



MINUTES OF THE GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION

MONDAY, APRIL 24, 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: Jim Hutchison, Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, and Michael Poradek

Excused: None

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the April 24, 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 March 27, 2023, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Michael Poradek to approve the minutes. Motion Passed.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. (CPA 23-03) Public hearing on the request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for the property located at 2850 Humboldt Road (Parcel# 21-338) from Park uses to Commercial uses, submitted by Dianne Crowley, property owner (Ald. J. Hutchison, District 2).

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

Mark Harrill, 2884 Humboldt Road

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. (CPA 23-03) Consideration with possible action on the request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for the property located at 2850 Humboldt Road (Parcel# 21-338) from Park uses to Commercial uses, submitted by Dianne Crowley, property owner (Ald. J. Hutchison, District 2).

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Michael Poradek to hold the request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for the property located at 2850 Humboldt Road (Parcel# 21-338) from Park uses to Commercial uses until the land swap information is available. Motion Passed.

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

3. (ZP 23-07) Public hearing on the request to rezone the property located at 2850 Humboldt Road (Parcel# 21-338) from split General Commercial (CI) and Low-Density Residential (RI) to General Commercial (CI), submitted by Dianne Crowley, property owner (Ald. J. Hutchison, District 2).

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:

Mark Harrill, 2884 Humboldt Road

Linda Harrill, 2884 Humboldt Road

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 23-07) Consideration with possible action on the request to rezone the property located at 2850 Humboldt Road (Parcel# 21-338) from split General Commercial (CI) and Low-Density Residential (RI) to General Commercial (CI), submitted by Dianne Crowley, property owner (Ald. J. Hutchison, District 2).

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Michael Poradek to hold the request to rezone the property located at 2850 Humboldt Road (Parcel# 21-338) from split General Commercial (CI) and Low-

Density Residential (RI) to General Commercial (CI) until land swap information is available.

Motion Passed.

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

5. (ZP 23-10) Public hearing on the request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) at 158 N. Maple Street (Parcel# 4-95) to allow for the development of the dormitory within the Office Residential (OR), submitted by the Redevelopment Authority of Green Bay, property owner (Ald B. Johnson, District 9).

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

Ald. Brian Johnson, District 9

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. (ZP 23-10) Consideration with possible action on the request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) at 158 N. Maple Street (Parcel# 4-95) to allow for the development of the dormitory within the Office Residential (OR), submitted by the Redevelopment Authority of Green Bay, property owner (Ald B. Johnson, District 9).

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Michael Poradek 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.

Speakers:

David Buck

Will Peters

David Coury, 1917 Lakeside Place

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Sidney Bremer 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 Sidney Bremer, seconded by Derius Daniels to approve a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) at 158 N. Maple Street (Parcel# 4-95) to allow for the development of the dormitory within the Office Residential (OR) subject to the following conditions:

- a. A maximum capacity of 6 individual unrelated residents who are students of UWGB and one VISTA fellow to act as the property caretakers for a maximum total of 7 individual tenants. Any increase in residents will require Plan Commission and Common Council approval.
- b. If the dormitory use is discontinued, the operation is dissolved, or if UWGB's Center for Civic Engagement no longer operates/manages the facility, the use shall terminate immediately. The use/operation shall not be renewed or reestablished without the Plan

- Commission and City Council review and approval.
- c. Conformance with the operating plan submitted by the applicant.
 - d. Compliance with all other regulations of the Green Bay Municipal Code.
 - e. Final site and building plans are reviewed and approved by the Green Bay Redevelopment Authority.

Motion Passed.

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

7. (ZP 23-12) Public Hearing on the request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) at 1200 S. Broadway (Parcel# 1-855) to allow a self-service storage facility in a Special Purpose-Residential Light Industrial district (S-RLI), submitted by Filip Barasan, Barsan Corporation, applicant and Green Bay Redevelopment Authority, property owner (Ald B. Johnson, District 9).

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.

Speaker:
Jon LeRoy

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.

8. (ZP 23-12) Consideration with possible action on the request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) at 1200 S. Broadway (Parcel# 1-855) to allow a self-service storage facility in a Special Purpose-Residential Light Industrial district (S-RLI), submitted by Filip Barasan, Barsan Corporation, applicant and Green Bay Redevelopment Authority, property owner. (Ald B. Johnson, District 9).

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Ken Rovinski 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.

Speakers:
Filip Barsan, 409 N Broadway
Ald. Brian Johnson, District 9

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Jacob Miller 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 Jacob Miller, seconded by Ken Rovinski to approve a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) at 1200 S. Broadway (Parcel #1-855) to allow a self-service storage facility in a Special Purpose-Residential Light Industrial district (S-RLI) subject to the following conditions:

- a. Submitted site plans to remain in general conformance of what has been provided with this conditional use permit request.
- b. The maximum building height shall be three stories, no greater than 40 feet in total.

- c. Individual storage units shall not contain motor vehicles.
- d. A minimum of three indoor parking spaces are provided to users. The applicant must meet sufficient additional off-street parking to meet the minimum standard for parking requirements for the self-service storage use.
- e. Submission of information regarding the specific custom sheet metal to be used on the buildings. Staff to review and grant approval.
- f. Final site and building plans are reviewed and approved by the Green Bay Redevelopment Authority.
- g. Compliance with all other regulations of the Green Bay Municipal Code not covered under the Conditional Use Permit, including standard site plan review and approval.

Motion Passed.

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

9. (ZP 23-13) Public hearing on the request to establish a Planned Unit Development at the 2500 block of University Avenue (Parcel# 21-1249-1-3) to permit the development of multiple-family residential use, submitted by Gorman & Co., applicant and Meyer Family Investment Corp., property owner (Ald. Craig Stevens, District 5).

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:

Jon LeRoy

Ted Matkom, 200 N Main Street, Oregon, WI

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.

10. (ZP 23-13) Consideration with possible action on the request to establish a Planned Unit Development at the 2500 block of University Avenue (Parcel# 21-1249-1-3) to permit the development of multiple-family residential use, submitted by Gorman & Co., applicant and Meyer Family Investment Corp., property owner (Ald. Stevens, District 5).

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Ken Rovinski to establish a Planned Unit Development at the 2500 block of University Avenue (Parcel #21-1249-1-3) 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.

11. (SV 23-01) Consideration with possible action on the request to vacate a public cul-de-sac located at Vine Street and Ricky Street, submitted by Mau & Associates, on behalf of Habitat for Humanity, property owner (Ald. Morgan, District 3).

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Michael Poradek 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:
Stephanie Hummel
Steve Bieda, 400 Security Blvd

Moved by Michael Poradek, 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 Sidney Bremer, seconded by Jacob Miller to vacate a public cul-de-sac located at Vine Street and Ricky Street, contingent upon waiting period and public hearing and subject to the following conditions:

- a. Access to parcel 21-1361-3 shall be maintained. This shall be addressed in the Developers Agreement with the petitioner(s).
- b. Green Bay Water Utility's existing facilities can be abandoned provided that abandonment happens along with the water main extension that is needed for the housing development.
- c. Wisconsin Public Service shall be granted a utility easement for their existing facilities within the vacation area.
- d. The existing Storm and Sanitary Sewer within the vacated area will need to be modified and/or a sewer easement will need to be addressed in the Developers Agreement with the petitioner(s).

Motion Passed.

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

12. (VR 23-02) Consideration with possible action on the request to deviate from Section 44-554, minimum lot size and minimum lot width, of the Green Bay Municipal Code, submitted by Mau & Associates, on behalf of Habitat for Humanity, property owner (Ald. B. Morgan, District 3).

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Sidney Bremer to approve a variance to deviate from Section 44-554, minimum lot size and minimum lot width, of the Green Bay Municipal Code. Motion Passed.

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

13. (TA 23-02) Public Hearing on the request to amend portions of the Zoning Code, Chapter 44, Articles III, VII, VIII, IX, XVI, and XXI, related to dog-friendly business, submitted by The Community and Economic Development Department.

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.

Speaker:
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.

14. (TA 23-02) Consideration with possible action to amend portions of the Zoning Code, Chapter 44, Articles III, VII, VIII, IX, XVI, and XXI, related to dog-friendly business, submitted by the Community and Economic Development Department.

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Michael Poradek to amend portions of the Zoning Code, Chapter 44, Articles III, VII, VIII, IX, XVI, and XXI, related to dog-friendly business. Motion Passed. Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, Jim Hutchison, Michael Poradek, No- None, Abstain- None.

15. (ED 23-02) Consideration with possible action on a request to release a 6 ft. x 300 ft. utility easement in the 100 Block of E. Mason Street (Parcel # 15-168-A and 15-2) to accommodate the Astor One Development, Miller Land Investment, LLC and Green Bay Redevelopment Authority, property owners and Green Bay Dept. of Public Works, applicant (Ald. B. Johnson, District 9)..

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Ken Rovinski to release a 6 ft. x 300 ft. utility easement in the 100 Block of E. Mason Street (Parcel #15-168-A and 15-2) to accommodate the Astor One Development subject to the following condition:

- a. A separate and existing 24' easement remains along the north property line for the use of a main by Green Bay Water Utility.

Motion Passed.

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

16. Consideration with possible action regarding On Broadway Inc. (OBI) Business Improvement District's (BID) budgeted vs actual year-end reporting for 2022.

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Michael Poradek to approve the On Broadway Inc. (OBI) Business Improvement District's (BID) budgeted vs actual year-end reporting for 2022. Motion Passed.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

I. Director's Report.

Neil Stechschulte presented the Director's Report.

2. Date of next meeting: May 8, 2023

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Michael Poradek 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

- All right, good evening and welcome to the Monday, April 24th meeting of the Green Bay Planning

Commission. We'll start with a roll call. Chair, Lisa Hanson.

- Present.

- Vice Chair, Jacob Miller?

- Present.

- Alder Jim Hutchison?

- Present.

- Commissioner Sidney Bremer?

- Present.

- Commissioner Darius Daniels?

- Present.

- Commissioner Ken Rovinski?

- Present.

- Commissioner Michael Poradek?

- Present.

- We're moving on to the approval of the agenda. Approval of the agenda for the April 24th, 2023 meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Motion by Commissioner Rovinski, second by Commissioner Poradek. All those in favor?

- [Everyone] Aye.

- Any opposed? Moving on to the approval of the minutes. Approval of the minutes from the March 27th, 2023 meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Motion by Commissioner Rovinski, second by Commissioner Poradek. All those in favor?

- [Everyone] Aye.

