



# **MINUTES OF THE GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION**

**MONDAY, MAY 8, 2023, 6:00 PM**  
**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.

Present: Lisa Hanson, Jim Hutchison, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Jacob Miller, and Michael Poradek

Excused: Ken Rovinski

## **C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.**

I. Approval of the agenda for the May 8, 2023, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Derius Daniels to approve the agenda. Motion Passed.

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

## **D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.**

I. Approval of the minutes from the April 24, 2023, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Sidney Bremer to approve the minutes. Motion Passed.

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

## **E. REGULAR BUSINESS.**

1. (ZP 23-11) Public Hearing on the request to allow a Conditional Use Permit for townhomes to be established in the Low-Density Residential (R1) zoning district located at Richmond Street (Parcel 21-1361-6), submitted by Mau & Associates, on behalf of Habitat for Humanity, property owner (Ald. Morgan, District 3).

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

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the floor for the Public Hearing.

Speakers:  
Stephanie Hummel

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.

2. (ZP 23-11) Consideration with possible action on the request to allow a Conditional Use Permit for townhomes to be established in the Low-Density Residential (R1) zoning district located at Richmond Street (Parcel 21-1361-6), submitted by Mau & Associates, on behalf of Habitat for Humanity, property owner (Ald. Morgan, District 3).

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Jacob Miller to allow a Conditional Use Permit for townhomes to be established in the Low-Density Residential (R1) zoning district located at Richmond Street (Parcel 21-1361-6), subject to compliance with all other regulations of the Green Bay Municipal Code. Motion Passed.

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

3. (ZP 23-14) Public Hearing on a request to allow a Conditional Use Permit to exceed the maximum building height in the Business Park District located at 825 Hinkle Street, submitted by Bayland Builders, on behalf of Russel Metals, property owner (Ald. Eck, District 11).

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

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the floor for the Public Hearing.

Speakers:  
Stephanie Hummel

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.

4. (ZP 23-14) Consideration with possible action on a request to allow a Conditional Use Permit to exceed the maximum building height in the Business Park District located at 825 Hinkle Street, submitted by Bayland Builders, on behalf of Russel Metals, property owner (Ald. Eck, District 11).

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Michael Poradek to allow a Conditional Use Permit to exceed the maximum building height in the Business Park District located at 825 Hinkle Street, subject to:

- a. A maximum building height of 38-feet, 6-inches is allowed under this permit. Any increases in height will require Plan Commission and Common Council approval.
- b. Compliance with all other regulations of the Green Bay Municipal Code.

Motion Passed.

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

5. (TA 23-03) Public Hearing on amendments to various sections of the Zoning Code, Chapter 44, Article XVI, Section 44-1580 (j) related to Development Standards for Short Term Rentals.

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

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the floor for the Public Hearing.

Speakers:

David Buck

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.

6. (TA 23-03) Consideration with possible action on amendments to various sections of the Zoning Code, Chapter 44, Article XVI, Section 44-1580 (j) related to Development Standards for Short Term Rentals.

Ald. Hutchison was excused at 6:45 p.m.

Speakers:

David Buck

Logan Wood

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Jacob Miller to amend Green Bay Municipal Code Chapter 44, Article XVI, Section 44-1580 (j) related to Development Standards for Short Term Rentals as proposed. Motion Passed.

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

## **F. INFORMATIONAL.**

1. Director's Report.

Neil Stechschulte provided the Director's Report.

2. Date of next meeting: May 22, 2023

## **G. ADJOURNMENT.**

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Sidney Bremer to adjourn. Motion Passed.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Michael Poradek, No- None, Abstain-

None.

## **VERBATIM MINUTES**

- Quorum.
- Is Jim online?
- Oh, I didn't even check.
- I'm online and I have a hard leave at 6:45.
- Okay.
- Okay.
- Alright. Alright. Alright, welcome everyone to the Monday, May 8th meeting of the Green Bay Planning Commission. We'll start with a roll call. Chair, Lisa Hanson. Present Vice Chair Jake Miller.
- Present
- Commissioner or Alder Jim Hutchison.
- Present.
- Commissioner Sidney Bremer.
- Present.
- Commissioner Derius Daniels.
- Present.
- Commissioner Ken Rovinski. Where is Ken? I can't remember. is absent. I don't remember.
- Ken is excused.
- Thank you.. Ken is excused. And Commissioner Michael Poradek.
- Present.
- All right, moving on to approval of the agenda. Approval of the agenda for the May 8th, 2023 meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.
- So moved.
- Second.

- And motion by Commissioner Bremer. Second by Commissioner Daniels. All those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? We go to the approval of the minutes. Approval of the minutes from the April 24th, 2023 meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Motion by Commissioner Poradek. Second by Commissioner Bremer. All those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? All right. And then moving on to regular business and starting with a public hearing. The public hearing has been properly posted and notification has been published in the Press Times. The planning 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 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. City staff will provide a presentation during the public hearing and questions raised by the public may be asked, but they will not be answered by staff until the upcoming actionable item. You must be recognized by the Planning Commission in order to speak and please address your comments to the Chair. Comments will be limited to three minutes. We will now open the public hearing on agenda item number one, public hearing on the request to allow a conditional use permit for town homes to be established in the low density residential zoning district located at Richmond Street submitted by Mau and Associates on behalf of Habitat for Humanity, Property Owner.

