't know if they've done a test on the lot or anything to even determine the feasibility of being able to engineer and put something there, would be my next question. And so, with these questions still out in the lurch, we're still what appears to be a decade out from even getting started on this plan. And so my question would be whether or not we would be able to incentivize a project there that might be more beneficial to our City, benefit in some way, shape or form? To look at doing something like that as well. That's all. Thank you.

- [Lisa] Thank you so much. Is there anyone else wishing to speak on this item?

- Motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- [Lisa] Motion by Vice Chair Miller, second by Commissioner Daniels. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- [Lisa] Any opposed? All right.

- [Michael] If I could ask the question on the park, I mean, when we're discussing the different options for that piece of land, especially because it's in such a prime location, was there any other options or discussion in the department for maintaining it as park space?

- [David] Sure, yeah. When we analyzed this area as a comp plan, actually when we started talking with Mr. Miller, all kinds of different options were looked at for that property. Parks Department at that time felt that the linear approach to the continuation of the Fox River Trail was most important. As you go north, not too far, there is extensive river walk and park space, and you go to the east there is also park space. So, in the Parks Department's opinion, they did not really need a larger park area at this location. But they wanted to retain that 50 foot for active river walk purposes installation of a trail. So it was discussed. We also talked about other type of land uses there that may or may not be appropriate. We tend to brainstorm a lot, usually in this room that we're sitting in right now. But because of the, sort of, logical extension of the Downtown north of East Mason, that was really the land use that was felt to be most appropriate. When we get to the zone change request, we'll talk a little bit more about that.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- [Lisa] A motion by Commissioner Poradek, a second by Commissioner Rovinski. Any further discussion? Hearing none, we'll go ahead with the voice vote. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- [Lisa] Any opposed? All right. And then that will move forward to City Council for January 17th. Moving on to item number eight. Public hearing on request to rezone the 600 block of South Adams Street from light industrial and public institutional, submitted by the Department of Community and Economic Development, petitioner, and Miller Land Investments LLC, the property owners.

- [David] Thank you, Madam Chairman. I don't know how much you need me to explain with this one. This would be the follow-up rezoning to the comp plan amendment.

- [Lisa] Thank you very much. Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing...

- [Thomas] Thomas Sarky again, the same question regarding... A different question regarding the property. Regarding the feasibility study of things that can be done there, regarding perc tests or to determine the feasibility of putting some of the buildings on there, have there been other plans, and if there have been, are they now under consideration again? The project is evolving, to say the least.

- [Lisa] Thank you so much. Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone else wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Let the record reflect that no one came forward and this public hearing is now closed. Moving on to the corresponding actionable item, item number nine. Consideration with possible action on the request to rezone the 600 block of South Adams Street from light industrial and public institutional to Downtown and public institutional. Submitted by the Department of Community and Economic Development, petitioner, and Miller Land Investments LLC, the property owners.

- [David] Thank you, Madam Chairman. So, I'm just showing on the screen right now the existing zoning of the site. So again, the conservancy along the street, a small portion of public, about one acre public, the remaining two and change, two acres and change, industrial zoning. Again, what's being requested is the public institutional along the riverfront where the trail would be, and the Downtown one zoning, which is a little bit different than the Downtown two, which you find on the east side of town, it has a height restriction of about 45 feet in that zoning. To give an example, the single family zoning district in the City allows 35 ft. So, it's lower, it's not quite a dense, but it allows quite a few mixed uses in there. So, it would allow a mixed use commercial with residential or just strictly residential. Again, this is a little over two acres, so not a giant piece of property, it's about 2.24 acres. But staff felt that the D1 zoning, because it's sort of a natural transition as you go to the south, rather than the standard D2, which does not have any height limits, allows much more density, would be more appropriate. I guess to speak... During the public hearing we had a couple of comments, and I'll just kind of talk to both those. As far as lighting concerns go, I mean, anything that's under bridge that's public right-of-way and DOT land, the landowner would not be required or responsible to light anything in the City property. Any development that would've happened on that site itself, if it's on the river walk, that's the City Council and the Parks Department's determination on how they choose to light that. On the private property, they would be required to have some lighting, depending on what the project is. So, you have to have certain light levels in entrances of buildings or in parking lots, and you're limited to that as well for spillover. As far as soil quality, the soil quality along the riverfront is suitable for and trail. Any development that would happen on the site, on the remainder of the site, the D site, would require that to all be analyzed as part of their site plan and building permits. Again, there is not, you know, somebody out there with a shovel ready to dig, it's still very much early in that stage. So, all those processes would have to go through, if it's found that it's too sandy, that it can't be developed, you know, there's ways to deal with that. We have a lot of riverfront property, sometimes they excavate and add. I'm not an engineer, so I don't know all the other answers. But I, kind of, wanted to answer that question. And then also, have there been other projects looked