- Any opposed? And then moving on to regular business, starting with a public hearing. 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. City staff will be provided 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 plan commission in order to speak and please address your comments to the chair. Comments will be limited to three minutes. And now we will open the public hearing on item number one, public hearing on the request to amend the city's comprehensive plan for the property located at 2850 Humboldt Road from park uses to commercial uses submitted by Diane Crowley Property.

- Thank you, chair. This first item is related to item numbers two, three, and four as well. Likely I will not be giving an additional staff report, so this may be it. The location is 2850 Humboldt Road. This is right next to the request we had last month which was located here. So this is the current location of Jimmy Sims. It's been a restaurant use for years and years. The request is to amend our comprehensive plan and also to do a rezoning on this parcel. So to start with the comprehensive plan, it's showing as park use. Most of the land surrounding this parcel is owned by the Parks Department and it is intended to remain as a heavily wooded park area. This however, has no benefit to the parks department. They have no interest in expanding their parks and this is intended to remain commercial. So the comprehensive plan amendment would change this from that parks designation to commercial. The zoning is its own little bag of fun. So this is split zoning along this parcel. I'm not entirely sure how this ever happened because the commercial entity isn't even in this portion, it's a little bit more over here, but for some reason this one little spot has the C1 zoning. The rest of it has R1 zoning. The intention is to clean this up and to have it follow the parcel lines to be the C1 zoning in its entirety. A slight issue came up today. They are looking to complete this request as part of an expansion project, which is shown here. So they are looking to add a patio area onto a portion of their land. However, the area they're hoping to expand it to, it's actually owned by the Parks Department. So they need to execute a land swap with the Parks Department and we did not receive the boundaries for that new land swap area in time for this meeting. So we're hoping to still hold the public hearing on both the comprehensive plan amendment and on the rezoning to see if there are any public comments as we did not have time to send out letters to notify that this was gonna be held. But we cannot go through with the action because we don't actually have the boundaries plan yet. It will be somewhere in here that the expansion will happen and then they'll swap somewhere down here. So it really won't have any effect on the use of the property. However, it will affect where the boundaries lie. So we don't wanna have to go through this action twice. So that is the background for both items one and three.

- Okay, thank you Steph. Is there anyone wishing to speak on this item? Is there anyone wishing to speak on this item? Is there anyone wishing to speak?

- Yes, I guess. Mark Harrell, 2884 Humboldt Road. So if she wants to build a little building on the left side, how would she get a lot of fill in there?

- And this is the public hearing portion, so there's not a question to answer. You can certainly ask your questions, but there won't be any responses to it at this time.

- I guess that's all I got, thank you.

- 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 now closed. Moving on to the corresponding actionable item. Item number two, consideration with possible action on the request to amend the city's comprehensive plan for the property located at 2850 Humboldt Road, from park uses to commercial uses submitted Diane Crowley property.

- Thank you. So to answer the question that was posed during that public hearing, a portion of this was already over the property line, the rest of it will be filled as needed. But it does show a step down, there will be some grade changes within that patio area. The details of that would be sorted out through our site plan process. We are recommending that we hold this item until we have the land swap boundaries.

- Right, so I certainly entertain a motion.

- Motion to hold the item.

- Second.

- Alright, we've got a motion by Commissioner Rovinski, second by Commissioner Poradek to hold the item. Any further discussion?

- Do we know when we would address this? For those who are interested, would it be next meeting?

- Probably not, but we will send another letter to the property owners.

- Okay, thank you.

- Any further discussion? Hearing none, we'll go ahead with the vote. All those in favor of holding.

- [Everyone] Aye.

- Any opposed? So that will be held. Indefinitely, yes. Moving on to item number three, which is a public hearing. And again, this public hearing has been properly posted and notification has been published in the Press Times. We ask that you confine your testimony to the facts related to the proposal at hand and avoid repetitive testimony. So we will now open the public hearing on the request to rezone the property located at 2850 Humboldt Road from split general commercial and low density residential to general commercial submitted by Diane Crowley Property.

- Same spiel.

- Okay. Is there anyone wishing to speak on this item? Is there anyone wishing to speak?

- Mark Harrell, 2884 Humboldt Road. So this new building she wants to put up, is it just a part of a little restaurant or? You can't answer that again?

- No we cannot.

- Next week that is available?

- Nope, it's indefinitely was held from the last item, so.

- Okay, sorry.

- It's okay. Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak?

- Linda Harrell, 2884 Humboldt Road. So what is the difference between the low density residential and the general commercial?

- Again, Mr...

- You just can't, okay.

- You can certainly ask your question, but we cannot answer them at this time.

- Okay, okay.

- The next item, I'll be able to do that.

- Okay, thank you.

- All right, thank you. 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 onto the corresponding actionable item, item number four. Consideration with possible action on the request to rezone the property located at 2850 Humboldt Road from split general commercial and low density residential to general commercial submitted by Diane Crowley Property. Thank you. To further clarify, this is not a building addition, this is just an outdoor patio area. So just you know, what are those things called? A pergola, yeah, patio stones, no building will be as part of this expansion. The difference in R I and C I zoning is pretty substantial. R I is basically for low density residents, so single family homes, maybe a duplex, not many commercial uses in that. Commercial is designated for restaurants, offices, things like that. So the distinction's pretty clear that a restaurant belongs in a C I district and not in an R I district.

- Right.

- And our recommendation is to hold.

- Okay, I was gonna say that.

- So moved.

- Second.

- Motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Commissioner Poradek to hold this item. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor?

- [Everyone] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right, and then that will be held indefinitely. Moving on to item number five, which is the public hearing has been properly posted and public notification has been published in the Press Times. We ask that you can provide 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 plan commission in order to speak. We will now open the public hearing on item number five, public hearing on the request for a conditional use permit at 158 North Maple Street to allow for the development of the dormitory within the office residential submitted by the Redevelopment Authority of Green Bay Property Owners.

- Thank you, Madam Chair. And kind of to give a quick background. So this is an existing 3,200 square footprint home on the corner of North Maple and Hubbard Street, right? The Hubbard Street cul-de-sac. Keep in mind the lot is about 4,200 square feet. So there's 300 square foot difference driveway or whatnot. So that was the first picture, this is the second one kind of showing what it is. It was built around the turn of the century. 1903, 1904 was the guesstimate. It is a very, very large house. Sometime in the '60s or '70s and it had been converted from a single family home into a six unit apartment building.

- Six.

- And not maintained very well. The city acquired it. I wanna say about four years ago. About four years ago, with the goal of light eliminations primarily. So whether that was to rehab it and sell it or to take it down, we didn't know. But the city had to do something so the Redevelopment Authority purchased it. You can go to the next slide, you can kind of see the pictures. So the top picture is from the intersection of Hubbard and it's kind of hard to see, but it is an old Queen Anne style. So it at one point probably had a turret. It's only a one story turret now. And then you can see on the Hubbard Street side on the bottom picture, there is three or four parking stalls there, a couple jump platforms for some of the or exit platforms for the multi-family that was there. Next slide please. So the future land use plan recommends medium to high density housing along the Hubbard Street corridor and then it drops down to a low medium housing as you go back into the neighborhood. From a zoning perspective, pretty much everything here is either zoned, office, residential, which is a mixed use zoning, which is a higher density zoning or downtown, which is the brown. Go to the next one. So this is a rendering or a cursory or conceptual thought of how that would be, how that building would be redesigned. Again, the building itself is 3,800 square feet. The lot is, I believe 4,100 square feet. So basically the city of Green Bay, the University of Wisconsin Green Bay and base companies, who are the owners of the Railyard property over the old Larson Green, they are working together, all three entities are working together to rehab this former multi-family home and create what's known as the Center for Community-Based Learning or what would be call the Center. It is really designed to provide affordable housing for students who are in the Civic Scholars Program, allowing them to do internships, work with ABRA Association in exchange for reduced

rent. It is the first of its kind for the UW system and definitely the first, I would say, officially sanctioned housing product coming out of the University of Wisconsin Green Bay outside of the campus. So for us, very, very exciting. Let me see if I can go on to the next one. So these are just elevations. So the outside of the building is gonna be fully rehabbed. They'd be going with a fiber cement siding pretty much all over the building, relocating windows and adding new windows where the new room layouts kind of dictate. They would replace them, they would put some access, shingle siding, trim boards, and custom millwork. Try to keep that historic, as much of the historic quality as we can. There is not a lot of historic integrity left in this building, a little bit on the outside and quite a lot of nice features on the inside. But yeah, they're not configured very well. They would add metal railings on the second floor that would extend up for upper level patios from the first floor. Essentially the property itself will be unchanged. However, they would be adding a one stall garage into the eastern portion of the building off of Hubbard and have three to four surface stalls. Next slide please. The inside of the building is where you're gonna see the most major changes, except for of course the outside will be heavily cleaned up. So the first floor is gonna obviously be the main floor it would be redesigned and completely rebuilt. It would have a meeting room, communal kitchen, and a half bath as well as the access, the ADA access to the ramp that would come from the outside into the main hall. And also have an ADA living space. So a bathroom, a restroom, and a bedroom that's designed for ADA acceptability. The second floor would basically have single and double bedrooms for students. Also have a full bath. The top floor would have an office and a bedroom for the Vista Fellow, who would be sort of like the Resident Advisor, although he does not, he or she does not work for the university, they're a separate entity. Plus potentially one or two additional bedrooms up on that third floor depending on how it all shakes out, with a full bath. So that's kind of how the interior would be redone. It would be a dormitory for five to six students. Also the Vista Resident Assistant, I'm not sure if they're calling them that, but whatever they're named. And again, the site itself would not change too drastically. When we reviewed the comp plan or not the comp plan, the conditional use permit requirements, there are basically seven and you see them in your staff report. We reviewed those. We also looked at the land development standards for dormitories and I won't go through all those as well, since you have a giant agenda, but there are seven that go along with that. When staff looked at the development standards we found that the proposal meets all of the development standards in the code. We also believe that the use itself is not inconsistent or contrary to the existing land uses in the area. The density of six students and seven, seven units in there, I guess. Six dormitory units, is probably much lower than the high density would allow, and frankly much, much lower than the six full units that were in there just a few years ago. So we do believe it meets the COP standards for approval. However, we are adding some additional comments based on the specifics of this being a dorm rather than just another congregate living establishment. So we would put a maximum capacity of six students that are students at UWGB and the one Vista Fellow to act as the caretaker. If the dormitory use is discontinued, the operation is dissolved, or UWGB Center for Civic Engagement no longer operates or manages it, the conditional use will terminate immediately and you would have to come back to do another dormitory or that type of use and ability to apply to the commissioning council. Conformance with operating plan submitted by the applicant conformance with every other code in the municipal code. And the last one, final site and building plans to be reviewed and approved by the Green Bay Redevelopment Authority, who currently still own the property. I won't make a recommendation, but you can see it on there.