- Thank you Madam Chair. This site may look familiar. This was on our last agenda as well, a refresh on the project. It is a I4 lot subdivision for single family homes. At the last meeting, we approved a subdivision variance for lot size and lot width, and then also the vacation of this cul-de-sac here as part of that larger development. Again, this is Lime Kiln, Manitowoc and then I think Main Street is right up here. Future land use shows this for our medium-high density housing area. The proposal is consistent with that. And then again, the zoning is R1 for this district or for this parcel. Adjoining this is R3, 'cause there are apartments back here. A lot of R1 but a lot of mixed housing going on in this neighborhood. One families, two families, apartment complexes, some commercial, so very varied neighborhood. So as I said in the agenda item, we're looking for a CUP for the townhomes. So that is conditional use in R1 for that use. So again, the platt here showing all I4 lots. This is the one outlot

for stormwater management. The lots that are on this side here will be used for single family detached homes. And then the lots proposed here are for single family attached homes, which we all refer to as town homes. So kind of more of a visual of that is that the ones that wrap around on this side are gonna be the standalone detached homes and then the attached structures will be here. In your staff report, I did give the details about the a lot size requirements that we have for those if the CUP is approved, and these lots do meet those requirements. Same thing for building height. I know there's sometimes the thought the town homes are gonna be taller than a regular single appointment home. All of them have the same height requirements and all fall below the height maximums for the RI district, so no worries there. It does meet all the other sections of code. Just to go through a couple visuals for the rest of the presentation, this was provided to me by the applicant, Habitat for Humanity. So just kind of looking at the scale of these homes, you know the lots are a little bit smaller, the housing product is a little bit smaller, but the town homes and the single family homes do compliment each other very well. As far as architectural style and architectural form. The only difference is that some are attached and some are detached. So we feel like they're very complimentary to one another. They're also very sensitive to the existing neighborhood that they are in. We feel like the size of the homes with the size of the lots were done thoughtfully considering the types of housing that are in this neighborhood and other types of commercial in this neighborhood. This a different rendering that shows a different color variety. You know, that's not really part of the request. The colors that they're using, it can be, I suppose a CUP can add a lot of things on, but they're just showing that there's gonna be some variety in the textures and the setbacks on the homes. So they're, they're gonna have a higher quality of architectural form there. Also in your packet they had some of the renderings for the site themselves, to kind of show you window placement, elevations, the floor plans themselves, so all of that was in your packet. I just wanted to give you that to get the visual of what we're talking about. So a couple other things to discuss. There was a neighborhood meeting held on March 21st. There were four community members in attendance. They had a couple of just generalized questions about the project itself. We heard a lot about children being displaced in this neighborhood apparently, 'cause it's a vacant lot kids use it as a park, a place to play. Aside from the fact that this is a private lot and that probably shouldn't be happening anyway. I did put in your report how close the neighborhood is to other parks. So VT Pride Park is 0.3 miles or a six minute walk from there. The Kroc center is not much further away and does have that private path that goes right past VT Park up to the Kroc Center. So there is some accessibility there for the, for actual public parks. So if that is an issue that they were having also, you know, there's always the question of is traffic an increase here. Given the location of this, we're guessing probably not. And by guessing I mean I'm 90% confident that traffic will only increase from the neighbors or people visiting. As you can see here, if there's gonna be any cut through traffic, it's likely to happen on Bader because that's the connection between Manitowoc Road and Main Street. The connection here is gonna be Ricky Drive extension to Richmond. So there'd be really no purpose of cutting through on this road when Bader already exists, would be wider. You know, there's more of a reason to drive here than there would be to drive through this neighborhood, especially 'cause it's not gonna connect back in this area. So we don't believe that traffic will have any noticeable increase aside from the homes that will be living, or the people who will be living there. I think the main concern that was expressed from the neighbors is they wanna see single family homes, but town homes are single family homes. You know, the only noticeable difference is that there are attached structures versus the detached structures. I did add some density information in your staff report. So the comprehensive plan calls to the medium, the high density housing. It specifically calls on town homes to be appropriate for that. The expected density is usually eight housing units per acre in that district, for future land use. For RI zoning, we typically look for 48 housing units per acre. And then this proposal has 5.2 housing units per acre. So that's an appropriate density for both

the zoning district and for the comprehensive plan recommendation. I'm also citing here the land use development standards that are additional to the single family attached in the R1 outside of just regular site plan review. And then obviously our regular seven points about conditional use permits. So with all of that, you know, we're, we find this to be an appropriate transition throughout and into the neighborhood here. There's already a good mix. This is just adding an additional type of housing to this neighborhood. And given that they are completely code compliant outside of the CUP for the use of that attached structure, we are supportive of this and the applicant is here if there are questions when we get to the actual actionable item.

- Okay, thank you Steph. All right. Now with this public hearing, we're looking to hear from anyone who would like to speak in favor, in opposition, or would just like to add 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 two, consideration with possible action on the request to allow a conditional use permit for town homes to be established in the low density residential zoning district located at Richmond Street, submitted by Mao and Associates on behalf of Habitat for Humanity, Property Owner.

- Thank you. We are recommending approval usually with CUP's we have conditions, it's a condition lease from it. There doesn't seem to be anything egregious about their site plan or we didn't see any red flag that came up if there is anything that you were looking to add. But usually we just add the caveat of, you know, compliance with all the regulations in our code.

- Thank you. Go ahead.

- What is the finished treatment on the sides and the back of the town homes?

- It would be the same as whatever's on the front. I think that they're doing a variation of materials and colors, but we require four side design for that. Just like regular home.

- The elevations didn't show that, so I wasn't sure.

- We can clarify with Steve, but I'm, it would be required as part of site plan. He can't just put a concrete wall on the back of the, but .

- They may not have the exact materials all picked out.

- Yeah, I imagine that's what's available. I mean, we've never been seeing that people propose something and then they have to come back. So we don't wanna be too strict with what it is considering our code is pretty, we have pretty standard language about what's got an architectural finish, things that are durable. So we'll be keeping that in mind. But if there are any design considerations, those could be added in.

- Are we on the actionable-

- No, we're on the .

- Keep up, Dave.

- Yeah, I will say that I'm on the board for Habitat for Humanity, but I do not have any kind of financial ties to this, but I, you know, but it seems to be a great project, you know, just from being on the board, a lot of the things that are going on, I just think it's definitely going to elevate this area in this community. So I will be voting for this, but I did want to disclose I am on the board.

- And I'll say this whole neighborhood is all Habitat. I mean, I haven't seen a bad looking Habitat for Humanity home, they've been doing really good work.

