



MINUTES OF THE GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2023, 6:00 PM

**In person at City Hall, Room 604 - The Harry Maier Room.
Virtual attendance is also available via Zoom.**

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

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

B. ROLL CALL.

I. Members: Lisa Hanson - Chair, Jacob Miller - Vice-Chair, Ald. Jim Hutchison, Sidney Bremer, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, and Michael Poradek.

Present: Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, Jim Hutchison, Lisa Hanson, Jacob Miller, Michael Poradek

Excused: Sidney Bremer

Others Present: Alder Melinda Eck, Alder Mark Steuer

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the February 27, 2023, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Jacob Miller, seconded by Derius Daniels to approve the agenda. Motion Passed.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the January 23, 2023, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Jacob Miller to approve the minutes. Motion Passed.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

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

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Michael Poradek to open the floor. Motion Passed.

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

Speakers:

Jon LeRoy

Ted Matkom

Sandy Popp

Dennis Hanson

Leah Weycker

Alder Melinda Eck

Neil Stechschulte

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Jacob Miller to close the floor. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Jacob Miller, seconded by Derius Daniels to approve the request to establish a Planned Unit Development at 216 S. Military Avenue to permit the development of multiple-family residential use. Motion Passed.

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

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

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to open the floor. Motion Passed.

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

Speakers:

Jon LeRoy

Neil Stechschulte

Ted Matkom

Leah Weycker

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Jacob Miller to close the floor. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Jacob Miller, seconded by Derius Daniels to re-open the floor. Motion Passed.

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

Additional Speakers:

Brad Rymer

Ted Matkom

Leah Weycker

Moved by Jacob Miller, seconded by Michael Poradek to close the floor. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Ken Rovinski to deny the request to amend a Planned Unit Development at 216 S. Military Avenue to amend the boundaries of the PUD. Motion Failed.

Yes- Ken Rovinski, Michael Poradek, No- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Derius Daniels, Jim Hutchison, Abstain- None. (2-4)

Moved by Alder Jim Hutchison, seconded by Jacob Miller to approve the request to amend a Planned Unit Development at 216 S. Military Avenue to amend the boundaries of the PUD. Motion Passed.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, Jim Hutchison, Michael Poradek, No-None, Abstain- None. (4-2)

3. Consideration with possible action on the Downtown Green Bay, Inc. Business Improvement District's (BID) year-end reporting for 2022.

Speaker:

Jenny VandenLangenberg

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Jacob Miller to approve the Downtown Green Bay, Inc. Business Improvement District's (BID) year-end reporting for 2022. Motion Passed.

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

4. Consideration with possible action on the Military Avenue Business Improvement District's (BID) year-end reporting for 2022.

Speaker:

Leah Weycker

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Derius Daniels to approve the Downtown Green Bay, Inc. Business Improvement District's (BID) year-end reporting for 2022. Motion Passed.

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

5. Consideration with possible action on Olde Main Street Inc. Business Improvement District's (BID) year-end reporting for 2022.

Speaker

Jenny VandenLangenberg

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Commissioner Jacob Miller to approve the Olde Main Street, Inc., Business Improvement District's (BID) year-end reporting for 2022. Motion Passed.
Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Derius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, Jim Hutchison, Michael Poradek, No- None, Abstain- None.

6. (ED 23-01) Consideration with possible action on request to vacate utility easements on vacated Motor Street and vacated portion of State Street at 1919 S. Broadway (Parcel #s 1-1407 & 1-1415), submitted by the Green Bay Department of Public Works on behalf of Georgia Pacific Consumer Products, LP, property owner (Ald. Johnson, District 9).

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Michael Poradek to approve the vacation of utility easements on vacated Motor Street and vacated portion of State Street at 1919 S. Broadway (Parcel #s 1-1407 & 1-1415), subject to the following conditions:

1. The property owner shall follow the signed agreement with NEW Water and the new utility easement is finalized and recorded.
2. The property owner shall provide the Relocated Easement as previously negotiated with the City of Green Bay.

Motion Passed.

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

7. (CPA 22-04) Public hearing on request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for the portion of properties located at 815 - 821 S. Chestnut Avenue (2-178-A & 2-178) and 414-418 4th Street (2-177, 2-176 & 2-175) from Commercial land use to Medium Intensity Retail, Office & Housing (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 on the public hearing request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for the portion of properties located at 815 - 821 S. Chestnut Avenue (2-178-A & 2-178) and 414-418 4th Street (2-177, 2-176 & 2-175) from Commercial land use to Medium Intensity Retail, Office & Housing (Ald. B. Johnson, District 9).

Speaker(s):
David Buck

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

8. (CPA 22-04) Consideration with possible action on request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for the portion of properties located at 815 - 821 S. Chestnut Avenue (2-178-A & 2-178) and 414-418 4th Street (2-177, 2-176 & 2-175) from Commercial land use to Medium Intensity Retail, Office & Housing (Ald. B. Johnson, District 9).

Vice-Chair Jacob Miller will be abstaining from this item.

Speaker(s):
David Buck

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Michael Poradek to approve the request to amend the City's Comprehensive Plan for the portion of properties located at 815 - 821 S. Chestnut Avenue (2-178-A & 2-178) and 414-418 4th Street (2-177, 2-176 & 2-175) from Commercial land use to Medium Intensity Retail, Office & Housing. Motion Passed.

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

9. (ZP 22-44) Public hearing on request to rezone properties at 815 - 821 S. Chestnut Avenue (Parcels 2-178-A & 2-178) and 414-418 4th Street (Parcels 2-177, 2-176 & 2-175) from General Commercial (CI) to Office Residential (OR) (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 on request to rezone properties at 815 - 821 S. Chestnut Avenue (Parcels 2-178-A & 2-178) and 414-418 4th Street (Parcels 2-177, 2-176 & 2-175) from General Commercial (CI) to Office Residential (OR) (Ald. B. Johnson, District 9).

Speaker(s): David Buck

Chair Lisa Hanson asked staff and the public three (3) times if there was anyone wishing to speak. Hearing/seeing no one, the public hearing was closed. Staff was the only speaker for this item.

10. (ZP 22-44) Consideration with possible action on request to rezone properties at 815 - 821 S. Chestnut Avenue (Parcels 2-178-A & 2-178) and 414-418 4th Street (Parcels 2-177, 2-176 & 2-175) from General Commercial (CI) to Office Residential (OR) (Ald. B. Johnson, District 9).

Vice Chair Jacob Miller will be abstaining from this item.

Speaker(s): David Buck

Moved by Ken Rovinski, seconded by Michael Poradek to approve the request to rezone properties at 815 - 821 S. Chestnut Avenue (Parcels 2-178-A & 2-178) and 414-418 4th Street (Parcels 2-177, 2-176 & 2-175) from General Commercial (CI) to Office Residential (OR). Motion Passed.

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

11. (ZP 23-03) Public hearing on request to establish a Planned Unit Development at the 1100 Block of E. Walnut Street (parcels 14-195, 14-196, 14-197, 14-198, 14-199, 14-200, 14-201 & 14-202) to permit a mixed-use office & multiple-family residential development, submitted by MF Housing Partners, LLC, applicant, City of Green Bay Redevelopment Authority, property owner (Ald. R. Scannell, District 7).

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

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the floor for the public hearing on request to establish a Planned Unit Development at the 1100 Block of E. Walnut Street (parcels 14-195, 14-196, 14-197, 14-198, 14-199, 14-200, 14-201 & 14-202) to permit a mixed-use office & multiple-family residential development, submitted by MF Housing Partners, LLC, applicant, City of Green Bay Redevelopment Authority,

property owner (Ald. R. Scannell, District 7).

Speakers:
David Buck
Alyssa Proffitt

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.

12. (ZP 23-03) Consideration with possible action on request to establish a Planned Unit Development at the 1100 Block of E. Walnut Street (Parcels 14-195, 14-196, 14-197, 14-198, 14-199, 14-200, 14-201 & 14-202) to permit a mixed-use office and multiple-family residential development, submitted by MF Housing Partners, LLC, applicant, City of Green Bay Redevelopment Authority, property owner (Ald. R. Scannell, District 7).

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

Speaker(s):
David Buck
Jack Klister

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

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Jacob Miller to approve the request to establish a Planned Unit Development at the 1100 Block of E. Walnut Street (parcels 14-195, 14-196, 14-197, 14-198, 14-199, 14-200, 14-201 & 14-202) to permit a mixed-use office & multiple-family residential development, subject to the following conditions:

- a. Adoption of the draft PUD;
- b. Consolidation of individual lots;
- c. Pedestrian access from N. Roosevelt Street to the buildings rear entrance be provided;
- d. Building entrances on the East Walnut Street façade include a canopy or other roofing element over the doorway and lighting with approval by the Department of Community Development. Motion Passed.

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

13. (TA 23-01) Public Hearing on request to create a text amendment to Chapter 44-1075, Floodplain Overlay District, submitted by Department of Community and Economic Development

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

Chair Lisa Hanson opened the floor for the public hearing on request to create a text amendment to Chapter 44-1075, Floodplain Overlay District, submitted by the Department of Community and

Economic Development.

Speaker: Jon LeRoy

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

14. (TA 23-01) Consideration with possible action to update Chapter 44-1075 Article XIII of the Green Bay Municipal Code, Floodplain Overlay District Ordinance, submitted by Community and Economic Development.

Speaker(s): Jon LeRoy

Moved by Jacob Miller, seconded by Michael Poradek to approve the request to create a text amendment to Chapter 44-1075, Floodplain Overlay District, subject to revisions by the City Attorney's office. Motion Passed. Yes- Jacob Miller, Lisa Hanson, Darius Daniels, Ken Rovinski, Jim Hutchison, Michael Poradek, No- None, Abstain- None.

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Director's Report.

Neil Stechschulte presented the Director's Report.

2. Date of next meeting: March 13, 2023

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Michael Poradek, seconded by Jacob Miller to adjourn. Motion Passed.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- All right, good evening and welcome to the Monday, February 27th 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 Hutchinson?

- Present.

- Commissioner Cindy Brimmer is excused. Commissioner Darius Samuels?

- Present.

- Commissioner Ken Rovinski?

- Present.
- And Commissioner Michael Poradek.
- [Commissioners] Not.
- Okay, well he might join us in a minute. Moving on to the approval of the agenda. Approval of the agenda for the February 27th, 2023 meeting of the rebate plan commission.
- [Commissioners] So moved. Sorry.
- Motioned by Vice Chair Miller, seconded by Commissioner Daniels. All those in favor?
- [Commissioners] Aye.
- Any opposed? Moving on to the approval of the minutes. Approval of the minutes from the January 23, January 23rd, 2023 meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.
- So moved.
- Second.
- Motion by Commissioner Rovinski. Second by Vice Chair Miller. All those in favor?
- [Commissioners] Aye.
- Any opposed?
- All right, and then moving on to regular business. And I also do see that Commissioner Poradek is now present.
- I got stuck, so...
- All right. Regular business item number one; reconsideration with possible action on request to establish a planned unit development at 216 South Military Avenue to permit the development of a multiple family residential use submitted by Gorman and co. Applicant, Henry Real Estate Development llc, property owner.
- Okay, thank you, Chair. So this item and the next one that we'll follow are items that were sent back from common council this month. So next, please. Just a quick refresher. We've all seen this, but just to go ahead and get some background again. This will be the northeast corner of a larger property that is currently owned by Martin Gorman, he's looking to go ahead and redevelop this site. Next. This is the overall larger approximately eight-acre site itself, next. There'll be, a is required to go ahead and be a part of this lot. Two is what we're looking at right now. That's 1.1 acres, next. The view is gonna our future land use right here. This will be a commercial land use, next. And the zoning is part of a PUD that is existing right now for temporary land uses on the site that allows for some limited light industrial along the C3 for the old Shopko building. Next. So what government has put

forward is a four-story, multi-family building with some office space on the first floor. This is a rendering from South Military Avenue, next. I did another rendering looking southeast from the corner of Leo and Military. Next. This is looking over on Leo, looking into the south southeast, the back of the building and the surface lot, next. This is looking on Military northwest, the front of the building. Next. This is looking north from the surface, lot of the old Shopko back at the back of the building. Next. These are some materials that are proposed in the community itself. Viable room for the the building, next. this is the proposed layout of the property with the building facing up along Military and Leo and surface parking in the back. That comes to some of our bulk requirements for the PUD, which are noted, which would be some setback issues that are addressed in the impervious surface, not being a C3 standard. And the building height's being, along a max of 50 feet, which would be over 35 for a typical R3 building requirement. Next. And another layout view of the the property itself. Next. These are some of our views of the first, second, and third and fourth floor, of the building, noting where common spaces are and these individual units. Next. And this is our first floor of you here, the yellow area could be common spaces, your greens and shades of green would be neutral residences and your grays would be service areas for the building itself, next. So with that, there were some changes that were provided by the petitioner here in the past few weeks. We asked both folks who were petitioning here, for both Gorman and Martin for their respective PUDs, to add any information here. Especially, what would you envision conceptually for the site here in the future? This is not an actual plan that's being put forward, but it is a concept of what could be done for the site. And this was provided by the folks of Eric Gorman. With that in mind, the petitioner is here and has prepared some additional information here with a PowerPoint. So if you'd like to go ahead and invite them, they can go give some further information here. They did not speak last time at this meeting, not for this particular item. And so if they do have some more information to go ahead and provide for this.