- Hi. Thank you David. I was like, we're still public hearing.

- Yes.

- Okay. All right, all right. So we are opening the public hearing on this item. Is there anyone wishing to speak on this item? Is there anyone wishing to speak?

- Hey, just Brian Johnson, obviously, Alderman for this area. So just in case you're looking for that affirmation, I think this is a great project. This is I mean, a perfect use for this type of site. One of the concerns that I had when the city purchased the property, I know they talked about a lot of different options and that one of them was even contemplating converting it back to a rental unit. I wasn't fond of that idea. I didn't think we should be subsidizing, you know, that type of transaction. But this is, I think fundamentally different because of the programmatic nature of it. So just wanted to let the plan commission know I fully support this good proposal.

- Is there anyone 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 came forward and this public hearing is now closed. Moving on to the corresponding actionable item, item number six. Consideration with possible action on the request to grant a conditional use a conditional permit at 158 North Maple Street to allow for the redevelopment of the dormitory within the Office Residential submitted by the Redevelopment Authority of Green Bay Property Owners.

- Yes, and I won't kind of go back over it all, but I'll just give you highlights. Six students, one Resident Advisor, massive interior renovation, and lipstick all over the outside of the building. New roof and also make it sustainable that it'll survive throughout the years. Staff is recommending approval of the request with the five conditions that are listed forth. There is a zoning action sign out front. They had a neighborhood meeting on, I believe on April 3rd. Two neighbors showed up and only concern was the exterior design that fits in with the rest of the neighborhood. Yeah, Alderman and neighbors within 200 plus feet, there were no, and the Port Neighbors Association as well.

- Okay. Well and I feel like that intersection, they've just done so much, that house across the way that they redid, the one house that was not there, now a house and then I don't see metrics.

- Yep.

- They haven't done much but, but the rest of that corner has been really busy and my kids walk by but this house all the time and are always going up on the porch and looking in windows.

- A lot of improvements.

- Yeah.

- So just as a point of disclosure on this one, I am that house that was across the street that was just built, but also I did work with base companies and UWGB consulting on this project early on in the phases, but did not receive any financial compensation for it and have not received anything since then, but just wanted to put that out there.

- I have a question for Dave. Is the maximum of seven individuals intended as a cutback from what is proposed here because it has room for nine?

- Well what was in their proposal was five to six students and one Vista.

- Right, I'm talking about the site plan.
- Oh the layout of the interior?
- Yeah, it shows, some separate.
- Yeah, well keep in mind the site plan, the interior, the exterior, are all cursory right now.
- Okay.
- Those are not guaranteed. This is a COP, not a PUD. So there may be changes to it in the future, which was part of the reason why the site and building plan go back to the property owner, which is the RDA, for final approval.
- But you all are clear that it shouldn't be more than seven?
- That is what's proposed and that's kind of where we're blocking it. I mean if there is a larger need it could be, it could come back and be amended, but I believe the city just sort of removed six full units and I'm not sure that we wanna add the exact same amount back. And keep in mind there's one garage station and four parking spaces on site.
- Gotcha.
- So as you add more, that becomes a necessity. However, there's a huge city parking lot, about 300 feet to the east and St. Pat's too who probably share.
- Thanks Dave.
- So yes we do feel that seven is an appropriate at this.
- Then Madam chair, I would like to open the floor and hear from the proposers as to whether or not they are content with that number if that program increases.
- Second.
- Okay, so you have a motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Commissioner Poradek to open the floor. All those in favor?
- [Everyone] Aye.
- Any opposed? Anyone hear from the applicant or I know Will, looks like he wants to say something to.
- Well I don't...
- Do you want go or do you want me to .

- Sure.

- So I'll stand up to the podium here just to say, I'm actually representing staff at City of Green Bay. So we're Peter's Neighborhood Development Specialist for the city of Green Bay. And just to elaborate a little bit on your question around capacity, since this is a first of its kind program for UWGB and the neighborhood as well, we're looking at kind of a phased approach of growth. So really we're looking to start with six or seven and when we got, we were working with our architect and we got these plans back and they showed all of this room, we kind of couldn't believe like, oh my gosh, you can comfortably fit like nine people in there. So working with Professor David Corey, who is here as well, representing UWGB and he'll speak as well, we actually perceive if everything goes well, this program could potentially be quite successful and UWGB staff do feel that it could support between nine and even 11. Not to say that it's always going to be nine or it's always gonna be 11 students there at one particular time, but clearly there's sufficient space there for that. And these are a difference, I guess, group of students that we're gonna be working in this program. They really have a specific focus to be there and involved in this program. So yeah, so I just wanted to elaborate on that. Obviously would come back to the RDA as it states in the conditional use permits if we are looking at increasing that capacity. But initially to start we are looking at the six to seven, that's our goal for now.

- I can jump in here too. I'm David Corey from 1917 Lakeside Place representing UWGB. And our idea is that we would be, this would be open to juniors and seniors, so it wouldn't be first or second year students because they need to live on campus as they should and their housing contracts, et cetera. But the other thing that we think is very exciting is that we have several new graduate programs. We're starting a new master's in public administration policy and we think this would be ideal for ways of recruiting graduate students from outside of Green Bay to come who need housing and would be working in the city anyway. So this would be a great opportunity for them to be in the city, to be engaged with the city, with the chamber, with downtown Green Bay on Broadway, to be in the heart of the city. And so we're confident that there's a lot of growth opportunities for those graduate programs. We have some other graduate programs as well in education, in our business program. So we're confident that we, between the undergraduates as well as the graduate students that we would be able to place them. And the Vista is a federally funded program, it's AmeriCorps, is the sponsor of the Vista, and through Campus Compact, which is a national organization that assists universities and colleges for community-based learning and civic engagement. We've been allocated a particular Vista. So that person who will be a graduate, will be there to help coordinate a lot of these types of programs and oversee a lot of the programming that we hope to have in the meeting room that's in the front of the house.

- Thank you.

- Thank you.

- Question, thank you. Since this sounds like it's the first housing project off campus, I assume there'll be some sort of coordination with housing on campus, in terms of student conduct and student responsibilities. Campus housing.

- Yes, although it, since the property will not be owned by the university, and I know what you mean coordination of--

- Well, so it won't be considered an extension of Residence Life on campus.
- Correct, correct.
- And the Vista won't necessarily be responsible for Residence Life needs et cetera of the student.
- Correct, so this is not, so UWGB is a little bit unusual within the UW system in that our residential housing is a separate nonprofit and it's not technically part of the university and therefore not a state entity. So it, there's sort of a three-way triangulation, but this property will be owned by base corporation. So it's an unusual sort of legal agreement that we, that base corporation will own it, but the university will agree that we will provide students who will live there, the university will be responsible for fundraising in order to offset the cost to give a discount to the students. When you're talking about student conduct, the Vista will be ensured that there's not inappropriate things going on, if that's the concern or the gist of your question.
- I come from a housing background.
- Okay.
- So I mean I think that the students-- There was some level of supervision from residents like, or a sense of services if there was some sort of--
- So there'll be a strong oversight from our center as well as the Vista. This will be by choice. So students will have to apply. So I'm confident that students who apply for this saying that they want to, they agree to a year or two year community-based learning project will be some of the better students at the university who are really committed to that. But because of the legal agreement, it wouldn't technically fall under the auspices of university housing to oversee or implement particular codes or restrictions that fall under the university.
- So if there's an issue on site, they're gonna be calling talking there to the Vista or they'd be calling like any...
- Correct.
- Resident in Green Bay.
- Yep, exactly.
- They wouldn't be calling campus safety or campus.
- No because it's technically not going to be owned by the university.
- Correct, yeah.
- For those interested. No, it's a good question.
- Do you have any further questions for the applicant?

- Thanks.
- Do you have anything you wanted to add?
- Nope, I'm good.
- All right, thanks.
- Was there anyone else that wishes speak on record on?
- Motion to support?
- Motion by Commissioner Poradek, second by Commissioner Bremer to close the floor. All those in favor?
- [Everyone] Aye.
- Any opposed? And then any further questions for staff during discussion?
- I move to .
- Second.
- Had a motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Commissioner Daniels. Any further discussion? No, go ahead with the vote. All those in favor?
- [Everyone] Aye.
- Any opposed? All right, and then that will move forward to the next city council meeting on May 2nd. All right, okay. All right, moving on to item number seven, 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 can find your testimony to facts related to the proposal at hand and avoid repetitive testimony. Now to over the public hearing on item number seven, public hearing on the request for a conditional use permit at 1200 South Broadway to allow a self-service storage facility in a special purpose residential light industrial district submitted by Filip Barson, Barson Corporation Applicant and Green Bay Redevelopment Authority and Property.
- Thank you Madam Chair. Yeah, that's the temperature. We don't normally see that district come up in the process very often and this is one of the uses that we might see down there. So what you're looking at is an overhead of the property over at eighth and Broadway, is a vacant lot. Next please. So the future land use for this area calls for light industrial. This use itself is a conditional use in just typical light industrial districts and is in this district as well. So next, so the zoning, yes, it's special district residential life industrial. And so what does that mean? It's an area in the South Broadway area. It's a unique district within the city itself. It's established to address planning and land uses and opportunities that go beyond the general purposes of the city conventional zoning districts. SRI district is a mixed use district, meaning it is intended to encourage a mix up compatible land uses in a variety of locations and scales in order to preserve and enhance vitality of the neighborhood. The overall intent of the land use within the district is to allow for a continuation node by limited