- Well, Thank you.

- It's all you, right. But I, you know, all their product, every house that I've seen that they've put up, the most recent one that I see often, I think right on Shawano, right by Gray Street. So yeah, I think it's gonna be a really nice little neighborhood over there.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Any further discussion? Got a motion by Commissioner Poradek, second by Vice Chair Miller. Hearing none, we'll go ahead with the vote. All those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? All right. And then that will be moving forward to City Council for, what is that, 16th? 16th, okay, for May 16th.

- Thank you.

- All right, moving on to item number three, public hearing. Again, 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, and whether you favor, oppose, or are only providing information. We will go ahead and open the public hearing on number three, public hearing on a request to allow a conditional use permit to exceed the maximum building height in the business park district. Located at 825 Hinkle Street, submitted by Bayland Buildings on behalf of Russell Metals, property owner.

- Thank you. So to familiarize you with the location, this , Walmart is right here. This is the building in question, there is an existing - structure. Oh gosh, it's gonna bug me.

- There you go.

- This is why we get gatekeepers. So this is an existing metal structure. Whoever's on the phone call,

if you could just keep yourself muted while we're giving the presentation, please. Anyway, sorry, where was I? Okay, this is an existing structure. It is surrounded primarily by warehousing and other industrial uses outside of some larger commercial here, Festival Foods, Walmart. The future land use calls for Business Parkway, Industrial and Commercial split. The zoning map kind of looks exactly the same. The entire structure is zoned for business park. So here's that existing building and with an expansion, they're proposing an addition that goes on the north side of the building. In the business park district, the maximum height is 35 feet. You can exceed that with no maximum via CUP. They're only looking to go up to 38 feet, six inches. So not much of a deep deviation from the code. We do have, again, the conditional use points in your staff report for review. And that is all we have for now.

- Thank you. Now with this public hearing, we're looking to hear from anyone who would favor, oppose, or just giving information. Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Let the record-

- Sorry, I was having issues with my phone. This is Mitch with Bayland. I don't have anything to say about the project, but I'm willing to answer any questions that anyone has.

- Okay, thank you very much, Mitch. All right. 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 four, consideration with possible action on a request to allow a conditional use permit to exceed the maximum building height in the business park district, located at 825 Hinkle Street. Submitted by Bayland Builders on behalf of Russell Metals, property owner.

- Thank you. We are recommending approval with two conditions, the general compliance with the municipal code and then also specifying that height and that if that were to change at all, they would have to come back to amend the CUP through Planning Commission and Common Council.

- So they're looking for three and a half feet?

- Yeah.

- Okay. All right. Is there any discussion, amongst the commission?

- I'm not worried about the three and a half feet, but there is mention, I believe in your report that the number of the other buildings are fairly high? Do they also exceed the 35?

- I would assume so. It's kind of hard to tell from a car. We don't unfortunately have building heights recorded. You know, we only have what we have, but a lot of the buildings appear to be taller than that. So it will definitely not have any, it won't pose any harm to any of the surrounding buildings.

- It won't block them at all.

- No.

- Thank you.

- I move.

- Motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Commissioner Poradek. Any further discussion? Hearing none, call the vote. All those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? All right. And then that will go forward to City Council for May 16th. Moving on to item number five, which is a public hearing. This public hearing has been properly posted and public notification has been published in the Press Times. We ask that you confine your testimony to facts related to the proposal at hand and avoid repetitive testimony. We'll now open the public hearing on item number five, public hearing on amendments to various sections of the zoning code. Chapter 44, article 14, sections 44 - 1580 related to development standards for short term rentals.

- Thank you Madam Chair.

- Oh, I did that way wrong. Sorry, it was article 16. I did my Roman numerals wrong, sorry. My bad. All right.

- Let me give you a little background during the public hearing. So a little bit of history. So there was a Wisconsin assembly bill that was introduced in 2016. It was not adopted, but it addressed short term rentals. So at that time, and Logan may no more, this is Logan Wood attorney for the city, so you can correct me whenever you like. And it was pretty much I think can do whatever you want type of legislature that didn't get adopted. But in response to that and the increase in short-term rentals that were happening throughout the community. And if you don't know what a short-term rental is, it's a rental term, less than 28 days. Over 28 days is just a month-to-month rental, right? Where you don't have to live in the home and you can rent out that or that unit, living unit. So that would apply to new housing. That would apply to non-conforming housing, grandfathered housing, housing in industrial districts. There's a livable unit there, you have the right to use it for that. So the city adopted some regulations in 2016 to kind of address some of those concerns. In 2017, Wisconsin Act 59, the right to Rent Act and put my other phone on there but was approved that did not match the 2016 assembly bill or the city's adopted codes in their entirety. We had not updated the code since then. Just this past January, fees were increased from basically a hundred dollars for your first application and a hundred dollars renewal. They increased that to \$500 for the first and \$250 for the renewal. Mainly because of the massively increased amount of staff time it takes to manage the short term rentals, which believe me are labor intensive. And then we also acquired access to a software Granicus. And it's a short term rental tracking software. So in what it was, so Alder Weary sent in a request in October of 2022, for the city to take a look at short-term rentals. Obviously he's the Alder for the area around the stadium, he receives a lot of correspondence and he basically had asked to review it and propose any possible modifications. And in your staff report goes into more detail if you don't remember from before, when he sent that forward. So city staff looked at it, Jeremy's office put together a memo that's in your packet, which kind of shows you what our ability would be to, to add to the regulations, and then some suggestions. Staff looked at it and we kind of came up with a series of seven changes. There's some regular grammatical changes