- I'd make a motion to open the floor.

- Second.

- A motion by Commissioner Rovinski and second by Commissioner Poradek to open the floor. All those in favor?

- [Commissioners] Aye, your Honor.

- Any opposed? Okay. If the petitioner would like to come forward and speak on this.

- Thank you very much. My name is Ted Matcom, the Wisconsin Market President of Gorman Company. And I wanted to start off with a story of how we got here today with this project. You know, since the last plan commissioner, there's been a lot of rumors, misconceptions about what happened here, 'cause we didn't present at the last plan commission. The whole story began about two years ago. I approached the mayor and asked about sites he thought would be a good fit for affordable housing in Green Bay. The mayor directed me to about five sites and I viewed 'em all, and the location at 216 Military was the clear winner. The reason is it hit on all the WIDA scoring matrix items and primarily the difference maker for this site was the proximity for amenities. They have a score that's called walkability, or the walkable score, and that is compared to other projects. And this one just shined, 'cause of the amenities around. When we approached the Martins about this site, I went over what I thought was a, you know, a doable vision for the site at the time. That's what John was showing you there. And we kind of talked about this because we thought the town homes would

be a nice transition to the single family homes on Randall. We got a hard corner here, it's actually a soft corner, but the corner here on Leo and Military is a nice corner as opposed to Shawano and Military, which would be a very hard corner. Leo's a soft street. And then people, which is kind of odd, but people love railroad tracks and they love that it's not like a super fast-moving loud train. It's just something cool to watch. And so we kind of orientated that, those two L-shaped buildings to kind of, you know, capture that. And this would be market rate workforce housing. This was always contemplated as the WIDA deal would be on the corner, and then the market rate workforce would kind of be in the back. And we toyed with this for about six months. After we met, the Martins and I met again, and it came very clear that we were dealing in interest and inflation environment in the economy that did not allow me to build this, and the Martins could not build the warehouse they envisioned. And so we kinda stepped back a little bit and they said, "Hey, you know, we would like to explore keeping the Shopko as a warehouse and training facility." "We'll give you this parcel here, which is a subject parcel tonight, for the WIDA deal." "But we need this to kind of do our warehousing and our training and, you know, when the environment changes, you know, we'll look at, you know, doing what we would call phase one." Or, say, phase two. So phase one is the WIDA deal we're talking about tonight. Phase two would be the rest of the site. And, you know, if in terms of the timing on that, if anybody has a crystal ball, you know, as in terms of inflation and interest rates in the future, you know, meet me out back and we'll get rich together, 'cause that's not, you know, no one has a crystal ball as to when that would happen. So the Martins started planning on how they could use that site and we started preparing a tax credit application to WIDA. It's important to know that the WIDA dynamic of tax credits is extremely competitive. One out of every five projects gets funded, and it was funded primarily as we indicated because of the amenities around. And John, can you flip to the next one? There was one, I think there was one more in there. Keep going. The WIDA amenities site... Oh, there it is. Oh, that's it! Okay, so here's a site here in the red and there's just a lot of stuff around here. Murphy Park is, you know, one controlled intersection away. You got the hospital there, you got Badger Park there, if you want to walk that pretty long distance over there, there's dental. The thing is, the big thing is, the food store there, Aldi's, is right across the street and the bus stops are numerous and plentiful around there. And that's really your walkability score right there. We've been doing business for 38 years. We've built about 10,000 units in Wisconsin. This is a, I mean, this is a dynamite site. This is a site that we look at and we're like man, this is absolutely what people need and what people want in terms of the location of those amenities. I was gonna show you some several projects, now you gotta go back, John, sorry. So this is one in Milwaukee. You see that urban edge right there with town homes on the bottom? That's in Milwaukee. Same thing here. This is in Madison and in, it's called Generations at Union Corners near East Washington Avenue. This is on East Washington Avenue in Madison. This is called Valor. This is veteran families, which is actually what we're gonna hopefully target here as well. And then, was there one more?

- No, that's it. Oh, Carbon. So it's also an east-wash deal with carbon and we got town homes, and so it's a very similar kind of bar-building deal that we're doing there. Works very good. What we plan to do, because, can you go back to the site plan, maybe, John? The real one, the other one. Yeah. So it is a tight site. The parking is also, you know, pretty tight here. But the way we wanted to target this project is for disabled individuals. So we've been working, you know, we took points for veterans in this project in terms of the WIDA app. So we're bound to that for 30 years. The affordability I'm about to talk about is a 30-year, you know, commitment that we make to WIDA. It's actually a deed restriction where they have, are the units that we're going to, you know, promise they've got, for 30 years, we're obligated under the deed restriction to keep that unit mix. And I was gonna tell you that unit mix real quick. So the unit mix right now that we're they're targeting, is, we have 48 units. Eight

units are 30% of the county median income. That's about \$21,000 a year with a rent of \$450 a month. There's eight of those. County median income, I don't know if you know what that means, It's like Brown County, median income. There's eight units at market rate, this is what's brilliant about this WIDA deal. They've actually done something extremely right here. They have eight units of market rate, so, like, unrestricted. So and what's brilliant about that is if you have lower income units and you have higher income units, the management of that has to be at the high-level. You have to have rules and regulations where people are, you know, in control. We have to be in control of the building. People worry about police calls or whatever. If you look at all of our property or our records in terms of managing these types of properties, and we have a lot of 'em, we're at the top of the list. And so here, we're gonna be manager for the entire compliance period. So that's an interesting mix, 'cause they have the top of the market, we're unrestricted, and you have 30% of units which are, you know, almost at poverty-level type of income, but they're people who need the housing the most. And then 16 units at 50% of economy media income, that's about \$32,000 a year. Their rent is \$800 a year, I'm sorry, I was gonna give you the rent of the market rate, just so you can compare it. It's \$1250 a month. So this would be 800 a month for the 50 percenters and then 60 percenters are \$900 a month at 42,000 a year. And that's 16 units. All these rents that are not market rate, they represent 30% of one's income. So that's what affordability is in the kind of the HUD definition. If you're paying rent, you're not overburdened if you're paying 30% of your income. So the last time we were together, Michael, you had indicated some opposition to this. You also testified at the common counsel, I think, on February 7th. And you indicated three things that were necessary for housing. You said that it's gotta be quality, it's gotta have stability and it's gotta be healthy, right? And I wanted to talk about those things. So quality, so this project is new construction, would compare to any high-rent housing going up in the city today in terms of finishes, noise mitigation, building amenities. A simple example of how WIDA affordability works. I think it's important to kind of explain this, and I apologize if we get lost in the weeds, but I'll keep it real up here. So if you have a \$10 million project and you have a 9% tax credit, and you guys may have heard that term or not, you have a 9% tax credit, what happens is when you complete that building, that building produces 9% of 10 million. That's \$900,000 of tax credits every year for 10 years. Okay? That's \$9 million of tax credits. Okay, so you get awarded this project with WIDA. WIDA gives you a \$9 million certificate of tax credits and they say go sell that in the open market and see what you can get. And in this day and age you get about 90 cents. The person who's gonna, the entity that's gonna buy those tax credits in this case is associated bank. So associated banks buys these credits, they don't make a lot of money of 'em. What they do is they do it so they get, they get credit for lending and investing in a qualified census track, which is this a lower income census track. So they take that and then they, what happens is you take the \$9 million and just keep the math simple, \$9 million from associated. You apply it to your \$10 million of construction costs. So you're building this amazing building, your construction costs are subsidized by the tax credits. So in the end, I got a million dollars of debt that's left over. So my rents only have to service that million dollars of debt, okay? On a market rate deal, without the tax codes, you'll have a \$10 million building, same building you'd build, but you get a \$3 million from a rich guy off the street, you'd get \$7 million from a bank, and your rents have to service the 7 and the 3. So that's why, you know, you're gonna have a lot lower rent servicing just that little debt, right? So that's kind of how all of this works. And so that quality housing, you know, it's market rate housing that under the WIDA program is going to be affordable with that sense. Stable housing. So this is an interesting model. It's a 30-year model. So people can never be displaced. I mean, you have people who are evicted for behavioral or money reasons. There's an eviction mediation program that we have with LSS, who's our partner here, Lutheran Social Services. And our aim is not to exclude people. We actually work, LSS works with all the individuals that apply if they have credit issues, which is our primary, the primary reason why people don't get accepted. We work with them for up

to six months while we're building the building to get people in there who have credit problems. So all of those programs and other, the liaison of supportive services come from LSS, and our target population is also for disabled individuals. So we have actually designed this building to have 27 units out of our 48 that will be targeted for disabled individuals. So I think Sandy here is with options for independent living, we've worked with them to design these or to identify these 27 units within our building and she would refer us disabled individuals and provide services for them along with LSS. So the parking, in sense of the parking, we won't even use the parking that we have there, because most of the people that we are gonna have in this building will not have a vehicle. That's why the walkability is so huge in the WIDA scoring matrix. The other thing is health. So again, you know, we're trying to build a community within this building. I mean Michael, I don't think people who were in the plan commission last time, there were kind of like a gas, that there was no green space in here. That the views here were not ideal because you're looking at a busy street or you're looking at the top of a building, you know these, you know, this type of housing is trying to create a community in and of itself for these individuals. They work with each other in terms of solving their everyday problems and it's a tight-knit community. And LSS actually will have their office, their Green Bay office in this building and they help as a community liaison to all social services for what these people need. So, you know, I've talked to a lot of people about this project since the plan commission last time and you know, I don't know what I would sign, but I would personally guarantee this would be an amazing community asset for this location in the Green Bay community and very much needed housing for the people that we're targeting. So, you know, I just, in closing, you know, and I think Sandy wanted to say something, and I've got Dennis saying something really quick, but, you know, I believe that Green Bay, you know hears at a crossroads with this project. You know, it's an affordable project. You know, we don't want it to fall in the category of not in my backyard. I mean I think we should promote this type of housing for the people who need it the most. We've got some stakeholders, you know, is it the optimal thing where the Shopko building stays there, and we do this in the corner? You know, no, that wasn't our original intent, but down the future you've got two stakeholders that I think are long-term players that will make that vision possible. And I think that the comprehensive plan over this building actually has the zoning that allows this. It's just a site plan that we're here tonight to kind of discuss. So I hope we can hear something from- Sandy, can you hear us? Or I don't know if... Sandy?