expansion of single and two family residential, in addition to access accessory uses for those residential uses where they enhance the vitality of commercial or industrial uses and to allow for a carefully selected set of commercial light industrial uses which are compatible with existing and anticipated housing within the area. So we're seeing next a, this is a property itself right now, the vacant land. It's at the corner. It's about 8,000 square feet or so, so pretty small. Next. So we received from Barson Corporation the proposal to have self storage. Not a way we typically associate self storage, but much more individualized and personal. So let's say three story building he's proposing on the site itself with parking inside of the building on the first floor. Approximately at the moment, 116 individual units is what he's shooting for on the site. That's what I'll get into this moment. I'll probably go ahead and us back down from the 116 he was initially proposing in this project. Storage to be on both the first, second and third floors with some parking on the first floor. Next. So you see a conceptual rendering of the project itself, but looking to go ahead and use a combination of exposed, finished concrete, custom sheet metal similar to apartment buildings, windows on the upper floors, a first floor storefront look and outdoor lighting. Next. This you see is a rendering of what it might look like from a driveway entrance off the alley itself, it being corner lot. Next, this will be first floor. You can see the unit size is a 5 by 5, 5 by 10 and 10 by 10 mixed throughout both the first, second and third floors. You see a drive coming into the property itself with just three individual parking stalls. So part of the things that are at play right here is, noting these are not typical garage stall storage here for people, particularly more of a urban centralized area to where people would go ahead and taking advantage of their units perhaps more often, by just storing a large vehicle and living it there for the time being. These are projected to be used more often than typical them being so small. Within the zoning code itself, it states that for every 10 individual units you must have one parking stall. For normal typical suburban South Shore facilities, not an issue, they're all parking stalls, they're all garages. That's not the case right here. So you'll note this right here does not meet what they gonna need to go ahead and have to meet code. We're not suggesting go ahead and lower that all, but you couldn't do that with the CP. So that said, there'd have to be some changes with this to go ahead and allow either, one, more parking on the first floor, which would essentially eliminate some those units in general. Go ahead and find that ratio to get to where it's into even, or two, take advantage of finding shared parking somewhere else within a thousand feet in facility, which if we go back up to in slide 23 or 20, keep on going, 20. There are areas where it's potential where they can go ahead and find some different private property owners who might be willing to go ahead and find a win-win right there for some parking. When talking with the applicant about this, and he is on the line here, so later on he might be able go ahead and explain this as well, he did note that he had to go ahead and look at his proforma to go ahead and see how could you go ahead and take this right here in the first floor and find some more parking stalls, and perhaps go ahead and make this happen within the building itself. Next. So you'll see right here on second and third floors into the layout as far as what you might go and expect on second and third floors. In the yellow you see an elevator, in the orange you see stairwells. And then in the blues and reds and purples, you see the individual units that are projected for this. Next. So get to the recommendation later. But as far as the conditions, there are seven conditions that were noted for this. One, submitted site plans to remain in general conformance of what has been provided. So they're not submitting the actual site plan here, but if this were to be approved that'd be in general performance of what's been provided. Two, the maximum building height shall be three stories, no greater than 40 feet in total. Three, individual storage units shall not contain more vehicles inside of them. Four, a minimum three no-parking spaces are provided to the users, the advocate must be sufficient additional parking meet these standards. Five, submission of information regarding the specific custom sheet metal, it was just noted would be that way. We're gonna have to know what that is, be approved them by staffing review. Six, it's much like the item we just had, is also owned by the RDA

so we need to go ahead and get their approval from the RDA as well from final site plans. And then seventh, through typical compliance with all the regulations of the .

- And then with this public hearing, we're looking to hear from anyone who would like to speak 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 eight, consideration with possible action on the request for a conditional use permit at 1200 South Broadway to allow a self-service storage facility in a special purpose residential life industrial district submitted by Filip Barson, Barson Corporation Applicant and Green Bay Redevelopment Authority property.

- Okay, so as staff we debated this as far as whether we've felt this be one worthy of approval or recommending denial. We've felt the overall pros as far as bringing forth something that was functioned as a note on the corner, works still in this limited space, kept parking hidden using quality materials and offering us a potential product that people keep on telling us they need to go ahead and have with self storage, worked well within this district right here as potentially a test case to go ahead and work potentially for other parts of the city. But this right here, it fits within the SRLI district. As far as condition uses in general for self storage, this just brings a lot more intensity compared to our use, which obviously would not ever work on the site. It was just say three garage stalls that were stored in these. So we recommend approval.

- So then those parking spots inside those, just for people to basically get their things into the storage unit that's not, there aren't gonna be cars permanently parked in there. They're just coming in, bringing their stuff, picking up stuff leaving kind of thing.

- Correct. Unlike, say, a typical storage unit where you just drive on into your garage stall or park next to it.

- Right.

- You need a place to go ahead and and park your vehicle. Yes.

- And was it something that they needed to have a neighborhood meeting for?

- No.

- Okay. And you haven't heard from anyone?

- We have not heard from anybody on this phone.

- And I'm assuming that the design standards that they're looking at are something that we've also discussed as far as what the shipyard, are there specific design standards for the shipyard area? Or is there not any progress.

- But it's a very good point that there's a lot of units going into the shipyard right now. And when you look at those storage units in there, they're very similar to like what you find in the basement of an apartment. So if you had a small unit, we got a place to store your car.

- Well and honestly in the neighborhood that it's in, I have a property close here, my tenants do not have storage. Something like this would actually work out for them. I'm just trying to, three stories, 40, I mean, 40 feet doesn't sound super tall until you're standing next to a 40 foot building in a neighborhood with all--

- Certainly, and this is why it would be in the corner lot, being at the book end of it of a lot where I've felt this could make a bit of difference. Now 40 feet, minus, go ahead and give a bit of a buffer right here. Applicant did not supply the final as heights, we know it's three stories. It's giving a bit of a buffer. For anybody, for just typical uses 35 feet is the max.

- And there's no stop sign. The next step, the stop signs at ninth and Broadway.

- Correct.

- There's no stop sign at eighth and Broadway, okay. And that park is right over behind there too.

- Are there, seeing from the images here and I don't know this particular location, are there single family homes right next door like one story teeny single family homes and is--

- That's I what saw.

- Someone I know.

- And the alley behind it for for access, there is a single family that is right next to it that is one story.

- Showing me yeah, thank you, .

- It's got that weird--

- Across the street as well. It's a hodgepodge and that's kind of what the dish is.

- It's right.

- A hodgepodge, yeah.

- We're right across the street,

- It's a corner straight across your right.

- What is this right here, is this is a car.

- It's like a repair kind of thing.

- So the building that we're seeing here that looks like around a small home, is that a residence?

- Yes.

- And it's gonna have to look up at three story?

- With this yes.
- Yeah.
- Is the applicant on the--
- He is. Can we, motion to open...
- Okay. Motion by Commissioner Poradek second by Commissioner Rovinski. All those in favor to open the floor?
- [Everyone] Aye.
- Any opposed? All right. And I guess if the applicant can unmute yourself, please. We have questions.
- Hi.
- Hi. Could you just state your name and address for the record, please?
- Sure Filip Barson, 419 North Broadway.
- And what was, I'm not sure it's a question. I'm just trying to imagine how I would feel if I was a resident in that little house, right next door to this big three story metal building. Have you had any thoughts Mr. Barson, about how to minimize the obstacle for your next door neighbor?
- I think ultimately we are, you know, working with my team, my design team, we're trying to put these buildings together in a manner that blends into the community. That's essentially why we designed them so small. We're not looking to be putting, you know, these projects that have, you know, the standard sheet metal that you know, is usually roofing as a facade. But the other part of this is when we look at this product in terms of where it can be within the city of Green Bay, it's an urban product. It has to be in an urban area. And ultimately with the amount of development that's happening in the, you know, north Broadway and even Ash Schwabe, this was a fit when we were looking at sites. And also additionally the zoning. Obviously we can't go into a residential zone. I think this area's up and coming. If that's the proper way, I think we're gonna have the coal piles over there, taken care of within the next, hopefully within the next 10 years, maybe sooner. So essentially, I think bringing a product like this to this neighborhood would help. I'm not sure how the homeowner would feel. I feel it's been fair that, you know, there was a sign put on that property if anybody had something they wanted to share. I'm not aware of anybody having anything to share, so unless John's aware of it.
- Thank you.
- Thank you.
- Since the alder is here, could we ask Alder Johnson if he has any comments for the neighbors?
- Yeah, so I haven't heard anything from any of the neighbors there. Filip, Brian Johnson nice to see

you sort of. Just maybe one question that I sort of had posed, and I think you're right. I think this is an area that will hopefully benefit in the next generation from some development along that corridor. And of course I'm always more intrigued with urban developments by activated spaces. So you have that lobby that's kind of called out in the corner. Would you be open to, you know, doing some type of retail or rather commercial leaseable space in lieu of the lobby?

- Yeah, I think I'd be open to it. I don't know if the size would be something that, I guess my issue, what I'm going to is I know downtown zoning does not really have a parking requirement. And being in this conditional use area, I'm not sure if we could fit any more parking on that site. And financially when we ran the numbers, it didn't make sense to lease spaces. So we're gonna try to incorporate all that parking within the first floor. And the retail space is gonna be probably, or I suppose the lobby would be probably less than 400 square feet. So unless somebody wants at least 400 square feet, we're gonna have you know, a lobby there probably.

- Well look for what it's worth, commercial trends are suggesting micro retail, is gonna be more in demand moving forward. So I don't think it's out of the question. You could monetize that space and you know, but I also, as I looked at the plan, I mean, since you asked Michael, it's a, at first when Cheryl Ranwick shared it with me, I was kinda like, ah, storage units, right? And this, I wasn't a fan. And she said, no, no, no, just see the plan first. And of course when I saw the plan, I agree, it's a decent design for an urban corridor. Nobody likes storage yet, everybody wants it. And so if you can find a way to reasonably accommodate it, make it aesthetically appealing, it's a product that I haven't really seen in our market, right, we see storage units, but not of this variety. So the only thing that I would just add is, and I think this is something we could work with Philip just outside if what you guys need to do. I broadly speaking, I don't mind it given that I haven't received any neighborhood feedback and that there is that need for that in our community but also just if we could work on the potential for activating that corner, I would like it a little bit more I think. But I certainly wouldn't oppose it the way that it's proposed, the way it stands in front of you.

- Thanks Brian. I just wanted to add briefly, essentially the objective of this was to fill in the storage void for future you know, developments that are gonna be completed here even at the rail yard and obviously in with the housing. And I've talked to developers and a lot of these guys need more storage for those tenants. And that's the whole idea behind this building. And even the design, as John mentioned briefly, to make it look more of an apartment, more like an apartment building as much as we can at least. And then hopefully serve these customers. And one last point, I just wanna let you guys know this was a deal that a client had reinvestment funds and we were looking to continue reinvesting in Green Bay and we believe this is a good site to continue moving forward.

- All right, thank you so much.

- Question, being unfamiliar with this type of building, I guess I have two questions. One, will the first floor be adapted with the air movement to accommodate cars going in and out and people who would sit there because three cars going in relatively, you know, next to each other. That's a lot of, you know, exhausts. And it would, if there's no special air movement, it would just go on up. That's one. And the second thing is this locked out? Do you need a key to get into this building or is it open?

- So the first question, the answer to that is that the first floor will be open, it's secured, it's more of a, how would I put this? A carport design. So the facade, obviously from the outside you would think

it's properly closed, but the first floor is open, it's not temperature controlled and then it is secured. So there is a gate which will be off of the alley and the only way to get in will be through a code or a key fob.