and that kind of stuff. But these are the substantial changes. And the groups that looked at it were our inspection division, planning division and law. So you kind of have the legal aspect, the demonstrators and the enforcers all kind of taking a look at it. So, and you can see these all in your code. If it's bold in an underlined, it's new text. If it's straight through, it's obviously effects being removed. So we added advertising as evidence for short term rentals. One of the big problems that we have is proving you're using it as a rental. We can find the listing online. We can even find in our new software, which I'm gonna show you some screenshots that it was rented and had reviews, but that is really not any proof that it was really done, that it was actually rented. But by adding the advertising as evidence and it's in better language than I put up here, that should help with that. We removed the state of Wisconsin tourist rooming house permit. The state of Wisconsin does not require that. We remove the state of Wisconsin sales and use tax permit. The state doesn't require it, but municipalities are allowed to require it. We had, but I have no reason why we still require it. Basically registering with the state as an insured business. But they have to register with the county anyway, so they're registering. We added proof for a condo association approval. We've had quite a few condos come in. Condo owners or tenants come in, few short term rental and the association calls later saying they're not allowed to do that. They're like, well that's private regulation, but at least we can catch it on the front end. We added proof of approval by a property owner for a tenant or a management company. So a lot of times a tenant will try to sublet if you're, you know, have done that ever in the past, they will do it as a short term rental, especially if in they're in a pristine area that is popular for that. Also, management companies have now kind of gotten into the game where we have some management companies that have 50, 60 units that they're using as short term rental. Basically a hotel room. And sometimes the owners don't necessarily realize what they're doing, their managing the properties. You know, your manager could be a sibling, it could be a a company company, but it's a representative. So we added proof that the owner knows. We shifted the June 1st renewal date every year on June 1st. They run for one year from June 1st to May 31st. We shifted that to July 1st to June 1st to match up with the Brown County Health Department timing to do their inspections. They do an annual renewal. They don't have to have that done until July 1st. So we had this weird gap in between. So we adjusted that and we detailed the placard placement and the information that's included on that placard. So even though that hadn't been enforced in the past, basically you're required to show a placard to the right of way. Shows its short-term rental and shows, gives the name and number and possibly email of who they need to contact if there's an issue. So it's a good neighbor policy, right? You generally know your neighbors, even if they're renters, you have an issue, go talk to them first before you call the police or do anything else. So that's sort of that same type of situation. Go ahead and go down to the next one. So this is kind of what really led us to that. So our records from the city show, we have a little under 300 short term rentals in the city of Green Bay.

- Wow.

- Not all of 'em are accurately permitted, haven't been renewed, whatnot. But around 300, 275, 300. This software, which we actually get through the, with the convention or visitor bureau or the chamber, one of the two, the county gets it and we can all link in, shows that there's 622 short-term rental units in the Greater Green Bay area. 17 were registered in the last 30 days. We get about 20 every month if not more. And then out of all the listings short and long-term, so we have a thousand. So you can see that it's, Granicus, it's pulling up a lot of rentals. And when you look on the map, now this is not scientific by any means, but the green dots are compliant, the red dots are unknown to be compliant. So generally what this software will do is it scours the web, it looks at over 20 different listing sites, pulls off applications, it goes and checks reporting for state taxes. And it pulls those up.

And so if those addresses don't match with permits, it flags 'em. So you can see the red compared to the green. It's drastic. So I understand the Alder's concern and some of the neighbor's concerns, but I just kinda wanted to give you that visual. And if you click down to the next one, this is when you click on an individual property, it'll bring up their listing. So it talks about how many bedrooms it has, talks about everything. And then on the right hand side has an activity timeline, this is one of three sheets and it'll have, next-. So it'll have basically documented rentals. You can click into those, it will have the reviews, it'll have the names of the management companies, it'll pull up just massive data. And all this data is basically being used to determine what is a short term rental and what's not. They are very prolific. They have some pretty negative consequences that we're, we've been read some of that in the attorney memo. The biggest one that we really see beyond being nuisance, and disrupting to neighborhood, is the loss of affordable housing. There's many people that were renting on a regular, fixed six month, 12 month lease. They go down to a month to month. And some short term rental people will boot them as soon as they get, Packer's season comes along or they get an event. This has a pretty bad social situation of inconsistent housing for people, especially kids having to switch schools, being displaced. And also just that you're constantly having to move. That's costly and it's just, we believe it's adding to potential homelessness situations. And you all have heard our shortage of housing, well about 650 units pulled off of the living list for affordable or any housing. Doesn't necessarily mean that affordable, but, so that is kind of it. The changes are not super drastic. Our code was done pretty well back in 2016. But what it really does is it clarifies and it, I dunno how you wanna put it, it kind of gives us a little more backing for when we have to do enforcement actions. Probably not the right term, but.

- No, I think it is accurate. I mean it's also just about efficiency on both sides. Both from the end user, for the applicant, as well as for staff on the other side as well. So both sides are benefiting from this.

- All right. So it's public hearing.

- Yes.

- Okay. All right. All right. So now we're looking to hear from anyone who would like to speak in favor, in opposition, or would just like to give information on this item? 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 six, consideration with possible action on amendments to various sections of the zoning code, Chapter 44, article 16, section 44-1580 related to development standards for short term rentals.

- Thank you. And what you have, so you have here staff report, obviously, the strike through code so you can kind of read it all together. And then the memo, we are recommending approval of the changes as we posted.

- All right, thank you.

- I do have a question. So going back to the map with the red and the green.

- That red is bad.

- That red is bad.