at? I've worked here for about five years, the only one that I've really seen has been Mr. Miller's project. But I did work here about 20 years ago, 15 years ago, and there were probably five or six projects that were floating around in the five or six years I was working here at that time. But again, it's a riverfront property, it's close to a pretty major arterial street. And so yeah, it's a property that has been under-utilized and it's kind of interesting and people like to look at it. And I did wanna make a point as well that one of the neighbors across the street, who lives at 705 South Adams, had contacted me, she can't be here tonight, but she'd like me to read her statement. And I will read that. But her name is Mary Jakles, she lives in a single family residence at 705 South Adams. It's been in her family for 40 years plus. She appreciates the City's concern about the existing zoning of light industrial. "As I too am concerned, a perfect world where my personal agenda would be administered, the entire parcel would be zoned public institutional and utilized as a park with parking, much like Voyageur Park and De Pere, offering enjoyment of a more peaceful green river's edge, occasional entertainment, family activities, without the intrusion of restaurants, condos, apartments or offices. But we don't live in a perfect world. But the City of Green Bay seems to lose projects and events to outlying communities. I was reminded that South Adams Street is considered a thoroughfare to Downtown, but it is by no means a major artery through the City, nor was it designated such in the '70s. It was built to accommodate traffic to the Port Plaza Mall. Since the opening of the Fox River Trail, the southern portion of Adams through the Astra neighborhood is narrow, congested and dangerous when the trail is busy and parking is on the west side of the street. Safety for trail users unloading and loading bikes, kids, pets, and occasional goose crossings, as well as traffic coming to a crawl or stopping are all issues that she has witnessed often. Additionally, municipal code violations of vehicular trespass occur regularly as some trail users use private driveway aprons on the east side of the street as turnarounds, convenient turnarounds, putting extra cars backing out onto oncoming traffic, creating more risk. As a homeowner it is distracting having cars pull into your driveway multiple times throughout the day. It's additional wear and tear on my driveway as well, driveway apron. So you might argue that South Adams is a transit route designed for easy Downtown access and business development, but through the residential neighborhood there are real issues with traffic and safety at various times of the day. Adding high density populations, unlike a park, not only affect the residents and trail users on South Adams, but traffic needs to move in and out of the Downtown via Cass and Porlier Streets. I understand Green Bay's waterfront is a huge asset as a high tax income-generating property where solicitation of development is the goal, rather than a public green space. My concerns for this parcel are how the City will choose to utilize the space with regard to the adjacent low-density residential and historical Astor neighborhood. In order to coexist in a peaceful and respectful manner with the neighborhood community, I ask the Council to please consider the following thoughts, building heights limitations, low lighting restrictions, consideration of traffic congestion and all things related to traffic, including noise pollution and emissions, speed and parking, issues with excess population density, i.e. police calls, vandalism, nuisance. Long-term property maintenance agreements to be fully enforced by the City. In conclusion, I am a realist and know my personal agenda will not be administered. But I have concerns for the neighborhood that I hope you will contemplate when making the decision for rezoning. Downtown zoning one and two are designed specifically for Downtown core on both sides of the Fox River, the central business district, Broadway and Old Maine, and provides a full range of high intensity uses. I ask that you consider rezoning the property in question to office, residential, a transitional mixed use district intended for edges of Downtown or segments of commercial corridors with neighborhood commercial district as a secondary choice, and Downtown one as the last option. Or still provide tax revenue, but don't enable high density development to further compromise South Adams. R I historical neighborhood, I ask that you consider rezoning with attention and respect given for the neighboring community. Thank you for your time and attention. Mary Jakles."

- [Lisa] Do you have further recommendations?

- [David] No, I guess I just wanted to... I think I kind of over-killed this... So, we are recommending approval of the request to rezone the property from light industrial and public institutional, to Downtown and public institutional.

- [Lisa] You said it was a two acre lot, or a two acre is what... Well, not when you're talking about the trail part, we can't use that part anyway. So, D1 45 feet and residential is 35, so are we talking a possible three-story building at 45 feet?

- [David] Generally, for 45 feet you're probably gonna go about three , unless you kind of buried it .

- [Lisa] I don't think you're gonna be able to do that right next to a river.

- [David] No, probably not.

- [Lisa] Okay. Okay.

- [David] So, one of the points to make with height restrictions, however, 45 feet again, Council can allow it to go higher with a conditional use permit. But I do want to point out that the Mason Street right-of-way, which is directly north, is probably a little over 50 feet high. I mean, it's adjacent to the south, but when you're looking north along Adams, if height is your issue, that's your visual already there. So, this is the corner of Cass and Adams, so this is the office space. So, your height's gonna be at about this level somewhere over here.

- [Lisa] Okay. And so there's no... I mean, we don't have an actual development, so we don't know about feasibility and all of that, and we can't address that.

- [David] Correct, this would be a straight zone. So, we have seen some conceptual plans in the past, and if those come forward I think we would be more than happy to look at them, but it could be different. I mean, the owners of the property, the current property owners, could sell the property, develop themselves, keep it forever in green space. I mean, it's private property.

- [Lisa] Commissioner Bremer, you look like you have a question.