- Oh, so literally there'll be an open big door there.

- I wouldn't say a door, maybe an automated gate of some sort. I don't think we're gonna do an overhead door.

- So it would be open, it would be open to the air in and out.

- Yep.

- Okay, thank you.

- It's not glass enclosed then, which was my assumption from the .

- Yeah, I think the lobby area will be enclosed entirely. But the rest will be more of a carport.

- So then to get up to the second and third floors, would that be through a locked door or is the whole building open?

- Yeah, so the elevator and all the doors work on a fob, on a key fob. So essentially pretty much any door that you want to go through, you have to use a door fob for.

- Okay, thank you.

- Welcome.

- Do we have any more questions for the applicant?

- Motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- Motion by Commissioner Poradek, second by Vice Chair Miller, close the floor. All vote in favor?

- [Everyone] Aye.

- Any opposed?

- Can I ask staff please? Why the shipyard district neighborhood, excuse me. Why the shipyard neighborhood association wasn't consulted or there was no consultation with them or meeting with them. That's some of the other applicants.

- Right, so we do that on practice, our larger scale. And with this being such a small scale in general, didn't feel first one we need to go ahead and have that the being slides 'cause it's a CUP, not like a PUD.

- Yeah.

- I guess my surprise in all this is it's very different from the rest of the neighborhood. It's a lot taller than the rest of the neighborhood from looking at the maps, it's all kind of very small homes scattered around that section. I think there's a good need for storage you know, all the principles of the project are good. I'm just shocked that there's no one here to be concerned and over speak to the project, I guess. So my concern is that, there would be other neighbors that might not have been consulted or the neighborhood might not know this project is coming where I would've liked to have seen some feedback from a neighborhood meeting.

- I could maybe speak to that Michael. So you know, I think broadly speaking in that particular corridor, it may seem like it's out of place, but if you actually ever drive down that street, this is a very mixed neighborhood. You have everything from large scale industrial uses to small bars to single family homes, you know, to double, it is a mix. And it's also a neighborhood that has a high concentration of rental units. So you're talking about investment properties and now I don't know what the situation is of that particular home next door, but just that block in that neighborhood in general, you see a lot of investment properties and landlords that probably you know, could care less either way. Whereas a homeowner may take a different perspective. So I just at least wanted to provide that clarity for you. And in fact there was at one time I know a city staff and I'm sure probably still continuing dialogue and Jonathan can certainly speak to this, but of almost rewriting the code over here. So they kind of had this reside type of code to it because it really is a mixture of everything in this area. And so from that perspective, I don't think the use is necessarily, you know, incompatible with what's already there. It's certainly the difference is that this is a new structure and there really hasn't been to date that I'm aware of any type of like discussion around is there a particular type of use that we only wanna authorize moving forward. And so the reality is with the way that's set up is down there you could probably propose any project and it would be compatible with that neighborhood. I think it's really one of those few anomalies in our city, you know, that I think you'd be hard pressed to find another condition like that somewhere else, but I just at least wanted to paint a little bit of picture for what that neighborhood composition is like.

- There's a good point for zoning for that area allows industrial uses by right singles and two, its require . So it's meant to be as you can the, it's meant to be an industrial area that has housing kind of integrated to make and transition that goes.

- If I can add in on that too, so I've worked with the city for five years and in that time I know I tore down at least three houses in this area that were blighted that eventually got sold to the RDA basically. If you see green space in this area, it was a blighted house that was torn down, acquired by the RDA. But the, from my knowledge, the history of it is that the zoning as it is, is to protect the houses that are there. Right? But the idea at the time when that went through was to transition to industrial. So it's, as a house comes out, housing is not really gonna go back in. That's kind of what my interpretation of that was at the time.

- So the caveat of perhaps work live units--

- It wasn't gonna be a single family home. So, 'cause even with my time with the city, there were some improvements for that that never really came through because of the idea that's of that transition.

- I would like to suggest some compassion though for the guy who's gonna be sitting right next door to the that's going up. This is a classic example of what's good, what's part of the bringing good. This seems like a perfect addition looking forward, but that poor one person or two people or however many are in the family are being sacrificed. And I would hope there might be a member of the staff, perhaps the alderman who would speak to them and give them at least some forewarning that by the way when jackhammers start another week, this is what's happening. I don't know how that would be done. Know I wouldn't wanna do it.

- See it to your point though, I'm looking at it. Is this a house or commercial site? It's a big.

- I was asking before whether it was a residence

- You know what it looks like a tiny little yellow house. But no, that's where that pop sign is that TV repair place. So I mean it's probably like a live-in kind of, work kind thing, but I'm guessing more so.

- Add onto that, I agree that that's a large scale thing next to what's existing there. So I was gonna see if we could add in something with, 'cause there's going to be security lighting. And I know that goes through the, probably through the site plan review, but just a condition that, you know, on any side that's facing a current residential use or perceived residential use that the lighting be limited or that that it does not, the lighting does not extend past the property line. Not sure how to add that in. But .

- If you go back to the rendering, doesn't it, so something behind ?

- In the property line, there can be some, it's limited but not fully. It's not zero. Street lights are.

- Yeah, it's beyond the ambient lights. So which you basically do is take a shot and the lights are all on, turn the lights off, take another shot. Very scientific. So the street lights would take into a cone. I think it's a quarter of a foot candle at property.

- I mean there's like a 20 foot fence right there so.

- And then no, this rendering right here is not fully yet you're seeing to the left of it would be, yeah, house it's not, you wanna just focus on the actual, the building itself.

- Well and I'm sorry I misspoke. So where does the shipyard end? Because you're talking shipyards third street, this is eighth. So I mean that's five blocks.

- I think the neighborhood technically goes down to, right by Richard Craniums.

- Oh that's fifth.

- Yeah.

- So fifth. So three blocks.

- I guess so I didn't catch that, John. Was the lighting, is that something that you've needed to add in

as a condition or is that something I could taken care of?

- You can add as a condition right here to make it more robust as far as standards go.

- They don't have a full site plan at this point, but do we know, are they planning to do buffering that kind of, or are there requirements in the site plan at those?

- So there's requirements as far as, 'cause the parking be all inside, so not we're gonna lose it than that or right there. We have our side yard setbacks. I leave it's six feet right there, which we're building up this size, now that large right there. So more can be added to go ahead and put more buffering into this, that requirement.

- One thing that seems obvious, not so obvious, but if that were a two-story house, it would be a similar effect to that neighbor because they can't see above the story they have. So the fact that this is three four stories, you know, is not that much different than a two story house in perspective of that neighbor next door. So I guess, and you need that third floor to make this viable. So, and I understand the concept of someone that's there, but this is you know, an open property. It's a two story house or three story development.

- I guess I appreciate the discussion. I'm pretty comfortable with it as is and would make a motion to approve. I second that.

- Yes, we have a motion by Vice Chair Miller and a second by Commissioner Rovinski. Do you have any further discussion?

- Without going for the more robust, I like that word of proposal that John was suggesting, may we simply assume that working on the site plan, the protection from people next door roundabout will be on the staff's minds. Thank you John.

- Well then that neighbor to the will get a letter after this meeting is done stating what the planning commission had said. We'll see, they may react that.

- I thought they had received the letter.

- Yes. But they get one after.

- And there's a sign in the yard too, right? Like the zoning?

- Yep.

- With the phone number. Okay.

- Thank you for that reminder.

- Okay. Okay, so we have a motion by Vice Chair Miller, second by Commissioner Poradek.

- Rovinski.

- Rovinski, sorry, Commissioner Rovinski. Any further discussion? Hearing then we'll go ahead with the voice vote. All those in favor?

- [Everyone] Aye.

- Any opposed? And then that will move forward then to city council for May 2nd. Moving on to item nine, 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 can find your testimony to facts related to the report at hand and avoid repetitive testimony. We'll now open the public hearing on item number nine, public hearing on the request to establish a planned unit development at the 2,500 block of University Avenue to permit the development of multiple family residential use submitted by Gorman and co applicant and Meyer Family Investment Corps property owner.

- Thank you ma'am Chair. So we're looking right here as a corner of University corridor plan, this is by the old packaging site. Next please. So the two land use plan, this is commercial. This area was also part of the University Avenue corridor plan. This area here in that plan called for mixed use of, commercial mixed use and residential along this corridor on the south side of the road. So that what is being proposed here is within, with the goals of University Avenue corridor plan, next. And then right now you'll see the zoning. It's a CI zoning as it's underlay and the government company and four building on the site.

- Familiar .

- That's in there. Next, you can see the site at the corner right now, it's one point acres. So as we'll just go ahead and kick that can right now. So Gordon came through with the Plano Avenue that set itself as about 1.2 acres. One can recall the issues that we're having with some of the green space and sparking issues on sites, the site with being one point acres fits this cycle development a bit better compared to what we had over on Military Avenue. And next. So you'll see right here the concept. It is a bit different from what you saw in your MEHN site packet back over on Friday. There were a few changes to go ahead and note. You'll note over on the northwest corner, there was a serpentine entryway that came to the property that's been removed. That was for ADA purposes. They moved to the back of the property to go ahead and enter off the entrance off of lobby with the sidewalk right there. So what you are seeing is University Avenue Newland Roth on the west parking, 60 stalls or so, which is a minimum requirements on the backs along with bicycle parking. Green space, is well over the requirements. Now a lot of this is by retention. This is not a hill itself and it was a green space to be with. Unlike the last one we saw about the military that did not have any sort of stormwater management that was seen visibly. There would've been something underneath this right here because of it being a green space existing right now, has to meet different requirements for quantity in quality on the site compared to what was on Military itself. There'd be entrances that would come up both lobby and university for automobiles. And part of the requirements that we're saying in the pew would be to extend the lobby sidewalk down to the south parcel line. Next. So what you see here is pretty familiar from what you have before. It's not the exact same thing but it's it's close. Same materials, same unit count, 48 units itself. Town homes ground floor with services, space in the ground floor. That's being a CI lot that could convert in two commercial space in the future if things were to go ahead and change. Next. I'm just gonna go ahead and see here some of the, layouts pretty similar to what was before. Ready to have some of the two story town homes, the front of long University Avenue and the mix of one, two, and three bedrooms. Next. So with this right here, this is just a diagram as far as showing where parks are in