- [Sandy] Yes I can.

- Sandy, do you wanna just say a couple words? All right, sorry.

- [Sandy] I'd love to.

- If you could just state your name and address for the record too. And I'm sorry sir, if you could give us your address for the record.

- Oh, I'm sorry. It's Ted Matkom, it's 200 North Main Street in Oregon, Wisconsin.

- Thank you. Go ahead, Sandy.

- [Sandy] Sandy Pop, 1195 Liberty Street, Green Bay. I am the assistant director at Adoptions for Independent Living. I'm also a commissioner on the Green Bay Housing Authority and I'm also a person with a disability. So I moved to Green Bay 30 some years ago and housing was scarce for somebody that needed things like a roll-in shower, level entry. So I was very fortunate when I was

able to get into an apartment at Fort Howard Apartments, closer to, it's on Chestnut Street. I lived there for about three, four years until I was able to rent an apartment that was just built on Western. So I'm very close to where this building would go up. It's a great area to live and I know there are some things like Ted mentioned that the green space, a lot of the apartments that I've seen going up lately have been the higher end apartments on Gross. I go to Madison once in a while. Some of the apartments that Ted had mentioned, I've seen some of those. There isn't much green space and yet they're all very usable, they're accessible and it's just important in Green Bay for us to have accessible housing. Sitting on the housing authority as a commissioner for the years that I have been on there, I have always touted any project coming in to the Green Bay area that the Housing authority is looking to support. I am always advocating for accessible housing. We have very few, I work with consumers with disabilities and have seen so many people fall through to the wayside or because they can't find housing that's accessible to them or rent something that's not and end up not being really able to utilize that apartment the way it should be. Another thing that I wanted to point out is we have a lot of people that we work with that are in assisted living and nursing homes that want to transition out into the community. So I worked with somebody recently and had them apply for section eight, had them do all the right things, but until the new apartments or the new apartments went up on the west end, I think, of Broadway, next to the homeless shelter or close to that. It was two years before this person could get out into an accessible apartment. That's how long the wait list are on Green Bay for accessible apartments. So instead of being in an apartment when she wanted to, she spent our taxpayer's dollars on assisted living. So the cost savings would've been just unbelievable, had she been able to get into an accessible apartment when she wanted to move out originally two years earlier. So it's things like that that I see not only as a taxpayer, not only as a person with a disability, or a person that's a commissioner, but also somebody who has tried to find accessible housing throughout the years. It is extremely difficult. So having, being able to work with Ted, we're looking at making all the apartments universal, visitable, so that people can visit everybody. Doors are wide enough and then to have that many available, accessible, apartments is just unbelievably critical to our housing efforts here for people with disabilities. So I just want to thank you for giving me the time to testify and wondering if anybody has any questions, please ask.

- Thank you Sandy. And was there anyone else from...

- Yeah, it's right over here.

- Go ahead.

- Good evening. Dennis Hanson, vice President with Lutheran Social Services 6737 West Washington Street, suite 2275, West Dallas, 53214. I'm here tonight to represent LSS, we are partnered with Gorman and Company on this development. LSS as an agency has been involved in the affordable housing industry for more than 40 years. I've been with LSS for more than 30. We've worked with Ted and Gorman and company on several successful developments. Two of the four that TED showed photos there, we are partners with on the development and one of the main things that we bring is a service component that Ted referenced. So when we first got involved in tax credit housing, it was twofold, number one, again, 40-year history of providing affordable housing in our main avenue for furthering that affordable housing was going away in the HUD capital advanced program. So we very quickly learned what we could about tax credit housing. Met with Ted very early on and he said one of the main things we need is an empowerment service provider. At the time, I had no idea what that was, but we said we'll figure it out. And what it is, essentially, is providing services to the tenants of the building. Most especially at the time it was for the tenants in the 30% unit, so the lower income

tenants, to help them be successful in their tenancy. And part of our 40-year history had been in service coordination through HUD properties. So we are very familiar with that model. We merged the empowerment service model along with the HUD service model and provided them both, not only to the required 30% units, to everybody in the building is our goal. And so we open our services, our coordination, to anyone that lives in the facility. And one of the unique things about this facility will be, as Ted mentioned, we will have an office there. One of our main services is called "Connections." It's the iris component of the family care program, serving persons with disabilities and older adults. And that staff for that program will be officed out of this building. So serving not just the community there at the development, but the larger community as a whole. Just for a point of reference, locally, I mentioned our long history and service coordination that includes Ross Grants through public housing. So we actually are the service provider for Mason Manor here in Green Bay as well. So, with that I will entertain any questions.

- Please, thank you so much.

- Thank you.

- Do we have any questions for the applicant? Is there anyone else from the public that's wishing to speak on this item?

- Excuse me, my voice didn't work. Leah Weycker, 425 South Military Avenue. I have met with Ted and also with the Martins on this project. Ted did come up with a lot of good things to address some of our concerns, the green space still isn't so much addressed. I'm one that likes to promote healthy living, including our awesome farmer's market over there. And the fact that this has family housing, it still doesn't meet that green space desire that I would have. I think you had brought up at the last minute, this is either gonna stand out really well or really not well. I still feel like it's going to be so obvious. Excuse me, there's no other four story buildings in that whole area. I think, across the street the BMO Harris is probably the next tallest building, and that one's two stories. So this definitely is gonna have a presence there. The fact, also, that it's tied into the rezoning into a warehouse has a lot of concerns for me, being in the business district. We really don't wanna turn it into the other end of Military, which is, you know, more the Velp end, where I feel like that's more warehousing suitable, more suitable to warehousing. I do like that LSS is a partner with them, and I wasn't aware of the assorted incomes. I think we were told originally it was just affordable. So I appreciate that effort too. So those are my two positives. My negatives again, the family, that it's two and three, three bedrooms, so you definitely are gonna have kids there, whether they're disabled parents or not. There will be children. And the green space and then tied to the rezone will be my third thing, until then. Thank you.

- Is there anyone else from the public wishing to speak on this?

- Should I have said that I was with Military under business district?

- You can add that in right now.

- Okay, that's what I'm with.

- Okay, and you're representing them with your statements here?

- Correct, correct.

- Okay, all right, thank you.

- All right, can I speak?

- Yeah, absolutely.

- Okay.

- So, Melinda Eck, I'm an alderman of district 11, 1634 Berwick Drive. I know that there was a full plan for the site, and it does look great. There is no guarantee that's gonna happen, there's kind of those two things that I'm concerned about. So, if we're rezoning it as industrial and so David or John might have to answer this, or Stephanie, if it's rezoned, and then say, and right now speaking with Ed Martin, he's not planning to sell the rest of the property. You know, that's not part of his plan. So if it's zoned industrial, and then say down the road that maybe he did open up to selling the rest of the property, would it have to be rezoned again to build what Gorman's are proposing?

- Yes, they would've to. Yep.

- Okay, so you know, there's a concern there. I just wanted to point that out.

- Thank you Alder Eck.

- Can I add a bit?

- Yeah, absolutely.

- Alder Eck.

- Yes? If there's any other comments you received from the public in between the last commission meeting and now?

- Nothing new since last time.

- We're talking about the PUD here.

- This is the PUD, but I think that- They mentioned she had a second.

- Okay, right, down the- In phase two but that's... Well no, I mean that's also a PUD.

- I'm not sure where the industrial part comes in. So that would come into your next item here. For the overall block.

- Got it, okay. All right.

- But it was my understanding their contingent on each other?

- They are, in all intents and purposes they are, yeah. Yeah, they're both bound together as far as-
- Okay.
- Just moving forward.
- Gotcha. Okay.
- Motion to close the floor.
- Second.
- Motion by Commissioner Poradek, seconded by Vice Chair Miller to close the floor. All those in favor?
- [Commissioners] Aye.
- Any opposed? Okay. Any discussion amongst commissioner, questions for staff?
- I can kick us off. I spent a lot of time thinking about this, probably more than I should have, to be honest. I listened back to the minutes of our discussion, not the first time, but also... I'm sorry, the first time and the second time. So the third time we're hearing this, listened to counsel's comments on it. Really just trying to understand the opposition to this. And I'm still struggling, to be honest, and I apologize to Ted for not allowing him to speak in the right order. The last meet, I think it may have changed some opinions, hearing some of the aspects that he provided as well today. So thank you for that. Yeah, I really, this project has been on the defensive for quite a while now, and I think Ted's comments helped kind of put this more back into the offensive part of it, I guess, where, why are we trying to find a way to say no to this when there's so many great things about it? It reminds me of perfect being the enemy of good. You know, we want this exact thing, we have this visionary mind of what this will be, but look at all the merits of this thing. It's a great project. I've been on plan commission since 2016. I think I encountered on one hand, how many times we have, we did tax credits on an apartment. It's very rare, very, very rare. And I just am having a hard time wrapping my head around how we can be against the projects can do so much good for so many people that really need it in a town that has a desperate need for housing. So I would love to hear anyone come back and say no to these people, that they can't have this. I'm sorry, I'm a little passionate about housing in this city, so, that's all.
- You know, I would just add to Vice Chair Miller's comments and you know, I was, at the last commission meeting, I had a lot of questions around, "it's gonna stand out," "it's gonna look different." As I was talking earlier, I did have a chance to go to Madison, I just happened to be in Madison, and I saw the orange and yellow building as I was driving down, and my first thought was, oh that's a great-looking building. And then I looked around like, why does everything else look so bad? Quite honestly. So I appreciate the additional comments, I definitely appreciate the mix of the units, knowing that you'll have the whole spectrum when it comes to affordable housing and market rates. And I love that 27 or 48 units, I believe will be designated in that space. So I agree with Vice Chair Miller. I'm just having a hard time understanding, even from hearing from people in the public, the opposition, and I joked earlier, I'm like, long as it's not a Popeye's, you know, we won't be here. But I'm still trying to, again, find a reason to not support it.

- We closed the floor, right? We did, yes.

- I will make a motion to approve.

- Oh, a second.

- Okay.

- Question for staff. The long-term plan, what is it called here? The long term concept, the last document attached, was added to the agenda item. Can you describe, maybe, your thought process and why that was added to this item?

- Right, so it was added to this item because we asked both parties, knowing that they're tethered together, can we have some information as to what you can see for the overall site here, knowing that this item right here isn't in its own vacuum, it still is a part of what's happening on the rest of the block. Gordon provided this information to us as far as what they could envision for the rest of the block itself. They provided it, so it's one of their items. They could see how this apartment complex could then fit into a total redevelopment of the overall area. And has noted it is not something that we're not taking that into account as far as this PUD, it's not that, but... I thought it was appropriate to go ahead and show that this is where an apartment complex like this could fit into a longer-term redevelopment.

- Is... There's no way we can work toward that here, with this motion, though. I mean there's nothing we can do on the commission to say that's the direction we would like to go if that was the direction of the commission. And make some sort of contingency that that, I mean, there isn't any.

- It isn't there, right, yes. So for the PUD itself, there's not a contingency saying it must go in this direction.

- Yeah.

- We were asking for concepts of what could happen. So with this, you're given a clear plan of what could happen to this 1.1 acres, the next PUD. That's what's going to be proposed to go into place for the rest of the property as far as uses and form on that part.

- Thank you.

- Just for a little clarification, the contingencies that's on this is looking ahead to the next item. The contingency is in the offer to purchase. Like is there, how is it tied otherwise other than that? Like, if we approve this PUD, but not next one.