- They're orange, it kinda looks orange to me.
- And this is a static map. So obviously, you know, this is, I think this is.
- Yellow line on the bottom.
- And this can all be filtered as well. I can take some quick screenshots.
- Is there an corrective action or action plan for the red? Are you, is there a memo or something you can send?
- There, yeah. So basically what we're going to do, so part of the problem is the way the code was written was not easily enforceable. So if it's challenged, it costs the city a lot of time and money to send Rachel or or Logan to deal with that. And I mean, yes, you do have them get a permit, but the cost is maybe not, not worth, you know, what you get out of it. Although that is our responsibility to do that. So what we plan to do, and we do this every year, is now, this is going to July, probably the middle of this month, we'll be sending out letters to all short-term rentals that we know of, that we have permits for. We'll also send it out to the listings that, that we can get from Granicus. So those come out in a spreadsheet, real easy, send 'em a postcard or a letter, stating, you know, July 1st you need to get a short term rental permit or renew the one you have. You've been identified as either having one or we've identified you as advertising. And then July 1st will roll around, we'll process, they'll take a couple weeks if not longer. There's a lot of them. Process those and then do another hit on Granicus and then send out either notices to those that have not, probably do that or start enforcement action.
- Lost my train of thought, do they, do the notices go out to the the owners or the address?
- They currently go to the owners.
- The owners.
- Oh, so it goes to the property owners, not the address of the property.
- Okay.
- That would be a, that's a good clarify.
- Yeah. Yep.
- We have a lot of issues with currently with sending notices out to the management because the owners will switch management and not tell us. So a good example, we have one that Ruesch Management was managing and we were sending them out notices they were in violation. Ruesch finally called six months later saying, well we haven't had that for about eight months.
- Yeah. Ah, thanks.
- So it was like, okay, everything goes to the owners.

- Okay.
- Wherever the tax bill goes, it's where they get the notice.
- That makes sense.
- They can inform their management. And again, it could be, you know, a sibling or whoever managing for you that doesn't, doesn't check the mail regularly.
- Yeah. Well and I'd say as a landlord, I'm not gonna get anything that's mailed to the property and I'm not gonna get anything that's probably mailed to the property property. You gonna mail it right to my billing address, So yeah, that makes sense. Well, because you never wanna not get your taxes.
- We'll go that-
- I can find you. Come on now. Come on now.
- So, but I'm assuming we're probably gonna be, not go citing right away?
- Right.
- We're probably gonna send notice, a second notice in the middle of July saying we notice you have not done a short term rental, but you're still listed, you have X number of days to contact us. If not, then we would start doing the corrective action. I mean the goal is compliance, right?
- Right.
- There are some people that just say, I don't care, I'm not doing it.
- Those are the ones that you gotta follow up on, but there's far less of those than, than those that will comply.
- As far as that goes, what is the ramification that they face if they say, I'm not doing it?
- It's generally citations. So it's five, I think it's \$500 a day, up to \$500 a day, that you're using the short term rental and not, without a permit. Especially once you've had a couple notifications, but then they probably go to court and whatever happens with it at that point. But that's where it would go. I'm not sure. But inspection also charges every time they have to go out and do a reinspection.
- \$50.
- \$75.
- Oh.
- But that might be also added onto that, depending what type of action needs to be taken.

- Okay.

- And they may have to go out to site, then that would apply. If they're just gonna look on the software, probably not.

- And we were sending out the notices because there's always the possibility that, I mean, I'm gonna be honest, if I wasn't in a planning commission, I wouldn't necessarily know that I would need to have permits for an Airbnb or-

- Yeah.

- Something like that.

- At first we were like, we're not sending out notices, they should know. And then it's like, no, we need to send out something. And that was also part of the fee increases. I mean we're sending out letters, we're doing on-

- Mailings, right..

- So this might be a loaded question and I'm just gonna ask it 'cause I don't know, but because I did see something on Ask Robin on doing something around this as well. Is there anything where the two actually talk or?

- We talked distributor.

- The same finance level.

- Exactly the same level, their fees are much higher. I don't know if that was approved while I was gone last week, but they did propose a heavy, heavy handed actions for less than six days rentals, which is, you know what, the rentals are less than six consecutive, most of 'em are weekends or just, you know, Sunday night, you know, for Packer games. We talked about that, for one thing, it would be incredibly costly to enforce and to find that out, and that there's quite a few ways to just get around it. So I'll just give you one easy example. You only wanna rent it Saturday night. Well, you rent it for the whole week. It's the same price, it's just Saturday night.

- Right.

- And you just don't rent it out the rest. I mean that's an easy go around.

- Right.

- Not violating any laws then, but there's nobody there. So at that point, I mean what's the point? And with code like this, if those really short term ones are problematic for us, we can always revisit the code. But I don't think it's been a huge problem beyond the regular, you know, noise and nuisance kind of thing.

- So I've got two big questions. First of all, where in the code does it say what a short term rental is?

- In the definition section.
- Okay, which we didn't get because this is just the process of applying for the .
- But I can redo that verbiage.
- I would like that because it's seven day cutoff that has me confused, so.
- I was looking there as well. Yep.
- But my-
- Actually-
- understanding is the state says we have no control over something that's seven days or more.
- That's not no control, but limited.
- Okay.
- Can't ban it.
- Yeah. Can't ban it.
- Can't ban it. But we can still regulate it.
- Can we have reasonable regulations? Yes.
- Okay. So I'm wondering the difference between the things that are over or under seven days and whether or not this applies to all of them.
- So as it stands right now, we don't have any additional regulations in terms of duration.
- Right. So we don't distinguish between less than six days or more than seven days. Six nights or seven days. So we don't have any distinction between those two.
- And what about 45 days.
- Then that would be, so the limit, the threshold is, has to be less than 28 days to be considered a short term rental.
- Okay.
- Otherwise over that time period, there's a month to month lease.
- Okay. And that's the issue that you were addressing just a minute ago too, Dave, that trying to sort those out would not be worth it. It'd be difficult to do.