- Yes, I do. I appreciate the decision to go with D1, rather than D2, because of the height restriction, I don't think I could support this otherwise. But I'm wondering, David, if you could say a little bit about the alternative zoning possibilities that Miss Jakles mentioned.

- [David] Sure. So, the two she mentioned was neighborhood commercial and office residential. So, the Downtown office residential and the neighborhood commercial are all mixed use districts within the zoning code. So they're all very similar. There are some heavier restrictions on the OR and neighborhood commercial zonings. They also allow single family uses, I believe with Council approval. And they allow a little bit more auto oriented-type uses, because they're meant to be the fringes in-between the neighborhood and the Downtown itself. Now, those may be appropriate, I mean, we looked at some of those, but they are pretty restrictive as far as heights go, setbacks go. And some of the uses in there, in both those districts, are not, how would I say it, as compatible as the Downtown would be in staff's opinion.

- Thank you.

- [David] But they are all mixed use districts, and if that is something the Commission would want us to look at more deeply, I mean, we could come back.

- [Speaker] So, it's a little bit outside of our scope in terms of rezoning, but I do think some of the comments around just the trail and the park itself, I think hold some water, the lighting and maintenance. And also the site itself being in... I know they're trying to get grass established there, but it is pretty dusty at this point. What would the outlet be for anyone concerned about those things to... Who should they be contacting at the City to voice those concerns?

- [David] Sure, if the anybody's interested on the the trail segment, so again 50 feet from the... Assuming this gets approved and the land gets divided, you'd go straight to the City, you could either call Inspection Division or Parks Department directly. And anything on private property, I mean, you can always call the land ownership, that's usually the best policy. I know for years Mr. Miller was out there every single day practically, and I could go out and talk to him. He always seemed to be there . But if you couldn't reach the property owners, you could always call the Inspection Division and they would send out basically a notice to correct whatever type of issue. So really, being an empty lot, the biggest things are going to be probably debris that might accumulate there or long grass if it's no maintained.

- [Lisa] Any further discussion amongst the Commission?

- [Ken] These will be private properties, right, the trail?

- [David] The trail would become public property, the City would purchase that. It's almost a land swap, because the City owns a stretch along Adams, which is the street frontage, the private property owner owns the riverfront, but has no street frontage. So, it's kind of a swap, but the land along the river would be owned by the City, and the rest would all be in private ownership.

- [Ken] According to the zoning?

- [David] Yep. And I will bring this up.

- [Ken] I just wanted to make sure.

- [David] Yep. So when you look, this is the preliminary certified survey map that would reconfigure the lots out there. So, everything in this outlot would be City owned, and an outlot basically means it's not really developable for anything. You could put detention facilities and stuff like that in there, but really very few active uses, maybe passive. And then lot one, which is this piece, which is the two and a quarter section, would be in private ownership. But again, once developed, you know, there's setbacks on that property, and all that.

- [Ken] Okay. Thank you. Motion to approve.

- Second.

- [Lisa] Thanks. We have a motion by Commissioner Rovinski, and a second by Commissioner Bremer.

- Thank you.

- [Lisa] Is there any further discussion on this item? All right, I'll go ahead with the voice votes. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- [Lisa] Any opposed? All right, and then that rezoning will go forward to City Council for January 17th.

- [Speaker] And I would make a comment on that as well, so they're both gonna go January 17th to the Council. Because the comp plan has a 30-day wait period in-between, we'll hold the zoning and they'll go together to the Council in March. Council doesn't meet, they meet once... A couple of times in the next couple of months. So, we would hold those zone change. So they both go at the same time.

- [Lisa] All right. Thank you so much. Moving on to item number 10, which is the public hearing on the request to establish a planned unit development at 216 South Military Avenue to permit the development of multiple

family residential use. Submitted by Gorman and Co, applicant, and Henry Real Estate Development LLC, the property owner.

- [David] Thank you, Madam Chair.

- So, as we get into this right here, I just want to give a bit of a longer background as to what we're gonna see here for the next two items. So, we have two public hearings, they're both at 216 South Military. One is what you're seeing in front of you right here, that will be for an apartment request at the southwest corner of Leo and Military Avenue by Gorman. That's what the public hearing will be about right here. The second for the rest of the block owned by Martin is... Next slide. Will be the rest of the block, less the area where there's the apartment complex. So, right now on this site, this Commission happened to see a PUD back in October 2021 for the site for a temporary PUD for this overall block. With this in mind, this, along with the Development Agreement, went through, was approved by Council in November 2021 with the intention of spurring on improvement and development along Military Avenue for the site. So, what you're hearing right now, the public hearing, is relating to what's at stake here for the apartment complex. Once that public hearing and action is done, there will be a second public hearing for the rest of the block and the uses relating to that.

- [Lisa] So, now we're just talking about the parking lot where that apartment's gonna go?

- [David] So, back one slide we're talking about. Now, it's interconnected, so folks go ahead and talk about what it means for the rest of the block, we get that. But they are two separate items.

- [Lisa] All right, thank you. Is there anyone wishing to speak on this item? Go ahead and state your name and address for the record, please?