- Oh right, yeah. As far as it- It would then be up to the both parties to go ahead and see if they move forward at that point. Initially this one PUD was put forward to this body here as one individual item. The rest of the block was asked to go ahead and have a second PUD to go ahead and do the rest of the block, knowing our forms that we had here, were going back to the development agreement back in '21, where if you can go ahead and find a good project that could be either residential, an excuse or commercial in front of the Shopko building itself, then there could be more

discussions as to what longer term could happen with the existing PUD for the site itself with uses. This made that domino go ahead and happen to where now we're considering the rest of lot for longer term and permanent uses beyond the temporary use PUD, which is in place right now for the whole block. So we need to change that PUD, we need to have a new PUD to allow this apartment with office space on the first floor to happen in this specific location. Then, without it came as far as making it more permanent uses for the both C3 and limited ally uses on the rest of the property.

- Okay, thank you.

- Go ahead.

- Just a quick comment on that, and that's an excellent point Ken. And so, you remember this was a unique proposal when you brought it first before the original time, 'cause obviously it usually can't temporarily zone something. And in fact we still can't temporarily zone something, but we can have a development agreement that says certain things will happen in certain amounts of time. There's a contractual arrangement with the applicant. So that's kind of what we've decided, what we did originally. We would also continue to do that, I think, on the second one in terms of kind of putting an additional revised development agreement in place that would put a variety of of conditions in there that would probably not normally be appropriate for a zoning action but could be addressed through an agreement in terms of timing of other sort, you know, pursuits of providing evidence of looking at redevelopment opportunities, those types of things. The current development agreement allows for a three-year existence of the temporary industrial use with two one-year extensions. If nothing else happens in front of it. But obviously this, now that there would be a first element of the screening of that site, then we would've to kind of revise that list of things, 'cause one box would be checked in terms of that list. So now we wanna take a look at what is the, what is the procedure then for continuing that screening? For continuing to evaluate the redevelopment opportunities on the site. Whether that's, you know, some sort of market analysis, some sort of, and again, what exactly that would need to be. We still need to be kind of vetted out on that, but we will be certainly be bringing that forward. Yeah, ideally we'll be having that similar, that language be coming forward to council at the same time as they have the consideration of this zoning.

- Okay, thank you.

- I ask a question of staff?

- Go ahead, Alder Eck, yeah. Because I'm not sure when you're going to vote on this, that I know that there was need for additional parking. That's still the case, right? And does that, like, say they recommend approval, what happens next with that?

- Right, so this still has to go back to slight plan or we'll go through the typical site plan review that would happen for any development. As part of the PUD, we do not address lowering the threshold for 60 stalls for a 48 unit on this site. We didn't feel it was appropriate for this, knowing that there are stalls in the immediate area. And with that in mind, it would still need to go through typical site plan review to find a way to either put 60 cells on or find a way to use within the code to allow for the extra cells of shared parking, or find alternatives to make that work. Right now there are 54 stalls, so there needs to be a need to find those remaining six.

- So 60? 60, all of them?

- Yes.

- Okay, thank you.

- I would say this, I mean, and I expressed my opposition has been stated earlier on the project, I want to vote yes for this project. I want to vote for the housing efforts that are being put forward here. I appreciate the developer's presentation and response to some of the concerns. I really do. But I, we have listened to the debate as Vice Chair Miller had said over the three times here, and the concerns continue to come up. We all know those and I can repeat those, of safety, et cetera. However, I think that all the common goal here has been to redevelop that entire place as a long-term strategy, rather than a short-term fix with this one parcel. I think that's been admitted by everybody, right? That we've wanted that to take place. That is not what is being proposed. And I understand the rationale and the historic conversation of why that is the way it is today. But I can't in good conscience just vote for one piece of this plan when we have no idea what will occur in the rest of that plan. There no guarantee to know what type of community that is. It's very nice to think that, and dream big and and dream about a long-term strategy for that entire area and for the Military Avenue business district, for that local community, for the neighborhood eventually in the surrounding area, that think people who wanna talk about, we talked about the lack, you know, the importance or not importance of green space. Well in the long-term plan there's a lot of green space, there's trees, there's buffers, et cetera. It's a creating a nice community, neighborhood environment and putting the best foot forward for Green Bay, for these people to have a long-term housing solution. So I can't in good conscience, because of the fact that we don't know what is happening with the rest of the property. I like the concepts of it, I like the communities that it will serve us, all those types of things that we have talked about. And luckily I think all people on both sides of the aisle have said we want more housing in Green Bay. We want to make sure everyone has accessible and affordable housing in Green Bay. Thankfully we haven't heard anyone speak against that point to our commission. I think we should be proud of that. But at the same time, if we're looking at a long-term plan rather than a short-term fix, I would like the owners and the city and others involved to go back and find a way, we can move toward a longer-term strategy for that entire site rather than that. And so therefore I will be voting "no" today.

- Again, I follow you, sorry, but I've stated my commitment for this project, approval simply because of the number of units. I think the need for units is so big for this city that that kind of overshadows some concerns in my mind. I understand the concerns that were stated at the last commission meeting of safety and I understand that there was a business across the street that had kids in the parking lot already. I hear that, it concerns me, but today's presentation with the fact that there's gonna be help from outside coming into the building, the fact that they did install a room for kids, it's not, it doesn't replace a green space, but it is a space for kids to go, especially little kids. I think things are being addressed and I think the fact this development is urban, it's not rural, it's urban. Green Bay's not used to urban development. We really aren't. This is kind of a spotlight here. We need urban development in this city badly. So I am going to vote yes for this.

- You don't.

- I don't know, I mean... Man, I see both ways. I think that the fact that they qualify for those WIDA credits is huge. I think the fact that LSS has partnered up with them is huge. The fact that the vacancy rate in Green Bay is, I mean it's ridiculous. I have people coming to me all the time asking if I've got

anything available, what's available, what can I find? And I worried a little bit that we were just trying to throw something, anything just because we need the housing in Green Bay. But it's hard for me because I, in Green Bay, the mentality is that block away at Murphy Park and I realize it's a big intersection. Green Bay mentality, it's hard to walk even a block or two to any destination. If you go to big cities, that's not such a big deal. And a lot of times if you've got families, you have a car, you're throwing kids in a car and running to a park anyway 'cause the kids get bored at the parks that they're always at, so... And I really, I mean, I think that this could be a catalyst. I mean, I know it looks different than everything else, but I guess I thought that was a benefit. I mean, and I'm not, you know, saying anything, but the buildings on Military, a lot of them are older and so something, anything new is gonna stand out. So I mean, I realize that we don't get that, that pie in the sky, that phase two, we don't have a guarantee on that. But that, I mean, perfect is the enemy of good. And it's not, I don't even feel like we're just trying to force it in there. Like it's just good enough. I this is a good plan. I guess that's why you said we do have a motion and a second on the floor. So I guess we can go ahead with, go ahead with maybe an individual vote.

- And the final plan would just say that Madam Chair, and I appreciate the reasoning behind it too. The amount of people that we can serve with this development, yes, that is very true. But if we were to push the parties involved to look toward a bigger development, how many more people could we impact by putting that pressure, I don't wanna say pressure, but putting that challenge forward for that area in the community. So I would just respond to that.

- And I absolutely, I would- If I thought that I... If I could do that, and we could do that.

- Yeah,

- I would love to apply that kind of pressure. But I also don't wanna be scaring off developers from the area either. We want to be friendly to developers and I mean, we're not gonna give them everything, but we're also, we wanna work with people who wanna work within the city too. So I mean, man, that's ideal, but I guess that's all I have to say on that. Anyone else have their 2 cents before we go ahead with the vote?

- Yes, I think that's a good point that you made there about the message that we send. If you look back at, I mean this is the directive that we gave staff, that city council has also said too, to find us housing, find us affordable housing. They delivered on that. If you look back at the Military Avenue corridor plan from 2011, it's got a whole list of awesome ideas. Goals 10 and goals 11 from the action plan. Goal 10, "Realize infill development office and residential uses were appropriate, resulting in additional local and commuter customers and expand the tax base." Goal 11, "Encourage the development of housing types effort to market demand is currently unmet such as senior housing, market rate town homes and assisted living." City staff delivered exactly what has been told of them by every document possible. And we're finding a way to say no, it blows my mind. I just can't, we can't be sending the message to developers, to everyone else around here that we're not willing to work with them on these type of projects. 'Cause it's exactly what we put out on paper that we want to do.

- Any further discussion? All right, so we've got a motion by Vice Chair Miller, a second by Commissioner Daniels. Can you put the approval, or I guess, sorry, everybody else has computers. I feel very outdated here.

- Just this.

- Oh just, oh that's it. I should just pulled up . All right, so that's the motion on the floor. So I guess I don't.

- I mean, we took roll call on the last one.

- The individual mode is probably best, then.

- It's also worth noting that when this went to council it was split and needed to be tie breakered by the mayor.

- Oh, okay.

- So I think taking a voice vote or sorry, the roll call will be best.

- Okay. All right. All right, Vice Chair Miller?

- Aye.

- Commissioner Daniels?

- Aye.

- Commissioner Rovinski?

- Aye.

- Commissioner Poradek?

- No.

- Alder...

- Hutchinson.

- Hutchinson!

- Aye.

- And Chair Hanson, Aye. All right, so five yays, one nay. And then that will go forward to City council for... Is it? March...

- 7th.

- March 7th? All right. Moving onto, then, item number two. Reconsideration with possible action on request to amend a planned unit development at 216 South Military Avenue to amend the boundaries

of the PUD submitted by MAU and Associates applicant on behalf of Henry Real Estate Development, llc., property owner.

- Thank you chair. So for this-

- Let's go over this quickly again here, I'll go to bit more in-depth because we didn't actually talk about it that much our last meeting and it's been a while. Two lots. This is lot one. This is a 7.25 acre, part of the property that is not the Gorman PUD. Next. So here's your overall site going from the road tracks north up to Leo, next. So let's focus on this right here into the third Development Areas and what they mean for different things. So, you happen to see the evolution of this beauty over the course of time since December. As staff we did split this up into three different Development Areas because we don't have that long-term. This is what will happen. Gorman, you got a site plan, you see it. With this one, it's what's there right now. So we wanted to put in some different gates to go ahead and put this area to work well with both Gorman, with Military and the neighbors off to the west. So you're gonna see the garb here, you open the northeast, Development Area A, which is the area of the parking lot that is just north of that seasonal area that shop ahead. Development Area B being Legal Street West, where the existing liquor store is. And then Development Area C being the Shopko and the parking that stops the west and slightly to the north. So for Development Area A, you'll note with this, we are allowing for uses all C3 and the list of limited light industrial for uses on this site. But as far as building goes, no new building can be allowed for ally purposes, just for C3 purposes. As far as the uses allowed in this district, just go over 'em again. It's all C3 and there's also limited production, and processing contractor yard, but it must be fully enclosed within the building. Dry cleaning establishment/commercial laundry, research and development facility, public safety and service facility, general office, government office, bank or other financial institution, clinic, healthcare facility, artist studio, warehousing and educational training facility. For the warehousing, that's not self storage. That's not permitted at all. This is warehousing, like they're doing right now with the site for Martin's goods. Additionally, there's some CUP aspects of this that would also include then, minor material recover facility, a ground transportation service, package delivery service, telecommunication tower, dwelling in conjunction with a business and live working it. So that would be allowed in the A area as far as the use, but no new building in that area. In B and C, those uses would be allowed, but building could be done. But it has to be in conjunction with the bulk requirements for C3 development standards. Some other restrictions would be screening to the west. For the folks who are living in the residential areas off to the west, our landscape requirements are required to be put in within 12 months to screen off that area. There'd be a limit on fencing that will be facing off towards Military Avenue within 200 feet of the right of way. And there'd be a limit on the types of developments that would look similar to industrial uses, such as garages and loading docks along Military Avenue. So there might be a use inside of those buildings that could be an ally, a limited ally use, the design and feel of it would not be one of industrial uses. So next, and this is just a quick look around, this is your Development Area A, next, this is B. And then finally the next two are, were C is, being the the north part of lot. And then the next image is the little annex part that comes out along Military. So these uses would become, rather than temporary, they become permanent for both C3 and the limited ally uses on the site.