- Right. And also recognizing that we would still need this code. We couldn't there, there's no outright ban or fix for short short-term rentals.
- But we are addressing everything that's a 28 days or month, shorter, or under 28.
- We're just addressing what we, what would be considered a short-term rental. That's less than 28 days.
- Yep.
- 29 and whatever.
- Yep. Yeah. For-
- Regulations no longer apply.
- For the short term rentals.
- Right.
- Other regulations would still apply but you wouldn't fall under this net, if that makes sense.
- I think a search would be really.
- The regulations only apply to those that are rented for 28 days or less.
- Yes.
- Right? Okay, I've got that.
- Yeah.
- Thank you very much. That helps.
- And my other general question, you don't have to find the exact language there, Dave. I got the answer, which is clearer than the exact language.
- We will all admit. What are people trying to avoid that has to do with fees, et cetera?
- I think-
- I've forgotten now what, it's been so long. I've forgotten what we require of short term renters.
- Sure. Well, short term rental owners have to get a permit and currently they need a state use and sales tax number, which we're proposing to remove. They need to register with the Brown County room tax, which they do that through the city and that's the special tax by the county for hotel rooms. They need to submit proof of insurance. They need to submit- I think I noticed it all the time, I had to do it all the time, insurance, that and proof of a health inspection, also a lease agreement that

they use that address. Where you can have your fires, that kind of stuff. And then the application itself, which includes owner's name, address, management's name and address.

- So that, I betcha a lot of those properties are not, they're not in compliance because of that health. I mean if you're talking about like, like paint on the, peeling paint, 'cause I've seen some of the short-term rentals in Green Bay that are not near the stadium and I mean they're pretty on the inside, but the outside you would never guess.

- And how far does a yearly, a yearly renewal of that health inspection? What I really think a lot of it is, it's either ignorance of not knowing they need one.

- I think that that's probably,

- But another, the ones who kind of do some pushback, it's usually the fees, they may only rent it out for the Packer games and otherwise they live there the rest of the time or you know, there's examples of a person I just spoke with today who will rent it out long term for eight, nine months and then use it for the short term for the rest of the time. So if you're not making a lot because it's a shorter, a three month time frame, you know, I don't know. So, but that's all-

- A weird, special situation.

- All speculation. Some people are just, you know, libertarian, my property, I do what I want. It's, I mean, all kinds of different reasons. I think the vast majority are just ignorance that they need one.

- Because I don't think the, hypothetically the revenue you would get from the game would exceed-

- It depends on your board price, you know, you have to think about your mortgage and you gotta think about all the different variables involved in running a property like that.

- And there's a lot of short-term rentals that are not near the stadium.

- Right.

- Short term rentals all over. I have a good friend who has one on a hundred block on Maple. She-

- And I looked at that property when it was for sale. It's like literally two north south of the trip. No, cause it was rough.

- Oh. Oh, it's not up anymore.

- Oh they didn't? Well I mean ,it's good that they did nice things but then that isn't a neighborhood where, you know, I.

- Well she lives down first way.

- So I guess that makes sense too. I understand that she-

- She does it mainly because of the farmer's markets, the festivals downtown, it's just extra income

for her.

- Yeah.

- So there's all kinds of reasons why people do it. Some people do it as a business.

- But you're think about the vast majority, it's, they just don't.

- I think the vast majority just don't know. And if they're not being regulated, why pay.

- Well, they'll get a letter pretty soon.

- Correct. And we have, again, we have over, you know, 250 short-term rentals who came in, got their permits and we have some very good short-term rental owners as well. So it's, and it's always the bad apples that ruin it for everybody.

- What percentage are operated by management companies compared to operating just by people who just put it up?

- I wouldn't know that I, yeah, maybe I'm guessing here, but maybe what, 25%? 30%. But it's getting, it's increasing, I've noticed with applications and even received foreign applications where the owners have never been to the United States, but they're buying properties around any NFL, NBA team and just buying up housing. Housing here is cheap compared to, depending where you are.

- With the conversation about the fees. You know, you said Ashwaubenon is a little bit higher than us and we're at 500 right now according to this. So do you know what Ashwaubenon is?

- I believe they're in policy.

- Madam Chair, just to interrupt, I believe Alder Hutchison has to leave, so he just, I think he's trying to get in here.

- Yes, I just wanna note that I'm leaving. I'll get to vote on this next Tuesday as part of the council. I'm in favor of this. So have fun voting. Thank you very much.

- Thank you.

- So with the difference in the fee structure, do you see people as being an incentive of trying to come to Green Bay instead and pay the fee, buy instead in Green Bay? You know, I mean if they're looking at where to operate the, well not in Green Bay and they see that Green Bay gets fined as half what it is, in Ashwaubenon and those people who would not be in compliance, do you think that would be incentive to come to Green Bay and not be in compliance or?

- Well, I mean the fines are gonna be, I'm not sure where Ashwaubenon's fines are, that's their permanent fee plus the permanent. But to be really kind of honest, most of the stuff around the stadium, it's location. So if they're, if they have to pay 1,500, to them, it's not gonna matter too much.

- Sure.

- Where that fee change really is gonna help us. There's \$500. first fee then it's \$250. So it's gonna get people to renew it because if they don't renew it by July 1st, maybe not discouraging you then it'll be 550.

- Sure.

- But I was referring to the for a violation, the penalties we'd now receive.

- Oh, well and then per day, 500 per day. up to 500 per day.

- Up to.

- It doesn't say that.

- Oh maybe it'd be per rental. But if they're advertising it every day it's, that's kind of a lawyer question.

- Part 12. Number 12,.

- Well, violations and it says penalties for, oh, for each violation.

- Right.

- So it might be advertising, it might be rental if we, cause now we have quasi proof when it's rented. And also, like I said, you can get reviews that come on there too. "I stayed there May 2nd, it was beautiful". Well it's obvious.

- I don't understand the notion that it's for every night. I don't think it's for each violation. If I rented it out for five days, I consider that one violation.

- Well and that might be the case. Like I said, I'm not exactly sure that might be, that might be an attorney question.

- Ask you about this, it sounds like this really does need to be amended in order to clarify the violations per night.

- We can but also remember that also for advertising too. So it wouldn't necessarily matter that you actually are renting or occupying. It's also for advertising the claim.

- Because as long as you're advertising, you have a property available and you're not permitted to do that.

- What we're considering that proof that you're operating a short term rental.

- But that if I advertised it, it would be one violation.

- Every time that you're advertising it, each day would be a new violation.