- [Gary] Gary Pond, 1474 Finch Lane. I'm in favor of the PUD in affordable housing, in responsible affordable housing. However, I think that this site is very dangerous for the young children because of its proximity to Military Avenue. You know, God help us, if a kid playing, who's a resident of that facility, gets injured on a very high speed area. They have not provided any play space for the children of the residents. And that's my main concern.

- [Lisa] Thank you so much. Is there anyone else wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Let the record reflect that no one came forward and this public hearing is closed. Moving on to the actionable item, item number 11. Consideration and possible action on request to establish a planned unit development at 216 South Military Avenue to permit the development of multiple family residential use. Submitted by Gorman and CO, applicant, and Henry Real Estate Development LLC, the property owner.

- [Speaker] Thank you very much. So, as we're discussing this, just to note the applicants is in the audience virtually along with the property owner here for additional follow-up here. So, the request here is for the development of a 48 unit multifamily development on the site at . Next slide, please? Next slide. So, what we're seeing right here is the CSM for what the entire overall block is. Lot two is what we are referring to right now. Lot one is the rest of the site. You can see the former ShopCo building and the existing Superior Liquor store over on the north part of the property. Next slide. So, this right here is our comp plan, the area is slated for commercial use, and we have a mix of uses right there. Next slide. That would be the zoning for the area, so right now we have our PUD in place where it says C3 zoning, but it has PUD to allow for limited light industrial uses on the overall block with the intention of creating new developments. Next slide. So with this in mind, seeing some images as far as what the developers are going to go ahead and put forward here. The comprehensive plan, so it's kind of a mixed bag as to what it means with it right here. It's not fully consistent with the comprehensive plan, because that's the whole block of commercial. But there are parts of the comp plan where it is consistent. It comes into play here with the comp plan, encouraging restoration of under-utilized urban properties to be viable commercial, residential, and or recreational opportunities. Additionally, Military Avenue has been identified for a target area for increased transitory development and

supportive zoning. Supportive zoning encourages the use of mixed and multiple uses on a property and encourages buildings be located near the front of the property and the sidewalk and have the parking be in the rear of the property. Bring the people up to the street itself, not have these vast parking lots that we've had here for 60 years on this property that might be used one day a year for snow storage. So, with this in mind, back in 2021 a call was put out there, "Go ahead and find development for this area." In Developer's Agreements that was reached between Martin and the City to find either commercial mixed use or residential uses in this area itself. And that stemmed this proposal here from Gorman. In total, it's a four-story building, 48 units. The first floor is mainly residential space. There is some common space for the tenants. There's also some office space for in the back of the property. Next slide, please? This is the corner elevation here, looking from Military southbound. Next slide. You'll see some of the parking that's in the back of the property itself to go ahead and service the tenants on the site. So, with this PUD, what's in mind, there's been some requests to go ahead and deviate from C3 zoning. Within C3 zoning, residential is allowed, but what is different right here is it does not have a full first floor commercial. That is required. So this would be a difference. Additionally, there are a number of issues with getting the building itself to go ahead and make this work. That was identified in the staff report, as well as some impervious requirements, and max building height going back to . This is a four-story building, so the requirement for this to be upped to allow this to be a four-story building, rather than 35, which is the requirement here for C3. So, this has gone through a long process here to get the point that we're at. You may have recalled that this was back... This was initially in front of you back in November as a potential item, but it was pulled by the applicant at that time. When that happened, there was a second PUD for the larger block in general that was put forth as well. With this in mind, there was conversations back and forth between both developers, both Gorman and Martin, and the City, And there was a neighborhood meeting at that time, later on in December, which about seven people or so attended, as well as Alder and Leah Weker from the Military Avenue . There were some mixed inputs as far as this goes, some reservations and questions, such as what was put out just now as far as play space for the property. While reviewing that, we did look into what does this area right here have, what public amenities are nearby. So one block to the north, north of Shawano, we do have Murphy Park, that's less than 1,000 feet away. Additionally, to both the west and the east sides, you have Badger Park and Chapel School/park, both about one quarter to a half mile away. With this in mind, we found there to be sufficient space for residents to go ahead and utilize public green spaces for the property. We understand and acknowledge that they're saying there's no green space, but the limited space on this property does inhibit areas for green space. So, moving on please, David? A few more images here of the property that have been proposed. These are some of the materials that have been proposed by the applicant. As noted in the PUD itself, they have pretty thorough plans here as far as the site plan and different building plans for the site. Next. This is their proposed site plan itself. It will need to still go through a typical site plan review. So long as it stays within the general spirit of what is being proposed here, we don't see any issue with this. One thing we do note, that we are proposing to stick to, is with it being 48 units we need to have, this is part of our code, 48 parking stalls, plus one stall per four units. That equals a 60 parking-stall minimum requirement. Ways around that would be potentially to change the parking lot somewhat to go ahead and make the parking work. That may be an issue though. There's also shared parking, which could be allowed within 1,000 feet of the property, as long as there can be an agreement that would be recorded between property owners to allow for additional parking. If those are met, we can go ahead and approve the site plan at that time. But right now they're not quite winning it, but there is time to go ahead and work it out between the property owners. Next slide please. This is just some images of the different floor plans for initial floors as far as where units are and where different public spaces are within the building. So, this is a bit different from our staff report, our recommendation. So, we've been talking here with the property owner, both developers here, for both PUDs here since November, December and this month, to get to where we're at right now. With this in mind, we sent out the PUD for review to the applicants back in the last week of December. We've been talking for the past week to get to where we need to go to. We are recommending tabling both this PUD request, and the following one for the Martin Block, until the January 23rd Planning Commission to allow Gorman, Martin and the City to have more time to address the issues put forth today, primarily to the next setting that's gonna come into play, not so much this one. And to work on an amended Developer's Agreement, RDA and Council Agreements. What is happening in the existing Developer's Agreement should be looked at and reviewed, to change up to what is being put forth right now. With that, the additional two weeks would give some time to go ahead and make some changes to go ahead