- All right, thank you. Any discussion or questions for staff?

- So has the owner expressed the need for, why does it need to be permanent? I had heard at the last meeting, and I apologize if I forget his name, but a gentleman from HJ Martin say they don't want this

to be warehousing or this forever. So then why does it need to be permanent if they don't plan on it being met?

- Right, at the time of that David Martin was here.

- Okay.

- And at neighbor meetings and I believe at this last plan commission, he did state that. So right now the PUD goes until '24. So it was approved in '21, it's three years. The development agreement goes three, one year plus one year extensions. They have that on it as well. He has mentioned the idea of 10 years as being an option. But with that, as an idea of how much they need to go up ahead for time to develop this site, he cited back over to how long it is taken to redevelop the site over in . That took about seven years or so to take the old Menards that was out there to turn into the building and health facility that it is right now. So there hasn't been a specific time. They're asking for a permanent, which can be more than 10 years, that's for sure. But ten's been a number that's been bounced around nearby by the Martin family.

- Okay. Because for me, 10 years makes sense. Looking at how they're, the other project you just mentioned, the Menards, seven years. Okay, but permanent, it just, it sticks. Like, all of a sudden you can get into that point where there is nothing to push you to redevelop. I don't like permanent. I just, I can't be on board with that.

- Can we put a limit on it?

- Was there a condition? There was a condition list, well, there is, yeah.

- There is in the PUD itself.

- Yeah, you put a limit on it on the last one here for the temporary one, at that point you put three years. Or you approved three years. I don't know if that was necessarily one done by planning commission.

- Right.

- Ken, I tend to agree. I think some of the other concerns about the rest of the property can be at least, at least there's something there to hold him to. Permanent is permanent, so, I think if... I think it's a decent idea, I don't know if they'll go for it, but I think it's far as good as we can do. All right.

- Go ahead.

- I think there might be a couple folks who would, might like to comment on this as well.

- All right

- Motion open.

- Motion by Commissioner Poradek, second by Alder Hutchinson to open the floor. All those in favor?

- [Commissioners] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right. Was it, did you wanna speak on this?

- Yeah, good.

- Go ahead.

- Ted Matkom again, Wisconsin, President of Gorman Company, 200 North Main Street, Oregon, Wisconsin. So this has been a big discussion between the Martins and staff for a long time. David, I think, thinks that the intent of our group is that, you know, the way that this was structured where they can't add on, they can't improve the building, they can only do things inside, kind of says, you know, we're just gonna use it as is. We're not extending the life of the building. We're not gonna expand windows, we're not gonna expand docks, we're not gonna expand what we're doing there. We're just doing this until the useful life expires. The environment gets better and we can move on. And I will guarantee you the Martins are not saying that that's a beautiful building and they want to keep it, I think David said that here on the record, but I'll tell you, putting a term on it kind of kills the deal because Ed will not agree to a term. We've discussed this many times, and the reason is, as I indicated before, if he had a crystal ball of one of the- The economy's gonna do, you know, even in 10 years, you know, we'd be, we wouldn't be doing what we're doing today. So, you know, it's a tough deal. It's almost like, you know, I hate to use the word "trust," because nobody likes trust, but you have two stakeholders that are gonna be there a while. I've got, you know, a real big stake there for 30 years. I ain't moving. And I'm gonna own, and I'm gonna manage, and I'm gonna be talking to Ed. And so I just think that it will take care of itself in the organic due course. But I think a time limit is not going to be well-received by the Martins, I'll just put that out there. But I understand where you're coming. I get it, we've talked about it, but it's just something that he will not agree to. So I just wanted to, you know.

- Thank you.

- Sorry, go ahead.

- Leah Weycker with Military Avenue, 425 South Military again. So this is part of the problem with the housing piece. So now you guys know what we've been looking at. It's not a complete picture, and I think that's why we have to buy some time perhaps on what does the whole space look like. I think you're exactly right, Michael. That plan of full-housing was awesome. We Military Avenue business district did not speak to this because again, this was information that came up way after. I think our third meeting here and we're still, you know, getting more information all the time. So my board only meets once a month and literally information comes up weekly. So I can't speak for the board on this piece, but we do not want Military Avenue to become a warehouse district. That's not what's in that plan from 2013 or 2011. And I do think Green Bay can be better. Excuse me, my voice. I think we can do better with our housing. It's a great place to live in I think we need more affordable housing, absolutely. I'm not opposed to that. I'm opposed to the way that it's getting pushed through and way too many contingencies and it almost feels like being held hostage to get our housing. And you guys have a tough decision.

- Motion to close the floor.

- Seconded.
- Motion by Commissioner Poradek, seconded by Vice Miller. All those in favor?
- [Commissioners] Aye.
- Any opposed?
- I will say that I, you know, since my time on the commission, I have definitely been one to want to move the needle and push developments forward. However, I do not like almost being held hostage by business. Especially when you've been on the end of expressing the need for the partnership and this doesn't feel like a partnership. I do love the 10-year, if we can put that on there, because that seems just from history, from a historical assessment, seems reasonable. But I will go on record saying I do not like "Give me this, or you get nothing," type of mentality. That's just my personal standpoint. And we have historical information to go on as far as time. So that's kind of what my initial thoughts are.
- But definitely we'll yield to those with more experience.
- Would we be able to bring up that, the ABC map real quick?
- So there's a lot going on here, but I think it's actually more simple than we're making it. So A that's the part right upon Military, next to the new apartments, they only can add C3 into that. That's it.
- So there are uses?
- Can still be a lie.
- With that's as far as the, with that list as well.
- Yep.
- C3, but the actual building component, the improvements, can only be for uses that are for C3.
- Okay.
- And that leads to C being the one, really, where they can't, we're really just allowing them to continue the use that they have right now. They can't build anything on, they can't add dock doors. They can't become a warehouse because it's, I mean it is already kind of a warehouse-
- They could add onto the building itself. They can't make it look like it's industrial use though. They can't add the dock doors to the front along Military.
- Okay.
- You could do it to the back over on Randall. They add on.

- They could add dock doors along the residential side?

- Yes. On that side there, the requirement would be within 12 months of approval. But they'd have to meet the existing code here for landscaping perimeter buffering over there that would, so right now they have a brass strip. They need to meet the requirements of the code to upgrade to give the separation that way. Regardless if they build or not, that has to be done.

- I'm not too concerned about the use. The list that we have in front of us is not intensive and a lot of these ones that we might, that might be concerned about just don't make sense for the site as well. I can't imagine it would make any sense for 'em to do some of those ones. So basically we're just allowing to use what's being used for now. If they wanna make any substantive changes, as in turn it into a giant warehouse, they'd have to come back. They can't do that. They'd have to get a new PUD to allow that. I think I'm more concerned about the look of the building. Let's make sure that the people that would be living next door and seeing this from Military, have a decent experience and don't view it as a eyesore. So I'd be more interested in conditions that ensure landscaping condition of the building. We don't want peeling paint or busted anything like that. That's more of my concern, is keeping the building in good shape while we, they work on pedestrian specs.

- I think the condition of the building and peeling paint, that would be like an inspection. A landscaping would be something...

- That would go through us.

- Awesome.

- John, can you remind me, in terms of the conditions of the improvements to screening landscaping?

- Sure.

- Could we review that one more time?

- Yep, again. So for landscaping, for , this is pretty boilerplate when it comes to this. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, detailed landscape plan shall be submitted and reviewed by, for chapter 44, the code, within 12 months of approval of the PUD by Common Council. Development Area C must be improved to meet the standards of Article 19, division 5, section 44-1964 of the code. That's essentially our landscape buffer. 25 feet right there. If a land use change occurs in Development Area B, which is one of the permitted light industrial uses, an approved site plan must include improvement standards of article 19. Going back to the there must, or the buffering must go on North, along Randall, to go ahead and cover that from the road itself, all existing landscape areas must be maintained and in good repair. So those are landscape requirements. As far as site plans that are, anything that's different, if any site has been purchased, it shall be not further divided without reviewing consent of the city. An updated change of use site plan must be submitted to the Department of Community and Economic Development to note any existing change of use of the site. Temporary barriers on the site such as jersey walls or temporary concrete walls must be removed. All existing and new service loading and refuse area shall be screened in accordance with existing codes. Any ground mounted and/or roof mounted mechanical shall be screened in accordance with our existing codes. Going back up to fencing and just building a site plan and maintenance, any new building C3 development uses shall have a building footprint. This is

Development Area A, which encompasses a minimum of 50% of the street frontage along South Military Avenue. No new buildings or building additions shall be built in Development Area A for any ally or light industrial uses. If you are in B or C though, you can add onto the building, so long as you stay within the development standards for a C3 use. And why we're saying C3 is because when light, or light industrial could move further towards the setbacks because in general, industrial areas are clumped with other industrial areas.

- Okay.

- Not... In Development Areas B and C, no fences are allowed to be erected within 200 feet of the public right of way of South Military Avenue, Leo Street or Elton Way. Keep in mind with that as far as just storage areas and things of that sort. No building design element associated with industrial uses shall be permitted, eg. dock doors, garages, lifts, mechanicals or other such development features, design features, determined by the development; by the development director of order destiny, shall be allowed in areas which are visible from South Military Avenue. No new loading docks on the east, north or south faces of the wall, with exception of existing loading docks. Service and loading docks are permitted along Randall St. right of way. And any reconstruction beyond maintenance must comply with the code requirements for C3 dimensional and other regulatory standards. So, if you're gonna design it, it has to go ahead and meet a C3 design and feel, if you're adding onto the building.

- Thank you. So they gotta be pretty close to, if you're looking at the setbacks, any building new construction would have to go back towards Randall or I guess towards the north, somewhat.

- Yeah.

- They can't go any closer to Military with exception of...

- A, I believe.

- A.

- Yeah.

- I think the real expansion areas to the west of the shop, or going north. North of the shop.

- So they're not coming in that area.

- They're not coming up any closer, it would be towards the backside or towards over there. In the current PUD, I'm guessing most of this does not exist in terms of holding them to improvements within 12 months. I would assume, 'cause they're operated as is right now. This actually gives us something to hold to them to make improvements on the site within 12 months.

- Right, the only- That is the one you must do as far as an improvement to the site. It's the adding of the bumper over on Randall itself.

- Okay. So we get that by... If that's something we don't have now within 12 months, we're holding into an updated PUD that has all this, what John just went through, which I assume some of it's there right now, but probably not to the detail that we have right now.

- The dimensional standards as far as, you know, that the existing PUD essentially goes on about the additional uses that are allowed, that makes the bell-end process, the bell-end into the warehousing of the employee facilities exist on the shopper site, at this moment.

- And it didn't address probably anything in terms of landscaping, the screening. Any of that?

- No, because it's temporary premium.

- Exactly, okay.

- I have a question. So things have been negotiated over months, whatever, and it's clear that the owner of the property doesn't like the idea of a 10-year limit. Is that right? What we just heard?

- If it was something they liked, this would've been already put into place here.

- Okay. So I guess we all have druthers for that property that's owned by someone who has whatever ideas. I see the fact that this apartment development happens and it gets built, then all of a sudden the rest of the site may be looking very good to develop in the same way. We can't envision that now 'cause it's not there, and maybe there is a momentum to help get the rest of the site developed in that fashion, versus not having anything there. I would much rather vote to leave this as is, get that apartment building built, and then see what the owner decides to do. I think things will happen potentially quicker, maybe they won't, but I am hopeful that the development of that site may be triggered by the success of that apartment building. So you have, it's a leap, it may not make any sense at all, but that's what I'm looking at by voting for the wording as it is.

- Just for my personal privilege, point of clarification, was the owner notified of this commission meeting tonight?

- Yes.

- And they chose not to appear?

- They were here last time.

- They were here last time, but not at this time.

- There is a representative by the seat here from MAU, who is here.

- I'm sorry.