- That's, that's what I still don't get is where does this each day or each night come in?
- Well, because you can't just have a one time fee, I'll just pay it once and then leave me alone.
- I think that gives us some leeway to scare people into compliance.
- And that is pretty much-
- But it's, I don't, I don't, I've never seen the city go crazy about anything. They're very reasonable.
- To your point earlier, it's about compliance, right?
- Right.
- It's not about we need punishment.
- We want you to be doing the thing.
- What I'm saying is, this does not scare me.
- Okay.
- \$500 A day doesn't scare you? No, it doesn't say a day.
- Oh, oh, we wanted, we wanted to scare them all.
- Yeah.
- Okay, I see.
- He's been very patient.
- Sorry.
- Oh, go ahead. Go ahead Neil.
- Just, I guess wanna compare it to what we do with like say a building inspection violation. So even though if that, so if inspector goes out, finds that a permit hasn't been achieved, he goes back the very next day, there's still not a permit achieved. Then there's that, that's an additional violation for every single day. So I think there is certainly practice in terms of how other ordinances are implemented in terms of not being a permitted use or a permitted activity that it is a daily, it is definitely a daily violation. So, and not that our guys would actually be going out every single day to do that. However they would, the ordinance would allow them to do that. And in the case of health and safety, they might actually go out and do a daily inspection to try to get something completed. But generally it'd be more like a weekly or a week to 10 days to check on. See whether or not, probably in this case I'd think like a weekly reinspection to see if they had actually achieved their permit would probably be more appropriate. But we do have the ability in case of, like I said, if it was

a health and safety issue that was someplace, not only just within the matter of the permit of this particular use, but also just general building codes and zoning codes that also could be applicable as well, so.

- And that's very typical for years. And that's what we did. Usually we would end up giving a five day fine and then that was enough to shock them.

- Yeah.

- But we could do it every single day. We didn't have inspection but we could have.

- But you can both of 'em as well and you know,

- And will this go through inspection. is in inspection division too?

- Yeah, they, they were part of-

- So your inspectors, okay because I've found the inspectors now, I've bought properties that were out of compliance. My properties didn't fall out of compliance when I had them, but I bought them out of compliance and I've found the inspector to be very reasonable to work with as long, you know, if you were actually trying to do the work.

- As Logan had mentioned, we, it's all about compliance. I mean if you're trying, if you don't have the money or you can't find a contractor, we will extend those.

- And that's absolutely a problem.

- But in this case, as Neil said, if it's a life safety issue.

- Right,

- We'll make sure you're not renting.

- Right. No, absolutely. Right. And that's where the health inspection comes in too. All of that kinda stuff.

- Correct.

- Can I just add real quick, back to Commissioner Poradek comment by the, ideally Michael, we would like the ordinances and things to be as similar as possible to kinda avoid that shopping across the boundary. So I think as we continue to work on these, we are actually looking at doing additional coordination with actually the village Ashwaubenon on this very issue for that reason. So yeah, we don't wanna be in a position where they're causing one to kind of flood or hop across to the other one. Just in terms of, you know, for the most part it's, it's just the real estate cost that's kind of keeping it striving where they're locating in their proximity to the stadium. But we don't wanna cause that an undue stress point 'cause there is a drastic difference between the ordinances. So that is something we are gonna be looking at as we go forward with this.

- I appreciate that. I just wanted to, and I'm fine with the application fee makes total sense and I think the cost makes sense that, but it's the fine element that would be concerning. The other piece is that since it seems to be Alder Weary, we had the communication originally that started all of this, has he looked at the language, had any comments for steps.

- He would have a copy of the plan commission. We didn't invite him here, but he does go to council here.

- Check with him, if he has one.

- And I would suspect one of Alder Weary's questions would be are we charging, are we fining enough for this particular item? He will probably ask, 'cause I believe he even asked about that even when we updated just our regular fee schedule with, when we were working on that with Logan, I think he actually brought that question up as to whether or not that was the maximum fee we, our penalty we could impose on that. So I would, I would imagine a similar question would be coming forth probably from him at council.

- Probably be a conversation I guess.

- But as long as it gives us the flexibility, like said was saying to do it every day and to do other things.

- My problem is the person to whom it is done every day. If I were that person I would blow sky high.

- They do.

- Right. And those object, the people that are the biggest-.

- Inspections work, so the inspectors will go by every day and that's usually seven and 30 days to correct. So you have that whole timeframe to correct the situation. In this case it probably be a seven.

- And generally in that letter it also says if you are not compliant, this section of code will go into effect, this is the amount of fees that you could be charged. So like they get that information up front too.

- If they do that up front.

- Right. And plus the inspectors too. If there's a situation like it's the winter and they're saying you have to paint your house, they will give you, they're not, they're gonna give you till spring. They're not gonna say you have to have done, I don't care about weather, so they're, right.

- I assume if someone was found out of compliance and they had to go through the process with the county, et cetera, the city would work with them on that over 30 day window. So you're not gonna be saying do all this, it's impossible to do in the next how many days.

- Again, it's getting the compliance. That's the big thing. I think that one of the biggest issues that I've had over the last year is people trying to actually before this past year, try to trickle information in

like, well here I have my health inspection, nothing else. Then they'll send another item in a little while later. I don't know if it's a stall tactic or it is that they just,

- That's when they're getting stopped.
- But we cannot track that. We have so many, there's paperwork everywhere.
- That's the reason we do have a regulation requirements. At the same time.
- Correct.
- Okay. Thank you. I was wondering.
- And I mean honestly this process is so much better than what our prior process was for approving short-term rentals, which is having them all come before us here.
- We wouldn't have room in city hall if we needed to do that now. Yeah, it'd be awful.
- Every single one had to come.
- I blocked that out.
- You blocked it out. I think I had a newborn then.
- Worked on that. Oh my gosh.
- That must have been right before I got here.
- Oh you, oh you didn't even experience that. Oh yeah. And it was room full of people every time.
- 'Cause the neighbors never wanted,
- They didn't want it.
- No. Oh.
- Okay.
- I have two questions quick, sorry. You're talking about compliance and ignorance. Sometimes it's just not knowing what to do. Currently if you just type in city of Green Bay short term rental permit, you get driven right to the application on there. I would consider maybe a landing page, something that can give like a quick FAQ or something to, 'cause if you're looking through this and you're just perusing and also regards to the code and what we're trying to deliver there, most people are not gonna read the code. They're gonna maybe look for whatever they can. So I think it, trying to find the easiest way to convey the message that you need to get a permit. Here are the steps. And I know what I'm looking at here and I think I can follow it just fine, but we're talking about some people who maybe don't have experience doing these things before trying to really lower the bar to get.