the area. That was a discussion here that came out the last grand rounds. The closest one here is Bear Creek parkways. You'll note when the requirements have a sidewalk that goes along lobby the neighbors south of the development go ahead and extend improve areas from the end of lobby to the park parcel down over at Parkway. So they would go ahead and take advantage of that then as well, all the neighbors in the area go ahead and take advantage of the improved access that be happening here, the future with the property group itself. So if you take that in mind, it's about 1100 feet or so from the property down to Bear Creek Parkway. Just showing a few more options here. You have Triangle sports area, which is a part of Bear Creek. That ends up being about 2000 feet. Part of that though, no sidewalk. So keep that in mind. If we're looking for a handicap circle way, taking on the sidewalks, that becomes about 3000 feet to go all the way around up by festival and back down to the neighborhood with sidewalks to get there. I wanna note that the slope that gets down from the top of the hill where you go broadly back down is one of the most pronounced slopes we have in the area. And then finally we have Kennedy Park off the northwest, which is somewhat less than a mile, but goes through quite a bit of University Avenue. With this in mind, the PUD itself has a few changes that are different. So why are we going through PUD itself? It's a CI. With CI on the first floor, you're allowed to have residential above, but the entire first floor has to go ahead and be commercial. This is asking for it to be both commercial, select office space and residential on the first floor. Secondly, he's asking for a change of the max height, to be 50 feet for the four stories of this building. So I know what was passed for back on the Ontario Avenue project. The setback on the eastern parking lot, part of the parking lot to be degrees from 20 feet to 6 feet in that area. As far as your buffering area, that's a landscape part of your site and review code as far as facing and topography, they do note a retaining wall in that area. But the request to go ahead and make that area shrunk right there. Fourth, making sure the sidewalk connection injury occurs from university down to lobby. Applicants did provide a landscape plan here today. What we happen to have seen would not fully go ahead and meet with all the different codes of landscaping, but after talking with them they can make some improvements to go ahead and make that work within the code itself, beyond that six foot setback over on the Eastern. So we'll have a recommendation later on.

- Okay. Thank you very much. All right. So now with this public hearing, we're looking to hear from anyone who is wishing to speak.

- Take my cue this time. Ted Mac, Wisconsin, migrant President Gorman and Company 200 North Main Street, Oregon, Wisconsin. Good to see you again. And the reason we're here is we had some unexpected events happen in the March 21st common council meeting when we brought this at a prior set at 216 Military Avenue. Luckily can't believe it, We actually found a site that scored the same. WIDA actually approved it at their board meeting this last week. And we're excited to be here to ask for approval on this new site. So it's the same building that's relocated.

- All right, thank you very much. This is the public hearing portion of this, so we'll probably have questions next. Thank you. Is there anyone wishing to speak on this item? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Let the record reflect no one take forward and this public hearing is now closed. Moving on to the corresponding actionable item. Item number 10, consideration with possible action on the request to establish a planned unit development at the 2500 block of University Avenue to permit the development of multiple family residential use submitted by Gorman and Co, applicant and Meyer Family Investment Corps property owner.

- So with this you have the draft PUD, the amended PUD that was put in court in your packet on

late Friday. Nothing has changed that and we recommend approval.

- I have a comment from Alder Stevens who called me today who expressed his approval of this application. He would like to see it approved.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Motion by Commissioner Poradek. Second by Commissioner Rovinski to approve. Any further discussion?

- I wanna thank John for coming up with the map showing layouts for the areas that are nearby. They don't have to cross University Avenue to get to them. Yay.

- And you can just walk right back through the neighborhood. You get to Bear Creek. I mean I've walked through Clement just to get back there.

- And that little lobby area there too it has a real nice neighborhood.

- And I think it responds to all the concerns we had at the last, the Military .

- And adding Luther's Family Services as well. That was a really smart idea.

- Just one clarification on the slide, which before they weren't conditions but points those have already been incorporated.

- Was already incorporated into the beauty salon--

- Yep.

- Yep.

- All right, so we have a motion on the floor. Any further discussion? Hearing none, we'll go ahead with the voice vote. All those in favor?

- [Group] Aye.

- Any opposed? Moving forward the state counsel for May 2nd. Moving on to item number 11, consideration with possible action on the request to vacate a public cul-de-sac located at Vines Street and Ricky Street, submitted by Malan Associates on behalf of Habitat for Humanity Property owner.

- Thank you Madam Chair. So this is part of a couple steps of an application process known as Habitat Homestead. So this is part of a large plat that we're processing. There is this vacation request. There is a variance request that is also in this packet. And at our next meeting there is an additional use permit for town homes. So quite a few applications for this project. So an overview, this is Line Hill Road here, Manitowoc Road. So this is tucked into that neighborhood, a little cul-de-

sac here. The request is to vacate this cul-de-sac. So the exhibit gives the particulars on that, which probably means very little. The plat however helps a lot. So this is where the existing cul-de-sac is. With the vacation of this, the land would get divided out half to the property owner on one side. The rest of this development here, the reason for this vacation is to allow for the road continuation here, Ricky Drive, to continue to connect onto Richmond Street. And then also to provide more developable area for this housing development. So some of the particulars you're looking at 14 lots in one out for stormwater management, which is the one that's here closest to cul-de-sac. Of these lots, eight of them are gonna be single family homes in the traditional sense. And then six will be attached single family homes. So the town home style, the variance request and then the street vacation request, both need to be approved in order for the plat to be approved. It is only in, the cul-de-sac right now is only accessible for two properties. The one that's in question and then an apartment complex, which is right here. As part of the conditions of the vacation request, we're requiring that access still be provided to this parcel. There have been no objections from the other property owner. We have them sign off on the applications now that they're aware of the vacation request. So with that we are recommending approval with some of these conditions. So that first is that that access has to be addressed in the developer's agreement in part of that vacation. Another, some our water utility that if anything needs to be abandoned, moved around, they would take care of that as well. Same thing for WPS. They have some existing facilities, they would like easement grants that our facilities moved. And then the state with our storm and sanitary from the city also through the development agreements. So some utility things. But those would be worked out through the development process anyway. So we are recommending approval of that request.

- Right, thank you.

- So I will be excusing myself from any discussion or voting on this as I am employed by Greater Green Bay Habitat for Humanity.

- And for disclosure, I will be voting on this matter. I do not have any financial stake, but I am on the board of Greater Green Bay Habitat for Humanity.

- I would like to move approval.

- Second.

- A motion by Commissioner Bremer, second by Vice Chair Miller. Do you have any further discussion?

- I don't think donations haven't.

- So motion open the floor.

- We can open the floor. One section, seems .

- Steve from Mount Associates.

- Oh wait, I'm sorry. All all those in favor of opening the floor. Go ahead.

- Steve Beat with Mount Associates. I've been working with humanity on the project. As Stephanie

mentioned, there's a lot of wheels in motion with this thing, we've organized for a long time. The vacation of the cul-de-sac is just a small portion of it. Trying to fit the right housing in there, the right people. We had a neighborhood meeting over at the affiliation Army Rock Center. I think we had about four neighbors that came to it just to kind of inform them and talk about it as part of this process. So they are well informed of what, you know, what's all going on there and how it's gonna happen. The street's gonna connect through all the standard comments. Of course it's nice cause it's dead now, but it's not really a huge neighborhood when we connect that to the students. So, but if you any questions, it's, I don't wanna call it fairly straightforward 'cause there's a lot of components to this one. But it should work out. It's a good project for that area to fill that in and finish it off so, okay?

- Motion approval.

- Second.

- Motion by commissioner Poradek second by Commissioner Daniels to close the floor. All those in favor?

- [Everyone] Aye.

- Any oppose? I'm sorry, did we had a motion and second in everything. Okay. Commissioner Bremer, vice Chair Miller. All right, now I remember. Okay. All right. All those in favor?

- [Everyone] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right. And then that will move forward from council for May 2nd. We got to item number 12, consideration with possible action on the request to deviate from section 44/554 minimum lot size and minimum lot width by the Green Bay Municipal Code submitted by Mountain Associates on behalf of Habitat for Humanity Property owner.

- Thank you. So same location here. This is the cul-de-sac that you just vacated. This parcel is the parcel that's going to be developed. So this is sort of an infill lot sort of, not an infill lot. So we did it by how our code is written. We couldn't use the infill standards because it's a new plat. But those do come into play here. So just for a little background, the area that we're looking at, this is the future of land use. So the comprehensive plan calls for medium to high density housing, fairly fitting with this neighborhood. It's a good mix of single family homes, duplexes, multi-family, some commercial in the area. A lot of the zoning is either R3, R1 and then very close to this commercial corridor here. So again, pretty solid neighborhood in this area, but very close to a lot of other amenities. So as we're looking at this plat, there are a couple of variances that are being requested as part of it. We do have the variance sections in or the, what are they called? I'm losing my brain. Yes, in here it tells you what a variance could be approved for. So that's all we'll sit in your staff report. The specifics of those are though. So up the 14 lots, again, eight of those are for a single family detached homes. Four of those lots are smaller than our minimum square footage requirement, which is 7000, 7500 square feet for the R1 district. So everything with the star is under that. Those sizes are shown here. As you can see, that's not too much substantially smaller. Some are on a curve, some are closer to that stormwater management facility that's required as part of this plat. And then looking throughout the rest of the neighborhood. So it looks at around 300 feet. The average sizes are pretty small. They can go down to as much as 5,000 square feet for some of the homes in the area. So it wouldn't be

horribly out of place. Same thing with the minimum lot width. The code calls for 75 feet minimum. None of these meet that. Staff is very supportive of that. However, we kind of looked at this as like that infill guidance that we have. So for an infill you can go down to 50 feet. The average is 49.94, almost 50 feet. So for me, I don't feel like it goes that far away from the attention of the code because just because it's a new plat and it's new parcels, it still feels like infilled property to us. So we're kind of using that as our guidance. So with that we would be comfortable. Also this, because it is that kind of like a micro plat within a neighborhood, it can make its own feeling. It's gonna have specific housing design specific setbacks. It'll give itself its own identity being on that new world extension. So we don't feel this would be intrusive to the neighborhood by any means. As we as staff have been supportive for a number of years of reducing some of our lot widths and lot sizes. The code is, we feel written fairly suburban. You know, you're looking at these huge lot sizes but they see you don't really need, they're probably should be either separate designation for things that are within flooded areas where it can be smaller or we should just kind of throw out some of those maximums and let the market and the neighborhoods kind of decide what those infills should look like. So generally speaking, we kind of are supportive of this development anywhere but in particular for this neighborhood because it already had, it fits with the character and it would define its own character as it gets developed too. So with that, we are recommending approval of the request as stated.

- Thank you Seth. So then it looks like Ricky Drive kind of does a little curve. It's not going straight across. If it went straight across those lots would be way too small.