- Oh my goodness.

- Oh, the window!

- Should we open the floor?

- Did you want open the floor? If they want to?

- Yes, motion to open floor.

- Seconded.

- Motion by Vice Chair Miller, seconded by Commissioner Daniels, to open the floor. Although in favor?

- [Commissioners] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right. If you could come forward and speak, I guess I don't even know if you wanted to talk, but you're...

- I'm from MAU Associates, 400 Street Boulevard. I wasn't planning on speaking. I think John's been doing a very good job. The Martins aren't gonna take their name off of that sign. They're gonna be marketing this, you know, regardless of what happens on this site. But like it's been mentioned, they are tied together. That is in the offer to purchase. And I mentioned, you know, they can't really do anything to the site. If they disturb more than 500 square feet, they need to bring that whole site into compliance with a city of Green Bay code for C3, and it just would be counterintuitive of the whole thing to make this building look nice just to use the building. Their intention is to market the site for who knows what it would be. They didn't want to provide, let's, they called it fluff. We don't know who's going to be interested in this site. I think, like, it was mentioned, this is a catalyst for the site. You have to start someplace. And I know, it's something that you mentioned, it is all or nothing. Would you rather have the housing or none of it when, if you get the housing, it could spur more housing or more development on the site. So if you guys have specific questions, I'd be happy to answer 'em. But I think, you know, the two aspects of it, they kind of go hand in hand. We're not "holding it hostage," like it was said, it's just, we need time. With no crystal ball, you don't know. Maybe it's 11 years. I mean, so if you put a timeframe on it, you don't know, and that's where they're going with a three plus one plus one. So with that, anything else?

- Would it be fair to characterize, they're not looking to add, they don't want the year in there just because it's going to be a burden, something to have to worry about in this regard.

- Right.

- There's obviously no intent. I'm sure this is not the highest and best use that they have in mind for it. It's more of why put that on there when...

- Right.

- There's not much of a purpose to it. We've put plenty of conditions on the rest of it already there. So I guess I'm just questioning why they wouldn't want, why they're so against your timeline, just the burden of-

- I can't speak to that. That's the owner's, I wasn't privy to that conversation.

- But-

- Yeah.

- The existing uses are the intended PUD that's put before you. Everything's inside the building.

- Okay.

- Thank you.

- Real quick, Ted Matkom of Wisconsin Gorman community. So it's interesting that when your discussion has gone towards this hostage mentality, and I'll say Ed is actually thinking he's doing everyone a favor, giving us a little piece of land to do the housing, and kind of letting us start that because he'd much rather market this whole thing as one big parcel to somebody. So, you know, I had to convince him, being the inside track guy that I wanna be, that I will be the guy to make this catalytic deal happen here. But he's feeling he's giving something to the community versus holding it hostage. The other thing I wanted to say is, the plan that I gave you there, we both agreed not to do it, just so you know. I mean, it's not like if you said no to this, that something would happen with the Shopko site. I mean there's no housing going there because the rents there are not high enough to, you know, our market rents are like \$1250. I mean, to have something happen there in today's construction dollars and industry divide, it's gotta be like \$1850. It's not happening there. And so that's, it's not gonna spur someone to act if you say no, I get the time limit. He, just Ed's, you know, a good businessman. I mean, he's not gonna put a term limit on something that he can't see in the future. That's just the bottom line, so.

- Thank you.

- Leah Weycker on Military Avenue, I think, Ken, you put your finger on it. It's a permanent rezone. That's what you're looking at.

- Motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- Motion by Vice Chair Miller, seconded by commissioner Poradek to close the floor. All those in favor?

- [Commissioners] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right, so I've got a couple questions for staff. All right. So not just for, just, so if, excuse me. Again, if we're gonna put a 10 year limit on it, they would just have to come back and be like, "we need more time," right?

- He could come back at that point and request for more time, yes.

- So now my other question is, as staff, you guys are recommending the approval and I know that as staff, I don't, I think you feel the same way as us. We don't like, "maybe this will happen," and

permanent things like warehouses and business districts and you feel comfortable with not putting a limit on this?

- Right, I understand the merits, people have good merits. I'm talking in this both ways. With this overall though, with the apartment complex and where negotiations have come here, we felt comfortable to go ahead and not put to rack that there has to be a time limit as far as staff recommendation goes, yes.

- Okay, thank you. I feel like permanence, it's so hard.

- So that's... Can I go back to the original comment I had from the last motion, which ties into this one, but if we want to look at that long-term strategy of forming a neighborhood environment with multiple housing units, this motion is going completely opposite to that by saying we wanna leave it as is, for me. I have a hard time seeing both of them together and I think that the points are very valid about, and I don't want to use this kind of hostage situation, but if we're all moving to that same goal, that doesn't sound like it's a coherent vision for that area and that's location in the city. And so with that, I'd make a motion to deny.

- I second the motion.

- I have a hard time with the permanence of just, but at the same time, what... People who have owned that area, they've been doing good work, but it's, again, it's still putting that it's permanent. I have a hard time with that. I mean, I would feel better with it 10 years, and then they can come back if they needed to extend it. But I just, I that permanence is just, it's so, you know, permanent. I mean when does the PUD expire, if they... It doesn't.

- I mean, right now, this is permanent.

- Right, permanent, permanent.

- Until somebody else comes forward with another plan that was approved for a reason. This is what it is.

- Right.

- I think for me though, it's the long, we're looking at this now in context of this particular development in the corner of it. And I think that the counter reaction to all this is, you're putting this, what we just passed, in the first motion, of this apartment complex. You're straddling that entire development around that apartment complex. This would be a much easier decision if we knew what was going on around it. But there's no idea. We know, I mean, it's been very obvious to the commission that this would hopefully not be the goal of that property. No one is advocating this state warehouse permanently, and the other uses. So it's counterintuitive to suddenly say we're gonna make this permanent. And if there's a problem with that, that needs to have more time to be worked out in a longer-term strategy, than it's currently be presented to the commission. So that we can insure good and more, even, housing for residents in the city.

- I see your point that, you know, only being a resident of this area for 12, 13 years. I mean, how long did that Sears building stay there, vacant or with nothing?

- Six years or so.

- Again, on record. Like, I don't like the MP progress, and I have visited Madison and saw the other properties and they look much better than anything else on the street. So I have no doubt that this will set the tone for that area. I just don't like feeling like we're bullied into a situation where we have to say yes. And that's what I feel like.

- The question is, is permanent industrial use here appropriate?

- Permanent light industrial.

- Light industrial, sorry.

- There's a big difference in our code between light industrial and industrial.

- Thank you.

- Well, I think the bottom line is, do we want that apartment building or not? Because if we vote this down, we'll walk away from it. It's that simple.

- I think I'm on the same page. We're submarining this because we can't, you want feel better about the fact that we, oh we think they're getting us on this. Are we that sick?

- Are we submarining it, or are they doing it by putting my contingency? Well, no, I guess, let's look at reality here, Ken. We have- What's permanent? What's permanent? You know what I mean? Permanent is a word that means different things when you're talking about a zoning of a property. Permanent doesn't mean permanent, not to me. I've seen so many changes in whatever. To me to get that apartment building built, because again, I'm for it because of the rooms, we need 'em, it overrides this "permanent," word that's associated with this. I think it's so important to get these rooms that if we keep these this zone permanent, fine, it's gonna change. It's probably gonna change. And if the business opportunity is there for the owner, he's gonna do steps to make that business opportunity happen. Be they, you know, good for the apartment or bad. I'm of the belief if that apartment gets building gets built, it will stir things in that direction. I just think that'll happen. Because those buildings are pretty well built, and they look great, okay? So the notion of voting this down, the second one is gonna vote the apartment complex down. That's the simple fact. We have the opportunity right now to approve the apartment, get it built. And I don't like the feeling of walking away from that, simply because the zoning would be permanent. 'Cause it's, you know, permanency is just the word. That's where I'm coming from.

- They're already using the site right now. They can't substantially change the site, even with a permit, without having to come back to us. So yes, it's a permanent thing, but they can't do anything with the site substantially. They, without having to come back to us. So I don't care if it's permanent. If they need to do a major change that would affect the neighborhood, they'd have to come back or start over fresh with that. So I just, they're already using it for these purpose- They're gonna use it for probably the same thing that they're using it for right this moment, which is Dawn Health, and I forget the other office space in there. Probably what they're intending on doing with it for the foreseeable future.

- Why are they using it already like that? Because we allowed that to happen?
- Because we wanted to activate a site that was empty.
- That they bought for light industrial use that was zoned commercial.
- I, we just went through all the virtues of all this and then we're gonna turn around and say no, we don't want the housing because this building might be used for something in the future. I just, okay guys.
- I want the housing, I just approved it.
- I think it's a good point that, that it's permanent until we change it. Because, I mean, that's what we're doing right now too. Well, there's a motion on the floor.
- Right there, yep.
- So I guess we could just vote.
- Okay.
- So there's a motion by Commissioner Poradek and a second by Commissioner... It was by , I wasn't... Commissioner Rovinski, I'm sorry. All right, should we do an individual vote?
- So what's the motion?
- To deny it. Sorry.
- Why don't you do an individual vote?
- Okay, so "yay" is denying.
- Nay is..
- No to the denial.
- Okay. All right. Vice chair Miller?
- Nay. Commissioner Daniels?
- Nay.
- Commissioner Rovinski.
- Aye.
- Commissioner Poradek

- Aye. Alder Hutchinson.
- Nay.
- And Chair Hanson, nay.
- Motion to approve?
- Second.
- Okay, so we have a motion by Alder Hutchinson, a second by Vice Chair Miller. Any further discussion? All right, Vice Chair Miller?
- Aye.
- Commissioner Daniels?
- Aye.
- Commissioner Rovinski.
- Nay.
- Commissioner Poradek?
- No.
- Alder Hutchinson?
- Aye.
- And Chair Hanson, Aye. So 4-2. And we're going forward to the city council for March 7th. All right. Moving on to item number three.
- Great.
- I mean honestly.
- [Wendy] Good evening, Commissioners.
- Oh, hey
- [Wendy] I have the three items.
- Wendy, hold up.
- [Wendy] Can you hear me okay?

- Yeah, but let me help you.
- [Wendy] Oh, I'm sorry.
- Why don't we all just take a break.
- We've got 10 items .
- Should we run through these three items quick or do you want take a break?
- I know if there's a decorum on this where we just decide to...
- It's up to you guys.
- I'm fine to press through, maybe let's just plan to do a break after this.
- Yeah, let's do the bids, 'cause Wendy's on.
- Okay.
- So, all right, so should I read through all three items or just the... We'll just start with number three. All right. Item number three, consideration with possible action on the downtown Green Bay inc. Business Improvement District's year-end reporting for 2022.
- [Wendy] Yeah, I can summarize this real quick that all three items will be brought to the plan commission. It's a requirement each year to bring forward the year-end reports for each bid. Last fall there was an anticipated budget that was submitted and what we're gonna do is the comparison. So the end of year report out, this is stated in the bid handbook, so we'll let Jenny pursue the first one.
- Just to be quick.
- [Jenny] Thank you, Wendy. Hi, I'm Jenny VandenLangenberg, I'm here to represent downtown Green Bay Incorporated. And do you have the, do I need to share my screen, or would you just prefer to have, or do you have the items in front of you? The top of it says DGBI's and charities' 2022 budget versus actual. Do have that?
- It's page 59.
- Yep, those shared in the book.
- [Jenny] Okay, great. Then I will just, it's a very cumbersome sheet that you have in front of you, so I will try to walk through it as quickly and concisely as possible, but please feel free to ask questions at any time. I also wanted to state overall that we, going into 2023, we have made a change between, with our business improvement districts and the management of them. So downtown Green Bay Incorporated is now completely overseeing the management of the downtown Green Bay bid and the old Main Street bid. It's not much different than what has happened before, but there was a separate 501 C3 for old Main Street. We did go through a consolidation process where that 501 C3 got

closed at the end of the fiscal year of 2022. The bids will still stay separate and we have a way to record all of, we've record the expenses that we know that the dollars coming in for each bid will be staying separate moving forward, but they'll be managed by one 501 C3. And to take that one other level, as you can see here too, it does say downtown Green Bay Inc. and Charities. I think Charities was another 501 C3 that was in honor of... Actually, I'm explaining that wrong, downtown Green Bay Inc. was a 501 C6, and then we had charities, which is 501 C3, we're keeping. There's one surviving entity which will be renamed Downtown Green Bay Inc. And we draft the 501 C6. So as you can see, kind of a messy situation from when this got started, you know, 20 years ago to where we are at now. We're just consolidating things to make things simpler on the auditing and the bookkeeping end, and it doesn't really look any different to anybody outside of our organization and our auditors. So I just wanted to make you aware of that, that this sheet will actually look much cleaner next year because of the waiver. We're streamlining things. But anyway, for this year, comparing what we had projected that we would do for 2022 and what actually happened-

- It's gotta stay open.