- To simplify it.

- Yep.

- And you're, you put in buzzwords. I just put, can I do an Airbnb in Green Bay and it says what's the best Airbnb vacation rental company. Nothing like, so if you're, if you're like looking up, what's the process for a short term rental? Well you put buzzwords like that. But if you're just looking up like, can I do this? Like I, man, how would you even know is Airbnb allowed in Bay? Oh, Bay area. So now it's going to San Francisco. Nevermind. City is Green Bay, so like several pages down or several things down now, short-term rental permit application process. Oh look at that, \$500 application fee.

- So no real question, more just a consideration. Try if that's something and.

- We'll be updating our applications website, everything after we get the new . And that's a good point and good point to make 'cause our web person's right here.

- Yeah. And then second part too, obviously this is a pretty, we knew there was issues before. We're trying to improve it. This probably isn't gonna be perfect either. Just acknowledging that it's, there's a lot that's out there and you're not be able to catch everything there. Is there gonna be kinda a review process? Are we expect to maybe see this again in a year or some period to just say, hey, how did, how did this perform? And then some other changes that might be.

- Yeah, almost anytime we do a text memo internally, we look at it, we try to do it 12 months, sometimes it's 18 months. And then fix things that aren't performing the way we anticipated or maybe have some kind of weird, you know, offshoot that happens from them. And we would do the same thing with this one. Usually that comes from inspection contract. They have issues. But yeah, just like parking. I think parking came back here three times. Obviously that's much more complicated. And is this thing haven't had much, we haven't had much issues with it at all. I think we worked the bugs out.

- Well, I don't know if you got a second, but second.

- Oh, okay. All right. Do you have any further discussion or questions? We have a motion by Commissioner Poradek and second by Vice Chair Miller. All those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? Then that will also go through to the council for May 16th.

- Okay.

- Alright. And moving on to informational director's report. Mr. Stechschulte.

- Good evening everybody. Just a couple of quick items. The one item that we did related to this that did go through common counsel for first reading here, just this past Tuesday, was actually a requirement to maintain identification for people staying in short-term rentals. You know, basically having vendor, the actual operator would need to hold onto them for any logic accommodation. This is just hotels, short-term rentals, everybody. So they have to maintain that. They're not required to give that over. But if they could be turned over to the city in case of, in case of a warrant was issued. But this actually just simply requires those lodging institutions to maintain records of who is staying at them. So that's just, that was the one thing. So this is, this is another area that's obviously not subject to the zoning code, but is more of an operational thing that has been kind of going through. That was just first reading just the other night. And I think the only other matter of business I wanted to bring up, and I don't know, commissioner Miller, if anyone has asked you or not, just wanna make sure to see if you wish, wish to have your, be renewed as a plan commissioner. I think your term is coming up, so.

- Yeah, I would.

- There we go. That's, that's all I needed to know. So that's just a yes and I will, you will be probably put on the next plan, next city council agenda to get renewed. So.

- Neil, does it say, when I started, is it year seven?

- Oh, let's see. Let me check the email from, we had, it does not, but I bet I can get that information though from you.

- I wanna say it was 2016.

- It was 2016 'cause I was just months before you I think. Yeah, it does say on the Green Bay website.

- So we're just getting you broke in, in other words. and actually that's all I have for this evening, Madam Chair. So,

- Alright.

- Available to answer any questions if anybody has any.

- Oh, I got one. Neil, I thought you, you did, you can maybe get this past us, but I noticed the nuggets and the RDA agenda tomorrow for the Adam Street lot?

- Yes.

- A conversation was had on May 3rd, what can you tell us about that conversation or what can't you tell us?

- Essentially the, yeah, what is being brought up back for is essentially the easement that was being requested. Essentially, it has been determined at this point that it is required by code if for both lots wish to develop that essentially that that 30 foot easement needs to be present between those two buildings. We actually do have an interested developer looking at the Adams Street parking lot,

actually could be bringing a very quality project forward on that. So this is a situation that we did have essentially for folks reading that we did have a meeting with several RDA members and Mr. Belstra representing the condo association. You know, they are essentially proceeding with converting a significant amount of the second floor into residential multi-family units. So essentially this is, he's, you know, proceeding with that. The other item that was in play is essentially the RDA owned a corner property of the building that essentially the parcel line actually went through the building. Something that never should have been allowed in the first place, but for some reason was approved about 10 years ago. So there was essentially a transition of that property over to the condo association. Again, the requirements there would've been, if we did not do that, there would've been a requirement to essentially put up a party wall, a firewall between the two buildings, essentially right along the part, right along the actual ownership line that really had no functional use and was quite a bit of an expense. So essentially those were the two key main items that have kind of been really I guess, dispensed with, for the original one was the corner lot. This one would actually be transition of that easement. But that project, that redevelopment project for it's proceeding essentially at this point in the Bay Lake City Center building. So with the multi-family units, it's about 72 units I believe are being proposed inside that building. Which is permitted and the use is permitted by the zoning code. So there is not a zoning evaluation that will be, you essentially had to meet, the project does have to meet building code however.

- Thank you.
- All right, thank you very much, Neil.
- Thank you everybody.
- Date of the next meeting is May 22nd, 2023.
- May 22nd, that's after, no.
- Motion to the chair.
- Second.
- Motion by Commissioner Poradek, second by Commissioner Bremer. All those in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Any opposed?