- Very, very much straight, too small. But they've been working with our department and the public works to make sure that curve is done correctly. So that's all being sorted through the planning process as well.

- Well, and 49 feet, I think about Kellogg Street, near downtown, those are all 48, 40. My property on Kello is 48 Allard right by West High. Those are all 50. So like it's a normal, it doesn't even feel tight, but probably in comparison to the other suburban style properties that are out there might. That's not small.

- Yeah. The average frontage for the neighborhood is either between 1570 feet. So most of them don't even hit 75 anyway.

- Yeah.

- So it's mostly for our new blocks, which this doesn't feel like a new block.

- Yeah, 50 isn't, doesn't feel that tight. It feels like a normal down.

- I agree no that's 50 feet line too.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Set a motion by Commissioner Poradek. Second by Commissioner Bremer. Any further discussion?

- I would just also on the record, I will not be voting or discussing all.

- So one abstention.

- And as previous.

- Got it. Got it all stated.

- All are just in favor.

- All right on the board, no money, give money, don't get any.

- And second by Commissioner Bremer. All those in favor?

- [Everyone] Aye.

- Any opposed? And one abstention. All right and then that will forward the city council for me a second.

- Thank you.

- Moving on to item number 13, which is a public hearing. And this public hearing has been properly posted and public notification has been published in the press times. We ask that you can find your testimony to facts related to the proposal at hand and avoid repetitive testimony. I'll now open the public hearing on item number 13, public hearing on the request to amend portions of the zoning code. Chapter 44 articles 3,7,8,9,16 and 21 related to dog friendly business submitted by the community and economic development department.

- 'Cause I don't think I've worked on anything super fun in a number of years. So I was really excited to do this. We as staff have gotten a couple requests related to like, you know, doggy daycares, bark and brew type of situations. And our code was either silent or very restrictive on those things. So for years we've been looking at amending this to open it up to other businesses to instead of making them jump through hoops, it would just be something that's in our code that's a little bit easier to follow. So with that we have a text amendment to take care of some of those measures. The two largest things would be the addition of these new designations of land use. So commercial business with dog area. And that's where we're thinking of a bar that has a place for your dog come play. And then commercial dog daycare here. This surprisingly was not in our code at all. So they technically either don't exist or they're under some other umbrella and they just been like kind of pedaling. So now we have them actually defined as what they are separate from another animal facility. With that we had to amend some of our land use tables and our codes to allow them in the, these districts. So downtown, all the commercial LIBP and then our residential. And then they would be conditionally permitted an ORNC, we did that because those are technically like some of our buffering ones. We wanna make sure that we have a little bit more control over those districts than the other ones. But these seem to be the most applicable districts for just allowing them by rank. So with that they are allowed within those districts or conditionally permitted within those districts. We have now added all of this, which is in your packet, but should just go through a couple of those. It requires soundproofing. Any sort of overnight kennel has to be enclosed within the building. Kennels that are outside are only per day use. They are required to have 100 square feet per dog that's at the facility.

For the dog daycares, they, we have some pretty strict pet scene requirements. We wanna make sure it's far enough away from residential that it's soundproof. It has to be six foot tall, they have to be wooden, there has to be a lock gate on it. It has to be 30 feet away from any residential zoned or used property at 15 from any other type of use. And that the outside hours are 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM which is the same as the city's quiet hours, and they are prohibited in the front yard. So we really try to play out every scenario, where's the dog gonna be? How would you get into that? How could they get out of it? You know, if it's your neighbor, how mad would you be? If it was that close view. So that's what we considered with that section of the code. And then for the bus commercial businesses with the dog area, you know, we're thinking a bookstore or something that has an area we can bring your pets. So it still have a fenced in area, but we thought that one should be a little bit more seed through so that way it's more friendly, it's got the, you know, you're trying to draw people in with that use versus keep people out. Both of the fence requirements do have exceptions that John as the zoning administrator can make as well. So something comes in and still feels like it's heating the intent of the code, like the safety of the code that he would be able to bury that. Fence can be no closer than five feet to any property line. Walk by your parking area, thinking little kids, the little hands and the dogs house. And then same with the hours of limitation. There are some noise level caveats in here. Again, measuring decibels, I'm not sure that we do that but someone in our in city hall does. So that's good.

- We can do that.

- We have about animal waste where it can be picked up, deposited and sealed, all those things. And that they have to be supervised in some capacity when they're in an outdoor area. So if that's with, you know, technology or someone actually being out there so that way the dogs, if anything were to happen. This is specific to dogs, we wrote it that way on purpose. There are some other facilities, you know, like cat cafes and that kind of stuff. But usually it's just one cat. The donor has like, we haven't had any requests or suggestions that it should be expanded to other types of pets. But we've found a lot of people interested in doing dogs specific things. So that's where we're starting to see how it works. And if it goes well and we have other requests, we can expand the section of the code. So we are also proposing that animal hospitals and vets are allowed to have outdoor runs in a closure areas, they are not currently allowed to. But we would be keeping let's see, boarding, animal boarding kennel and animal grooming would still be interior. So those are all the things.

- I wanna see the first person doing the camera.

- Yeah.

- Alright, thanks so much Seth. With this public hearing we're looking to hear, anyone who wish should speak.

- The dogs bring along.

- Is there anyone wishing... Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Let the record reflect that no one can afford and this public hearing is now closed. Moving onto the corresponding action item, item number 14, consideration with possible action to amend portions of the zoning code. Chapter 44 articles 3,7,8,9,16 and 21, related to do friendly business submitted by the community and economic development departments. Motion by commissioner Rovinski second by Commissioner Poradek, do we have any further discussion? Hearing no. Go ahead with voice

vote. All those in favor?

- [Everyone] Aye.

- All right number 15. Consideration with possible action on a request to release a six foot by 300 foot utility easement in the 100 block of East Mason Street to accommodate the Astra one development, Miller land investment LLC and Green Bay Redevelopment Authority Property Owners and Green Bay Department of Public Works Applicant.

- Thank you Madam Chair. Once again, my name is Diven and I am the new planner one. So this is my first agenda item. Yay. It's a great initiation. Thank everybody for being very gentle with me. Start here. So this is basically a cleanup measure from a project that the city has been working on, in the PowerPoint presentation here is that map that's referenced the 1981 map. And you can see the highlighted area is the six foot by 300 foot utility easement. And then you can kind of get a visual for how the property used to look with the warehousing in the front, which is owned by Miller Land Investments. And then the property on the other side is owned by the RDA and is now a location of the Fox River Trail. So there's a aerial photo kind of showing where it is and the relocated trail. And then the future land use is showing it as parks area. We're not handling anything with that at this time. We're just trying to get rid of the easement to make the site developable and then whatever comes up. We would take care of as we go along. And then as far as the zoning, it has the downtown one district as well as the parkland to obviously accommodate those potential new uses. We did send it out to staff or for review to see if anybody had any objections to removing the easement. The only comment that came back was from the Green Bay water utility. If you can go back to the max that on, yes, there is a rather large main water easement that's in yellow that runs on a north property line. So the easement cannot contain removal of that portion that would go through that six foot area. So anyway, our recommendation is to approve the request with that condition to make sure that they would then recreate a new easement to make sure that the water department can access the, okay, that's it. I dunno if I'm missing any.

- Thank you very much.

- Only thing I was gonna add is in the end of 2022, December of 2022, the complain was changed to downtown and you recall

- I can't just provide just a quick update. This is obviously a continuing effort to get the CSM updated to allow the property swap with the relocated bike trail. This has been a long time coming. We've been working on, we finally got the boundaries, property boundaries correct. Now we're simply trying to get the easements correct. Once the easements are correct, we will probably be facilitating the land transfer between the RDA and and the private owner to essentially to correct that situation. Right now the bike trail's essentially on private property, which can't be good for the owner in case see would happen there. So I'm going to be getting that done. And then basically this will complete the requirements of the development agreement, the phase one that was originally adopted with the developer. Folks will recall Mr. Miller, unfortunately passed away last summer, so we're dealing with his land trust right now. So they're probably not planning on directly proceeding with a development on this site, but we'll be, actually be, probably be putting putting the site up for sale once the land swap is complete so.

- Motion to approve with contingency recommended by staff.

- Second.

- I did want to come up with a bunch of questions to make it difficult.

- All right so we got a motion by Commissioner Poradek and he's second by Commissioner Rovinski. Do we have any further questions for staff? Complicated questions. All right, here's none. We'll go ahead with the vote. All those in favor?

- [Everyone] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right, then I'll move forward to city council for May 2nd. And item number 16, consideration with possible action regarding on Broadway Inc. Business improvement districts budgeted versus actual year end reporting for 2022.

- Hello? This is broker marketing director, acting like a marketing director. I asked for copies of her annual report and she was like, well give them can in . Wow. You guys take pass. I think I'm trying to win.

- Oh, thanks for for having me here. As you may, as I'm sure you're well aware, I think it was February that you took up the other business improvement district plans. Unfortunately, I wasn't available for that meeting as I was out of town, so this was the date that we settled on to come and talk to you. Good meeting tonight. I think it's nice to see a lot of really, really good projects kind of fly through. So kudos to staff for the hard work and making those decisions easy. So we're here to talk about the business improvement district plan, which for us operates a little bit differently. Of course, the annual report that was passed around to you all that includes on Broadway as an organization as a whole, the business improvement district in particular, which has a separate board of directors. It really contributes, this past year was about 5% of the total value of on Broadway's budget. Some years it can be a little higher, but just to give you some perspective on what part of our budget the bid actually comprises. So within that plan, and I'm just speaking to the items within the plan, of course, if you have questions about anything outside of that related on Broadway as a whole, happy to feel that afterwards. So lighting was budgeted for tree lighting in the winter months. We budget 15,000. We invested about 15,000 into that. The balance really comes from other programs that on Broadway raises money for. So when you talk about leverage, that's kind of what we're really shooting for with a lot of our bid investments. Annual maintenance, this by the basis is gonna be one of the easiest reports you've ever seen. It's like budgeted as much cut this much. Annual maintenance budgeted \$25,000. There again, we actually spent more than that. I believe the numbers rate around 50,000 if I recall correctly. But that's basically all of your decor, your pole banners, weeding, things of that nature. Public art, we allocated \$15,000. We spent closer to \$50,000 on mirror installations and repainting our benches and trashcans and a few other small projects. So that was what was allocated under design. Under administration, there's an admin allocation of 16,469. Actual investment in that is probably closer to half a million. And that's really just your staff and your rent and all those things that you need to operate. And then the audit, our annual audit is right around \$9,000 a year, but we do a combined audit between on Broadway and the bid, which is similar to what the other bids do as well, gets you some cost savings. And so 3000 of that 9,000 really came from the bid. And then the balance is paid for by on Broadway. Under marketing, we do kind of a general allowance for some district branding and promotion. 17,877, same deal there. We invest substantially more than that, particularly with some of the in-kind support that we secure

through Media Partners. If you actually include that in-kind amount, you're probably a couple hundred thousand dollars invested in district branding. So underneath that, we show what our annual bid proceeds were. The budget was 82,346. But as many of you know from being here year after year, sometimes those numbers come in a little bit differently. Usually not a lot of deviation but minor ones. And that's 81,532 is what was received from bid proceeds and then subsequent delinquencies that come in after that initial cheque issuance. So I'd like to think that we're taking the money that is allocated by the bid and spending it wisely, but more importantly leveraging it for much greater impact, which is something I think our organization historically has done very well so. Yes sir.