- [Jenny] We actually came out really well, all things considered. One thing I wanted to point out is when this budget was created for 2022, this budget was created mid-year for, you know, quarter three of '21. We were still, you know, that was still in the midst of the pandemic and still coming out of that timeframe where events were still a little iffy. We were hoping for the best in '22, and it really did turn out quite well for us. So overall, very happy. And just a few big things to point out here. This large line item here in our income for special event revenue and sponsorships, that was the, you know, it's considered the charities' arm, that was the 501 C3, where we're able to take in money through sponsorships and event revenues. So what we had budgeted for \$346,000, we actually came in at \$331,000. So hit that number quite well. Again, for a budget that was a little... We were unsure of due to the pandemic. A few other things recorded here. You know, we received some extra money for an employee retention credit at the federal level. We received some of our funds from the city of Green Bay for the Farmer's Market. One thing to note is when we created our budget, we had thought we would be using about \$75,000 of PPP funding that was received actually in '21. We just kind of plugged that number in there. I know we'd have to probably dip into that to make our budget come out. As you can- I'm gonna drop to the bottom, like the very bottom line here. I didn't incl- We didn't end up really needing to dip into it quite that much. We had predicted that 75,000 at the bottom line here you can show that we were \$12,000 short. So really it was about that amount, the \$12,000 that I would say came out of that, that PPP money or that those reserves that we had. So, sorry, I don't want to go too much into the weeds with that, but. But everything else that we set out for the year ended up coming out okay with our staffing, we did have to increase staffing. The thing that we pay our staff, including our event crew, to keep up with wages in the industry to retain workers and to recruit new workers. Even though that had happened, we still came under budget because we did have basically almost a full-time person out for the whole year. We had two full-time positions open for the majority of a year. So we did come a little short- Or we didn't spend as much as we thought we would on staffing, and all of our other operating expenses, as you can see here, were pretty much in the ballpark of what we had predicted, with a little extra that was spent in legal fees and such in order to consolidate the organizations, like I had already mentioned earlier. Our main focus is, and our organization for programming are physical improvements. As you can see there, the total. We underspent just a little bit because that was one of the positions that was unfilled in 2022. So we were just, you know, trying to get by. We didn't have as much of a chance to get, you know, to work on public art and some of the, you know, the other things that take some time from a staff member to do that. So more of that to come in '23. And as far as business development and

marketing to other major things that we do, came in written budget where we would've expected and special event expenses are included in on this budget. Those were also kind of in-line with what we had anticipated or you know, not too far off from what we thought. So again, in, as it turns out, we, you know, we did well all things considered, with things bouncing back for the year with sponsorships, and we were able to hold many events, had some new events and made a lot of things happen in a year coming out of the pandemic. So any questions, anything more specific you'd like to know?

- Motion to approve?

- Jenny, I do have one question for you.

- [Jenny] Yes.

- Under the physical improvements, looks like there was some money kind of moved around, potentially like less or more spent on Adam Street, less on public art, that type of thing. I know that's one thing that a lot of people notice, is of course the physical improvements, the holiday of lighting and stuff like that there. So, I guess, just I have more general question of what's in plans for '23? Is it gonna be similar or is it gonna be more money that's gonna be needed for certain things?

- Sure, good question. And I'm sorry, I should have addressed the Adam Street plan. This is, it's kind of the beginning of what we're hoping is an exciting opportunity. The actual streetscape in the downtown area hasn't been a major focus at the city level. And we do have a physical improvement committee yet in our organization. And it's something that they have recognized in our staff, but has recognized we wanna start really looking at making improvements in our downtown. And they chose the three blocks of Adams Street, to really take a look at it, because it's the one, the blocks north of Walnut Street. So it's kind of got down by the hotel in Northland, all the way up to Walnut. We have three of the fanciest restaurants in Green Bay on that street. And if you were to take a walk down there, you would definitely notice that it needs a facelift. The streetscape plan is still there from the Preport Plaza in Aldi's. So I'd say that way on Adams, as well as on Washington Street, has hasn't been a major focus or hasn't been given enough love. So our organization has invested in the initial plan with ISG to start looking at concepts on how we can improve that. We have worked very closely with the city leaders, including public works, and the mayor and the economic development team. So I feel like we have all the right players to really start moving things forward, and so that is one of the major focuses that we're looking at in 2023, is to really start looking at the streetscape. Like you said, it's very visible and I think everyone agrees that it needs an upgrade, and we had to start somewhere.

- Thank you.

- [Jenny] Yep. And one more thing to add to that, just so you're aware. Just very recently, a few weeks ago, our request for Arco funds to hire an urban designer, or urban, I'm sorry, urban planner. Planner, I'm saying it wrong. Urban planner that will focus just on the downtown area between, on our side of the river as well as on Broadway District, has been approved with Arco funds. So that's moving forward as well to help move some of these things forward as well as, you know, some other projects that we wanna be working on. So more to come on that.

- Okay, thank you so much Jenny. So we have a motion.

- Can we get a second?
- Second.
- We have a motion by Commissioner Poradek, a second by Vice Chair Miller. All those in favor?
- [Commissioners] Aye.
- Any opposed?
- All right, and that will be moved forward to the city council for March 7th. And then item number four is consideration with possible action on the Military avenue business improvement district's year-end reporting for 2022. Hi.
- Leah Weycker again. 425 South Military. I don't have the handouts, but they should be in your packet. As usual, we were always pretty conservative on our budgeting and so we came in within budget. Sometimes we have a hard time spending money in the sense of, we have plans and then it just doesn't quite come to spending as much as we anticipated. So that was true this year as well. We did get the \$25,000 grant for the farmer's market. So we were able to add a staff person. As you know, the bids are all structured differently. Our bid has one employee, bid myself, so it was really nice to get some help for that farmer's market. So we have a part-time person and potentially to add them to add a full-time/part-time. To add a part-time person, going forward, that's not just focused on the farmer's market would be a goal. Right now the position's just super part-time for just the market. But if you had any questions, I think this is a report of how we did budget-wise, but we still are, part of the spending from this year was the strategic plan, and we paid some of it in last year's budget and then some in the beginning of 2022. And we still have to implement a lot of those things. So we were looking at a redesign of the image and branding, different branding, which is a huge price tag. And I think our group is super conservative to make sure that we have the funds available. So that should be coming, we had anticipated then the banners will change out as well. So, you know, a lot of things will be affected by a new branding, and we'd like to be a good safety district as well and look into cameras, some more crime-preventive and just encouraging private property owners to install their own image image systems outside of their buildings. So that's the other big ticket thing that we're looking at going forward. Any questions on my... I did include, I think we had talked to it, and we didn't have the complete business list. So when we approve our operating plan with you guys, usually that's never ready. So I didn't include it and he caught that I did. So I did include it this time 'cause it's actually finalized and it literally was finalized in February.
- Oh.
- So it takes that long. We did see an increase, I think, because of the difference in the 2022 property taxes. Our revenue actually went up for the first time since I've been employed there. Sorry, we're all in that face well. Actually, I don't think commercial went up as much as residential did, but it did increase our revenue slightly for this upcoming year.
- Quick question, not around this, but just a sign, where is the- Is the farmer's market going to be in the same location or is it going to move?

- Good question. I keep going back and forth with them. It's gonna be in that parking lot somewhere.
- Okay.
- We're booming with new business.
- Yeah.
- A good problem to have, but I keep encouraging and I think Jenny pointed out a strategic, or a urban planner. I would really love them to help me plan in a place that that market always had a place to go.
- Right.
- Parking lot doubled as, turns into a market on the right day. I don't have any good plans of that. Like I know it exists.
- It's like a green space-something.
- Something that was brought up against it.
- Market, yeah.
- So I think, right now, they told me where the club car wash that you guys approved on the corner was approved. There were five other little spots. And he said he's got really active interest on three out of those five.
- Wow.
- So he guaranteed me a spot in that parking lot till August, which is like prime farmer's market time.
- Right.
- So we might need to move to another spot in that market or in that parking lot. But it will definitely be there. Our winter one is going on right now and I think the Vice said, let Leah use the spaces because they activate the buildings and they end up getting rented, and it happened again.
- Oh!
- So as much as I'm loving that 30,000 square feet that they let us use for the old, the former Office Depot, there's definitely interest. So we won't have that next time. But they're already telling me which other spaces to activate to turn over.
- Tuesday morning.
- No, actually Tuesday morning- Tuesday morning signed off already for Sierra. The old Sierra trading post, it's now called Sierra, but it's a division of TJ Max.

- Interesting.
- They're sports division, so like Columbia and, yeah. And then the old...
- Buffet.
- Buffet that we had our market in, that one's been under renovation for a long time. It was in really rough shape and having been food related, and that will be five below.
- Okay.
- So those two big spots are spoken for and like I said, the big one that I'm in is now gonna be spoken for as well. They won't tell me what that one is, but I heard little. Little ideas.
- All right.
- Motion to approve?
- Second.
- Okay, thank you Leah. Got a motion by Commissioner Poradek, second by Commissioner Daniels to approve. All those in favor?
- [Commissioners] Aye.
- Any opposed? All right. And then moving on to item number five, consideration with possible action on Old Main Street Inc. Business improvement district's year-end reporting for 2022.
- [Jenny] All right. This is the easier of the two budget versus actuals that I get to present tonight. And if you take a look at it, it's pretty straightforward. Everything that we had kind of predicted in the budget was pretty close, pretty spot-on. We did end up taking in more contributions in sponsorships than we had projected, which is good because in the bottom line, we originally had anticipated a shortfall, and our budget and we ended up coming out ahead about \$2,400. So all in all, it was a solid year for Old Main Street and we did, you know, we kept up with our planter program that takes place every 38 planters that are up and down the district. And we also take care of a few of the medians on Main Street as well, that's contracted with the plant people. So that really helps with our district appearance. We spent a little bit of money on some banners. They are in need of replacement. So I do anticipate this year that we will have to really take a look at the banners that are located on Old Main. And we're working right now with our board of directors and we're actually getting a little subcommittee to talk about what does that look like on Old Main Street, currently it says the Arts District. We're not sure if we wanted to stay with that identity, or what that's gonna look like moving forward. So you might see some changes coming up in the future, as far as the banners go on old Main. Everything else, just a lot of the things kind of just get rolled into what we do with Downtown Green Bay. You know, we share the marketing pieces and such. We didn't have several events in Whitney Park last year, and everything, you know, is coming back really solid as far as events went, and the revenues parole Main Street. So very solid year. Any questions at all?
- Motion to approve?