and try to tie this up to where all parties would be in agreement. Not too much to this one, but to our next item. But they're both intertwined.

- [Lisa] All right, so we're looking to table items 11, 12, and 13. Eventually, we're on 11 obviously.

- [Speaker] As I was preparing for the meeting, I looked at these plans and I was super excited, very excited, I love the look of it. Though, I'm trying to put myself into mind if this was up right now, this would be like the only... Is it the only, in that area, it just seems...

- [Lisa] Like literally a block behind Military, to the west, there are tons of apartments, actually to the east, if you think about it, Western Avenue is right there. But even like Janice, which is right behind Ninth, like there's a lot of apartments over there.

- Okay. But I love the look with the building. I would say when I first saw it, I didn't see any play space or park space, but now I know there are a lot of parks around it. But this, this looks great for that area. I think it's gonna stand out. I don't know if it's gonna stand out a good or a bad way, because it will be the best-looking thing in that area quite honestly.

- A catalyst.

- [Speaker] Yeah. It looks great though. I think it'll be out of place.

- [Lisa] We're tabling this, if we don't have anything to discuss any further. So, the floor is open. Oh, go ahead Neil, I'm sorry.

- [Neil] I snuck in late, so I haven't. Neil, sectional development director, if folks don't know who I am. Just want to add on to what John has said. Folks would probably remember this process these uses would not traditionally be allowed in a C3 zoning area, there was concerns over allowing them. However, you know, certainly coming off of some of the discussions we've had on East Town Mall, with the retail front and things kind of screening the industrial use. While that's the same building project in that case, this would be two separate buildings, but we feel that the premises is essentially the same. That if it can be done in a manner that's attractive and still works well, that we could still utilize those kind of more traditional commercial residential mixed use uses to allow... Again, it's very limited, kind of dipping our toe into light industrial uses with identifying the very specific aspects that are in there. The applicants have been very, very communicative and we have good progress being made on doing these. Alder Wery did send a note this afternoon, you know, actually wanting to see if we could do some more things about the architecture. He'd like to see a little bit more... Some more glaze and some other things, maybe take a look and try to raise that a little bit. And part of the effort we're looking at in doing that, certainly for this particular project, we would be looking at some design, maybe adding some design standards for the overall site in general. But some of them may certainly be applicable specifically to this site. So, what staff has done to this point, is they have kind of the three key areas that they're really looking at. Now, we're looking at kind of at least identifying minimum standards, design standards, for the entire area that would essentially kind of be a little bit cleaner and a little bit straighter on that. So again, we feel that this is a good time, very good cooperation, we're very appreciative of the efforts that both developers have put in to date. And we do think that this has got excellent potential to kind of hopefully be something that we can lean on and utilize for reviewing other projects in other large format areas going forward. But there have been some concerns over the large format use, it's in general not. And I did wanna also just provide a real quick statement. Mr. did provide quick information regarding what the actual rents would be, because someone's had that question. Some people would say, affordable units, they'd probably say they're not affordable enough, and other folks would maybe say they're... There is kind of a marketing here. So here's just examples obviously, 'cause it is tied to number of bedrooms, there's multiple factors that set that. So, for an individual renting a one-bedroom unit, \$38,000 a year would be the qualifying income. And that rent would be \$870 per month, that's for that one. For a family of four, the income limit would be \$55,000 per year at \$1,200 a month for a three-bedroom unit. So, at least give folks I think some

real life... Those are more of an average I think what the rents would be, they certainly could go up or down from that. But I think that question does come up, and certainly concerns over the term affordable. So, we'll try to get some more realistic numbers on what those would be. So, just with that, I just wanted to add that context for everybody in terms of... I know we've been going back and forth on it, it's been before you a couple times, we think this next delay will help us kind of really get this to... I think the key aspect of this, that we had not done before, is kind of the combination of the Development Agreement and the PUD to kind of govern and guide the schedule of how those things get implemented. Again, working with the Bartons, this has been, you know, a unique process, but we think it's... Right now we're very pleased with how the direction's going. We think this could hopefully be something we can build on going forward. So, with that, certainly available to answer any questions.