- I think you might have misspoke. Can you go back to murals?

- I did not misspeak.

- The number that's on ours is the same on both columns.

- Yeah.

- Yeah, sorry. So the actual meaning, so there's the budget that the bid budgeted and then then the actual is how much of the bid money was spent on that and then on Broadway matches or contributes even more beyond that. So when I said the mural, I said the number was rate amount 50,000, 50. That is accurate because on Broadway raised additional funds beyond what the bid allocated to make those investments. And that's really the case with all these. So the actual is really what the bid actual dollars were.

- You used all the money, you said this was the money, you used all that money and then we spent more somewhere else. Got it.

- But that's a really good observation, DJ and what I'll maybe do in the future is at a third column that can maybe articulate kind of what on Broadway's contribution above and beyond the bid has been to those respective areas.

- I appreciate.

- And you kind of get a sense of it a little bit in the annual report where it shows our expenditures. You know, we follow, we're a nationally accredited Main Street program. So we follow the four point approach, which means that if you invest in these four areas, that's where you see the transformation strategy occur. This is a tested for 40 years nationally. And it works. And even downtown Green Bay and military to a certain extent follow the same formula. They just call them different words. And for us it's design. What you see on here, it's the investment in your public spaces, public art initiatives, historic preservation organization, which is that you have a good board of directors, you're engaging volunteers, you have good financial support coming in throughout your community. The third pillar is promotion, which includes your branding of your district, but also all of the events that you do and the way that you program things to bring people into your district from a foot traffic perspective. And then the fourth pillar is economic vitality, which is business recruitment, retention. You're trying to recruit, housing development, fill vacant spaces, that kind of thing.

- Excellent. I was kind of wondering why we didn't see you the last meeting or the meeting before when we saw the other three, but I wasn't gonna say anything 'cause the meeting was already long.

Good to see you then.

- One more thing.

- Yes sir.

- Can you..

- No go on yeah, absolutely.

- Can you speak on where you guys are with the market?

- Sure. Green Bay Public Market, right? Yep, sure can. So that is a very, very complex project and I have no hesitation when telling people why don't we have that now? Because it's hard and there's not enough people willing to do hard stuff. And so we are still on track with where we wanted to be. I think, you know, like a lot of projects, you sort of have this ideal timeframe and then as things start to happen, you're like, "Oh, I need a three month extension, I need a six month extension." And that's really kind of what's happened to us from when we first announced. So why didn't we announce when we did? It was definitely premature, meaning that we normally wouldn't have made the public announcement when we did. However, we were on the county agenda the following day to talk about ARPA allocation. So we knew if we didn't publicly announce it, the media would've seen that and they would've controlled the narrative. So it wasn't an ideal timeline for us. Now that said, where are we? We like to say there's three buckets to this project. One is tenant relocation and tenant recruitment. So we have to relocate the tenants that are in there, particularly those that have long-term lease rights. And that means you have to come up with favorable conditions for them to get them to agree to that type of relocation. And then you have to recruit the tenants that will ultimately move into the space. We'll have space for about 28 tenants, although some of them will likely combine stalls. So we're expecting you'd see maybe 20 total. Okay, well, trying to get 20 tenants to all open up on the same day is not easy. So, but we're making really great progress on that front. The second piece of it is really related to architectural engineering and design. We went through a soft bid process with contractors. Really what we wanted our contractors to inform us on was, hey, we've got what we call a 20% bid set. Meaning our plans are 20% done. Tell us what you think the numbers would come in at. And because we wanna know if we're in the right ballpark, so we make some estimates based on average price for square foot, what it will take to renovate the space. The good news is, knock on wood, this is metal, close enough that the numbers came in right where we hoped they would. So that that's good news, right? Especially with how unpredictable everything is in our environment right now. So we feel that the numbers are, it's going to cost what we think it was going to cost. And then the third part then, of course is the funding. And so we are assembling our capital campaign team right now. That is a really dynamite list. It is a list of a-listers that know how to raise money and have experience raising money, but it's more than just private philanthropy. It's new market tax credits, which we've received a preliminary 10 million award on which when you sell off the tax credits, it's probably like 2 million, 3 million, somewhere in there. And then some other grants, government grants and things of that nature. So our fundraising is actually in a really good path as well right now. So those are the three buckets.

- I'd like to wish you good luck in that venture. And I want to congratulate your Onroad writing Incorporated because I'm alder on the very far east side of Green Bay. And time and time again, when someone calls me and there's an issue, they point on Broadway and say, look what they did.

And we do that on the east side. So thank you very much and continue the good work.

- Thank you, and the answer to that question, if it were a question would be, yes, you can do that. Revitalization is hard. And look, I'm the beneficiary of 20 years of hard work before I even showed up. And I'm very mindful of that. And we've done, I think as a team, some really good work to accelerate some of the work. We've brought some new ideas to the table. We've got a couple others that are kind of brew under the surface right now that we're probably gonna do some press conferences on in the near future. So kind of be on a lookout for that. But we're really excited about some of the things that are going on. We feel like we've got some good momentum, which of course when you have that it attracts additional investment and additional support. And so we're really starting to see that spiral. But it's been 25 years in the making, right? And so that's the thing I like to remind people. This is a game of patience. And the Broadway district continues to be one of the most talked about revitalization success stories in the state of Wisconsin. Madison talks about it frequently. And for those who have a memory, which predates even me, I've just heard the stories of what the Broadway corridor used to be like. And of course I hear how different it is today and that excites me. I think it should excite everyone in our community. Great? Thanks for the questions.

- Motion by Commissioner Poradek, second to Commissioner Rovinski, approve the annual financial report for on Broadway. All those in favor?

- [Everyone] Aye.

- Any oppose? All right, and now we'll move forward Thank to council for me a second. Moving on to informational director's reports, Mr. Stechschuete.

- Speaking of decisions that take a long time to get things done. Now we've got that done. At least the rest of us can actually start to get things done and ask questions about, what's going on in the city, not just what the football team anymore. But we got that going for us now, that's the good news. So just wanted just a couple of quick updates. Wanted to certainly compliment Gorman. I'm not sure if Mr. Beckham is still there. I'm guessing he's probably on the road already, but really for them. And wanna do a special thanks to staff John Leroy, especially for all of his work in getting that done. And certainly a shout out to our, very important partners at WIDA, really was pretty much a herculean task, I think really to pivot as fast and as quickly and effectively as really everybody did on that project to make that one and bring that, get that forward for this plan commission meeting tonight. So it just kind of goes to show when you actually have a focused developer who's really, really ready to work with the city and really make something happen, how fast things can actually move. So, but it was really a great project. We're very, very excited to, and certainly appreciate the commission's support of the project here this evenings, but so compliments to really everybody involved on kind of making that happen and then not so kind of unusual circumstances about a month ago. So another update we received several, I think we've received up to seven. I'll check with Dave, comprehensive plan proposals, update proposals. We've got it down essentially to two finalists. We've done interviews. We're gonna be meeting with hopefully the mayor, hopefully tomorrow or Wednesday at the latest to come make a recommendation. Probably we'll be bringing that recommended proposal through the plan commission and then onto council for consideration. So hopefully watch for that here in the next couple of weeks. Had a meeting today to discuss very preliminary concepts, use concepts for the JBS site with our consultant on that site. We're excited to see really where that's going and starting to really firm up and come together with possible concepts on how the park space would interact with this area, what sort of housing might be coming into the

area. So we actually had very seven very preliminary kind of sketch kind of concepts where we're gonna be refining those down to three or four and then eventually down to two. And I'm sure those will be coming forward to this group for discussion and presentation here at some point in the next couple of months. John has also been hard at work at finishing up our CRS review regarding floodplain projects with FEMA. He's kind of wrapping up, we've got it down to 42 properties he's going through to kind of verify exactly what sort of improvement's been made in the floodplain to have those done. That's essentially, that helps us, helps residents maintain their flood insurance rates. So very important project that John was unfortunate enough to walk right into when he got, when he's started here with us and ended up, has done a good job kind of picking that up. So kudos to him and Dave Buck and Aaron Rovinski on our staff for all the work they have. The three of them have really been doing to keep that process moving. Paul Newmeyer used to take care of that, did that for I don't know how many years he was responsible for working on that. And obviously when he re retired, kinda have to kinda hit the reset button and get that all started. So thanks to them. Brief Coal piles update. We just attended, Steph attended the Port Symposium, here about a week ago with Brown County. Essentially the last update we had is that they were, as soon as they hit 30% design on the Pullium site, they would be reaching out to Sea Rice Coal Company to start incorporating them into the design elements and start using their input into the finalizing the design. They have hit 30% and we were basically in the room watching them set up that next meeting to discuss that next design level. So we're excited to see that one moving forward. Very good sign that they continue to make progress on that project, continue to still receive some good federal and state funding to make things happen there. But more, from our standpoint, a very important part for us getting the actual coal pile site renovated is getting Sea Rice involved in the design at the site. So we are excited to see that happening. Dave Buck is working on some text amendments for our short term rentals, essentially ordinances that we're working with our attorney's office to kind of get those reviewed and to see if there's, we are very limited in terms of what some of our options are based on the state legislation or statutes. However, we think there's some avenues we can do, try to improve that licensing promise process and try to get that going. So probably be having some text amendments hopefully coming forward here in the not too distant future. There you go. So with that available to answer any questions anybody has.

- All right, well thank you for your report.
- Great. Thank you everybody.
- And the date of the next meeting is May 8th, 2023.
- Motion to adjourn.
- Second.
- Motion by Commissioner Rovinski, second by Commissioner Poradek. All those in favor?
- [Everyone] Aye.
- Any opposed?