- [Lisa] Thank you so much, Neil.

- Well, this is...

- Michael has something to add.

- [Lisa] Oh, go ahead, Commissioner Poradek.

- [Michael] Thanks. I think there's a lot of good momentum around this. I mean, there's a lot of cooperation it sounds like. I'm all for adding affordable housing. However, I have to just say I'm really hesitant about this. I live near the area itself. I get through there oftentimes. I share the concerns about getting to the space. I'm glad there's parks nearby, and I know that, but in order to get to those parks you're crossing through a very residential area, very commercial area, excuse me, lots of traffic, lots of busy traffic. It's not just walking down the street in a neighborhood block to get to the park. I mean, this is crossing through a pretty active area of the community. I'm concerned for the quality of life. The green space around it. The look of the building does not fit the architecture of the general area itself. At least from my experience of it. I think it looks... It's interesting, it looks nice as a building, as a concept, it just does not look to blend into that area of our community. So, I have a lot of hesitancy around it. I think I share a lot of the concerns that were brought up about the safety issues, the family life there, especially because we'll be having the parking lot right directly surrounding it, of course, as discussed. But there's a lot of hesitancy, and I think that I... I'm all for affordable housing, just in the right location in our community. This to me just does not seem like a viable location for a good quality of life for the residents who'd be living in that location. So, I have my hesitancy toward it, and just wanted to state that.

- [Lisa] All right. Thank you. Go ahead, Commissioner Bremer.

- I want to support what Commissioner Poradek just said. My concern would be with having some, it needn't be large, but some fenced in space for particularly very young children who could not manage to get across Leo Street in order to get to Perkins Park. Other than that, I'm very pleased with this architecture. And I have to say, for the most part I've not been thrilled with the architecture of the recent years in the City. But this one does please me.

- [Lisa] Do we have a motion?

- Yeah, a motion to table.

- Table it, okay. I have to read through the next items as well, just because we didn't strike them from...

- [David] We do have a public hearing coming up for the next item. So that's a public hearing as well.

- [Lisa] And that was a posted public hearing, so we'll have to still continue with that.

- Yes.
- Okay. All right. We'll have the next public hearing as well.
- [Speaker] You didn't get a second, did you?
- [Ken] I did not get a second.
- Actually, I seconded the tabling motion. Can we table them separately?
- [Lisa] We're gonna have to, because they're all on the agenda. All right, so a motion by Commissioner Rovinski, a second by Commissioner Bremer to table item 11 until...
- 23rd January.
- January. All right.
- Correct.
- Okay. All right, all those in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- [Lisa] Any opposed? All right. And that will be tabled till January 23rd. And then moving on to the public hearing on item number 12. Public hearing request to amend the planned unit development at 216 South Military Avenue, amending the boundaries of the PUD submitted by MAO and Associates, applicant, on behalf of Henry Real Estate Development LLC, the property owner.
- [Jon] Thank you, Madam Chair. So, what you're seeing here, this is for the remainder of the block. So, what you see here with this map will be, the current PUD is in the blue, the rest of it, both in the yellow and green, is the rest of the block and that's where the language of the PUD and the uses come into play. So, we'll get into some more detail here when we get done with the public hearing itself. But what comes into play here with this is, what is the role? This is a C3 area with some additional industrial uses added to potential permitted uses on the site. Along then with different standards for development throughout the site when it comes to improvements in the different development areas.
- [Lisa] Okay. Thank you, Jon. So, the public hearing, we're looking to hear from anyone who'd like to speak in favor, in opposition, or to provide comments only. State your name and address for the record.
- [Leah] Hi, Leah Waker with Military Avenue, 425 South Military. I'm confused whether I should comment now or wait for the other public hearing. I assume there will still be another public hearing when we get more information. Literally, this has been a changing project by the day. I did go to the hearing on 22 December in a blizzard with six other people. So, I just feel like I can't, I can't give you all the comments I'm gonna give you now, because it literally does change by the day. I would like to see that we can do some warehouse on the back side of that property. I'm not interested in seeing a warehouse zone on the Military side of the property. The housing, I think if you look at what doing, there's balconies, there's green space, there's climbing walls. Very similar developments as what we have here, there's really no amenities for a person to want to live here. I'd like to see more of that. I'm not opposed to the housing, I'm very supportive of the housing actually. I just would like to have it have more amenities that we would draw a great neighborhood group to be there. I do think the green space is a huge issue. Those parks are not close by, not at all. You have to walk quite a ways. The two developments in that are going on, that are very similar and similar in size, have courtyards, they have grills. Where would these families even grill out? There's literally zero space. Again, we talk about quality of

life, we're not giving them a very good quality of life for being in the housing. So, I'll hold some of my comments till the next public hearing, which I assume we'll have.

- [Speaker] So just a note, these are the public hearings right here.

- [Lisa] These are the public hearings for these items.

- [Speaker] This will go on to January 23rd. There is the option of the Chair to go ahead and open the floor back open the comments, which is a pretty standard thing, people are here to go ahead and note.

- [Leah] That hardly warrants for having another public hearing.

- [Speaker] I think that's legal though, right, we can't post another public hearing that quick frankly.

- [Speaker] Yeah, with the public hearing timing, it would push it back pretty far. So, there's two items, one is the comp plan amendment, and the second...

- It's PUD and PUD.

- Well, this is just PUD.

- Yeah, okay.

- [Speaker] So there wouldn't be another public hearing itself, however, maybe we can get the Commission to commit to opening the floor when it comes through for action items on the 23rd. And then I find great success with just asking the Alders to open it up for public comment and discussion. Alternatively, I mean, the Commission could hold another public hearing, but it's gonna push it back well into February or March, because of the statutes on notices.

- [Speaker] Right. So it's not particularly typical that you have a public hearing and if the item gets tabled that a secondary hearing then after that by a Commission, that it gets opened. And that's typically what happens here with other PUDs that have not... They don't get fully recognized at their first meeting and hearing.

- [Leah] So, it's hard to comment on the unknown, isn't it?

- [Lisa] Well, you can always comment on the actionable items.

- [Leah] On the what?

- [Lisa] On the actionable items from before.

- [Leah] Oh, I see. Okay, as opposed to.

- [Lisa] As opposed to a public hearing.

- [Leah] Okay. Okay. I can appreciate that.

- [Speaker] The beauty with the comments on the actionable items, it's gonna be a back and forth... For the public hearing, it's just you making a statement.

- [Leah] Got it. I was confused though, thank you for clarifying. So, I still will have time to comment on the project, okay, I appreciate it. Yeah, I do think we're inching our way to a good solution where we can meet everyone's needs. So thank you.

- [Lisa] Thank you, ma'am. Is there anyone else wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Let the record reflect that no one came forward and this public hearing is now closed. Moving on to the corresponding actionable item, item number 13. Consideration with possible action on request to amend a planned unit development at 216 South Military Avenue to amend the boundaries of the PUD. Submitted by Mount Associates, applicant, on behalf of Henry Real Estate Development LLC, the property owner.

- [Speaker] Thank you, Madam Chair. So, this is where the take some time here to go ahead and get this finely tuned here over the course of the next two weeks comes into play. So, you'll note that we had called development areas A, B, and C. Part of why we had those areas designated, because as of now we don't have the best of long-term plans as far as what it means for design standards on the property right now to go ahead and separate your spaces between commercial, residential light and industrial uses. And so that's where some talks back and forth with both Martin and Gorman would be beneficial. To note, as far as the uses, zone that would allow for light industrial in certain parts. Right now we're saying... Well, we're working on within A, B, and C. But those uses, just to go ahead and note, would be limited production and processing, a contractor yard, but it must be fully enclosed within the building. To just backtrack, these are all different uses that are allowed right now within light industrial. And as staff looked back at some of the uses, some we just immediately said, "No, it does not make sense with the surrounding residential and commercial." Others we went, "We think this could go ahead and work." But additional uses would be a dry cleaning establishment/ commercial laundry, research and development facility, public safety/service facility, general office, government office, bank, clinic, healthcare facility, artist studio and warehousing . That does not mean self-storage warehousing, that's a prohibited use. So, we're talking people doing work. That's one note we have. We also had some permitted uses that would be conditional. So, we go back to this board and the , that'd be a material recovery facility, minor, we're talking electronics, computers, TVs, something of that sort. That was a major one that was a no. Ground transportation service, package delivery service, telecommunication tower, wireless communication facility. And then some other ones that are also conditional on C3, which would be . So, we've looked at the uses, we took the LI uses, we constricted them to what we thought could work better when it's being designed well enough to go ahead and put that industrial more towards the center of the back of the block and have proper industrial buffering to the commercial and residence.

- [Ken] I make a motion to table the item per staff recommendation.

- Second.

- [Lisa] Motion by Commissioner Rovinski, second by Commissioner Poradek, to table the item until January 23rd. Any further discussion? Hearing none, we'll go ahead with the voice votes. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- [Lisa] Any opposed? All right, and then that will be tabled until the next meeting. And moving on to informational. Director's report. Mr. .

- That's me.

- In person.

- [Neil] Exactly. Yeah, nice to see everybody. I don't recognize you guys without the boxes around you. Yeah, I wish, I was kind of in that room crying last night, Lombardi ghosts, where were they last night?

- [Lisa] They weren't talking to us.

- [Neil] We'll we'll not go there. Exactly. Just a couple quick updates. Staff continues to work on actually our comprehensive plan RP. So, on top of everything else I've got David doing, he's working on that for me right now as well. So, I'm hopefully gonna have that together and happily have something to kind of just share with the Commission here the next meeting or two. I'd like to have something to kind of just get your feedback on before it's actually ready for prime time. But obviously, as you noted, Madam Chair, it's an old document, it needs some TLC. So, there's newer issues we need to address and we're looking forward to really getting that going. Just wanted give a brief update also on, we've contracted with Gray for redevelopment of the JBS site. If folks remember, we kind of brought that forward to kind of generate some public engagement, and then to do three redevelopment concepts, kind of finalizing into one recommended concept to kind of help proceed with that. We've had our initial kickoff meeting internally with staff on that meeting. So, we're working on kind of finalizing the project schedule a little bit right now. I think they're looking at about a six-month process. We kind of want to speed that up a little bit, since we've been kind of messing around with this for about year and a half, two years now, so we kind of want to get that moving. But we're excited that that process is underway. If folks remember, the three components of that project will be hopefully some creative housing solutions for that site, as well as a destination park facility, and then kind of an urban agriculture component somehow worked into that overall project. So we're excited to get that going. This is one we've received considerable amount of State funding to assist with, and we're just looking forward to kind seeing what folks can come up with. Obviously the outreach for that area, that neighborhood, has been more challenging in the past for us, for a variety of reasons. So, we actually intentionally really selected Gray, and their sub-consultant firm by the name of Muse, that specializes actually in a little bit more outreach. Their actual urban designer actually speaks Spanish. So, there won't be a translation from designer to someone translating it, they can actually have an ongoing conversation with some of the folks in that neighborhood, which we're really excited about. It seems like we should be doing this on all of our projects a little bit, but now we actually have a tool in place to really actually do that. So, we'll have a trained actual development urban design professional who can actually speak the language of the residents in the area, and really kinda go back and forth with that. So we're excited about that moving forward. Working on the housing report required for the end of year, which is, you know, if David did have any hair, he'd definitely have hair like this after he got done working on it. It's a statutory requirement that we have to do every year that kind of analyzes what the housing market has done every year in terms of how much space we have available, how much was zoned, how much is planned for, and a variety of other factors, that is not the easiest thing to kind of grab and pull together. So we usually do it once a year, so David's working on that as well. And obviously we're still working on continuing to try to keep... A lot of our projects that are in the pipeline are certainly experiencing financial difficulties and things and trying to keep them alive. So, Mr. Rovinski is certainly aware of that problem for sure. So we have, you know, multiple requests for financial assistance that we are evaluating and looking at as we go forward. But really wanna try doing our best to try to keep a lot of those projects moving forward. As of right now, we aren't seeing anything really falling by the wayside, but we are seeing a couple of delays and a couple of folks trying to kind of reshuffle their capital stack to afford their projects. So, maybe a short-term tapping of the brakes, but we're hopeful that things improve and we can find some resources to keep everything moving forward as planned. And with that, available for any questions anyone has of me.

- [Ken] Just to follow up on that, I wrote down two things, the Monroe Project, is that probably one of the...

- [Neil] Actually, that one we are working forward on a brief update on that one. Figuring out how to proceed on their environmental work on that site. So, they're actually in conversations with their environmental consultant and the City in terms of how to address that and get that moving forward. We think that's pretty straightforward in terms of what we're gonna need to do. Funding that is gonna be the challenge. They're actually working with, even though it's a market rate project, HUD actually does provide financing for market rate projects as well. So they're actually working through a federal program to try and get the environmental work and the overall construction project all financed in one shot, which we had a very positive conversation. I think the Mayor is actually joining a call with HUD next week with the developer on that project, to try to get that financing squared away.

- [Ken] Okay, thank you. And then I could have sworn , the Green Bay Press Gazette building...

- [Lisa] It's like a game store and...
- [Dan] , but I have seen the game store.
- [Neil] Right now there are temporary, at least interim tenants in the building using the space. I think there's still some redevelopment potential looking at being considered for that space. But I think at least for the short term, the current donor has leases in there for at least, you know, the game shop... So, it's an interesting combination of uses in that space. But it's a great corner, it's certainly a highly visible one, and they seem to be doing okay business-wise. My assumption with that, at least those would probably be more short-term uses until the developer figures out exactly what they can maybe do. Either to settle for a larger tenant in the building, or redevelop the space.
- [Ken] And then my last question, what is going on with the transmission repair?
- [Neil] Transmission?
- [Ken] See, they were the ones that were supposed to go in that building, that's what I thought.
- [Neil] Yeah, I'll look at staff, I have not heard anything on that one in several months. So, I don't know if the project just kind of fell through or what was...
- [David] I believe they had some logistical issues with traffic movements.
- [Neil] Oh, okay.
- [David] And I don't think it's gonna be going forward, but I'm not 100% positive about the detail on that. But they had some pretty large issues trying to maneuver, you know, vehicles to be repaired in .
- [Lisa] West side or east side? Come on now, .
- [Neil] All right, anything else? Okay. Thanks everybody.
- [Lisa] Thank you, Neil. Date of the next meeting is January 23rd, 2023.
- [Ken] Motion to adjourn the meeting.
- Lisa] Motion by Commissioner Rovinski, second by Vice Miller, to adjourn. All those in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- [Lisa] Any opposed? All right. Good night, everyone.
- [Speaker] Bye guys.