- No, thank you Jenny.
- [Jenny] You're welcome.
- Motion by Commissioner Poradek.
- Seconded. Seconded by Vice Chair Miller. Any further discussion?
- I would just say that all three of the reports have a lot of community impact for a relatively small amount of the budget, so applaud to all three districts for all that they do with the budgets.
- All right, so motion by Commissioner Poradek, second by Vice Chair Miller. All those in favor?
- [Commissioners] Aye.
- Any opposed? All right, and then moving on to item number six, consideration with possible action on request to vacate utility easements on vacated Motor Street and vacated portion of State Street at 1919 South Broadway. Submitted by the Green Bay Department of Public Works on behalf of Georgia Pacific Consumer products, LP, property owner.
- Thank you. Now is one should be pretty straightforward. We have two sections of vacated roadway located here, which are both on 1919 South Broadway, which is where GP is located. There are existing utility easements underneath this utility area, which are shown more specifically here. They need to be relocated with Georgia Pacific's expansion. They've already worked out a deal with whoever is in those utility areas to move them and have them relocated out of there. So we're really getting a total package application here. So, just two conditions on this, both from New Water, and then our department of public works about them following throughout the relocation of those utilities. So we're recommending approval with those conditions. Do we have any discussion?
- I just want to know how they got all those utilities to agree to move. They have it here.
- Power?
- Pointers? Nah.
- They're paying to have them move. That's how they do it.
- They're being just friendly.
- I'm guessing their utility bill's big enough, Ken, that they answered the phone.
- Motion to approve.
- Second.
- Motion by commissioner Rovinski, seconded by Commissioner Poradek.

- All those in favor?

- [Commissioners] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right, and that will move forward then to city council for March 7th. Woo, moving on to our first public hearing! All right, new sheet. 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 only providing information in this matter, and your comments or concerns. We also ask that you can find 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 and please address your comments to the Chair. Comments will be limited to three minutes, and if you are, is there anyone left on internet?

- I don't think so.

- Okay then, alright. Okay, we will now open the public hearing on item number seven, public hearing on request to amend the city's comprehensive plan for the portion of properties located at 815 through 821 South Chestnut Avenue, and 414 through 418 Fourth Street from commercial land use, to medium intensity retail office and housing.

- Thank you, Madam Chairman. So I'll give a quick overview before the public hearing, but not a recommendation until action, which is the next item. So this is the site, and the first thing I want point out is the big red line on the X. 414 was not meant to be in this comp plan or rezone change. So it was in the public hearing that way. So I am just stating that it is not part of it. So this is the site itself. It's on the south side of the shipyard, directly south of Mason Street on the north. You can see the, I believe, that's an on-ramp and an off-ramp. You have the coal piles directly to the east, across Broadway. To the west, you have predominantly single and two-family homes and a single two-family neighborhood as well as to the south, with the exception of the Broadway frontage, which is commercial. And if you go to the next slide, please ma'am, this is just sort of a, forgot I put this in here, but a better location map of where it is. One more. It is just a closer site, so you can see the site itself right now has a garage, an old garage still on it that is being used by the Green Bay bicycle Collective for storage. It's actually very pretty. They painted it all up, it looks really great, but that is the only thing left on the site. And a driveway to the east, there is a dry cleaner. So mini storage, and then as I had mentioned, it is pretty commercial all along Broadway with a few exceptions of few homes and very low density residential to the south and the west. Next one, please. So this is the future land use plan in our code right now and with my line and X. So you can see that the current comp plan recommends commercial land use for that entire block itself. To the south is that high intensity retail office housing, to the west is low to medium density housing. And if you want to flip to the next one. So you can see the zoning matches, that if you don't recall, it wasn't too many years ago that staff came through, redid everything in this area. It all matches up, which is nice. Now we're changing a little bit of it. But if you'll notice with the zoning that light yellow is an R1 or an R2 zoning, I believe that's R2 there. But orange is an OR and the red is obviously a commercial zoning and it's general commercial. So when we looked at this location, for one, it's all owned by the redevelopment authority, they are looking to market that for housing. Commercial districts do not allow housing on

the first floor, only above the first floor. So when we looked at that, we were slightly concerned. I believe some of the reasoning was that that block was pretty much empty. It's just to the south of Mason Street, the ramps, that this would be a good place for commercial activity. We have kind of rethought that, especially when we look to the south, directly to the south, which is a mixed district or our district, which allows commercial or multi-family, whether it's on the first floor or mixed use. And so we are gonna, we are coming forward with a recommendation of changing those four parcels. Everything west of that line to the- Oh, well to the OR district and another action, but to a medium intensity office. A retail office housing designation in the comp plan. I'm on the wrong item. And I think-

- Yeah, it's...

- Okay, the next one. So we are recommending approval of changing the comp plan for those parcels from commercial to medium intensity retail offices.

- So it all matches up again, the orange with the orange.

- The orange? Well, it matches up with the comp plan as well, which isn't orange.

- Okay.

- But yes.

- Okay, all right. So public hearing. All right? Looking to hear... I'm looking to hear from anybody looking, I guess anyone who, whether you favor or oppose, or providing information in this matter, 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. Let me go on to item number eight. It's consideration with possible action on request to amend the city's comprehensive plan for the portion of properties located at 815 through 821 South Chestnut Avenue, and 414 through 418 Fourth Street from commercial land use to medium intensity retail office and housing.

- Correct, that is the how plan designation, and again, without 414.

- All right, minus the 414. So 416 through 418?

- Correct

- Okay.

- And we are recommending approval.

- Okay. Because we just got the whole presentation, right?

- Yeah, right.

- We're kind in a hybrid scenario right now, where we're gonna try to do it this way, because although we don't have anybody here to speak, sometimes the questions are answered through the presentation.
- Right. You're right, okay.
- Motion to approve.
- Second.
- Motion by Commissioner Rovinski. Second by Commissioner Poradek. Any further discussion?
- Just one, I will be abstaining on this vote. I know of a nearby property owner or next-door property owners.
- All right. All right, so with that motion on the floor, I'll go ahead with the vote. All those in favor?
- [Commissioners] Aye.
- Any opposed? And one abstention. All right, and then that will move forward then to city council for March 7th. All right, item number nine, public hearing on request to rezone properties at 815 through 821 South Chestnut Avenue and 414 through 418 Fourth Street from general commercial to office residential.
- And I kind of went over this in the last one.
- Yep.
- So this is the same area, this would just change the zoning to now match what you're recommending for the comp plan.
- And it's 416 through 418.
- Right, and we would go that office residential zoning, allows mix of uses, a little bit higher density, but also commercial. While still leaving 414 commercial to make a developable lot still along Broadway, should tidy or the mini warehousing ever redeveloped.
- Okay.
- Motion to approve.
- Was this the public hearing?
- Public hearing. 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 item, item number 10, consideration of possible possible action on request to rezone properties at 815 through 821 South Chestnut Avenue, and 416 through 418 Fourth Street, From general commercial to office residential.

- We are recommending approval of the zone change.
- Motion to approve.
- Second.
- Motion by Commissioner Rovinski, second by Commissioner Poradek. All those in favor?
- [Commissioners] Aye.
- Any opposed? Oh, and one abstention. We have one of Vice Chair Miller abstention on the record.
- Okay, do you wanna do a break?
- Yes please, let's do it quick.
- Oh man, I gonna-
- All right, all right, all right, okay.
- Let's all take a five-minute break.
- Okay, go ahead.
- That's behind me!
- Good, how are you?
- We're up in that corner, and probably-
- Yeah, of course! I'm just gonna...
- I'll be ready for now. I thought for some reason there was, but that's not. Yeah, I was like hold on, that would be perfect.
- Telling on her brother when her dad is in front of there.
- But it's not, that's just the table.
- I just forget, because when I go to regular meetings, it's always very, like, icy, you know? Their names are all difficult, and I have to remember their voices.
- My goodness, even the name tag's pointed toward me.
- When you code works, does a garage detach? Does a detached garage count as an accessory structure? So I have it-

- A pure definition of-
- I was just making sure.
- So I can still build a shed or a greenhouse in addition to my detached garage?
- 150.
- 150 square feet? I don't think, I didn't think we were bad.
- Add it to the list of reasons this building hasn't... It just is what it is! They can't have it. No way they didn't anticipate the electrical device usage that we do now. They had no idea what we were doing.
- John, I do think that we were viewing the site plan for the work that we're doing.
- 1956, I think?
- I said 50s, I was just going for a decade, you know?
- And I've literally, I've got two blocks, so...
- Just wait till that development comes in, crossing that marathon.
- Usually that usually does fix up the other one.
- All right, all right, we're back in session. I don't know where where I am. Okay, all right. Right, we're on item number 11, which is a public hearing on request to establish a planned unit development at the 1100 block of East Walnut Street to permit a mixed use office in multiple family residential development submitted by MF Housing Partners LLC, applicant, City of Green Bay Redevelopment Authority, property owner.
- Thank you Madam Chairman. Public hearing, you wanna read the instructions or you want me to have to...
- Oh, do I have to read it every time? Come on now. Really?
- Follow the rules, Karen.
- Oh. Oh we did for the last one.
- I mean, what? Wait-
- That's why...
- Sorry, I thought we did a brief overview.
- Yeah, but do you want me to do that before you pre-read that?

- Oh my gosh.

- You just gotta read it.

- I've literally only read this once every single planning commission meeting I read at the beginning. I mean I can, no, I'll read it. I'm supposed to read it, I'll read it every time.

- Way to go, Babe! 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 asset, after your name has been called, you state your address, whether you represent a group or association, whether you favor or oppose or only provide any information in this matter and your comments or concerns. We also ask that you can find your testimony to facts related to the proposal at hand and avoid repetitive testimony. City of 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 and please address your comments to the Chair. Comments will limited to three minutes.

- Thank you, Madam Chair. Okay, so give a quick overview. Again, this is a request for plan unit development. It is essentially to allow the construction of a mixed use office and 43 unit multi-family project at the corner of North Roosevelt and East Walnut Street. So what you see here is a 1.21 acre assemblage of parcels that are eight individual parcels at this location, mainly on East Walnut. If you wanna flip to the next one. So this is just a site that has been cleared. This is another site that much like the Chestnut, had been acquired through the redevelopment authority, reassembled into a larger piece that was able to be marketed. And that is what we will be talking about today, for a housings project. Just a couple views. This is a view from the intersection on the top from 2019. Looking at the site, you can see it's just kind of empty with a few trees. And then looking from the west on east Walnut, down east. Next one, please. So this is the future land use. Future land use plan recommends medium and high intensity housing to the south. It is low density housing, but pretty much medium intensity to the northeast west. Next one please. This is the zoning which doesn't quite match the recommended land use, but the orange is the OR, which is that mix-use district, a little bit higher intensity. The yellow is the R1 district that is mainly low density or single family. And the next slide, please. So what is being proposed here on this 1.28 acres, Again, it's 43 units and 5,000 square feet of office space. It is a three-story building. Was there a section before this one?

- I don't know if it's captured. Don't make it scroll.

- Yeah, these are way out of order, something happened.

- There's one in the packet.

- Okay. So, the building itself is gonna be a three story building, will be exceeding heights of 35 foot maximum height by 7 feet to 42 feet tall. Overall, out of those units, out of those 43, 5 would be one-bedrooms, 26 would be two-bedrooms and 12 would be three-bedrooms. There will be three bedrooms. The design of the building, and it's kind of hard to see from just the elevation drawings, but the site itself has a very west, east orientation, very linear. So it runs along the Walnut Street frontage, but the building itself has a lot of relief built into it. It has individual entrances along the entire East Walnut Street frontage. It has a mix of, mainly it's Fibers on end-siding. However, it's got a

mix of siding types and orientations. They are showing some vertical siding, some horizontally placed siding, and also some siding panels, which create sort of big block areas, all in the attempt to kind of break up that large facade, make it look like individual units and kind of fit more in with that East Walnut corridor. Additionally, there's a brick knee wall that's introduced all along the Walnut Street side and partially on the Roosevelt and West side of the buildings. And then where the commercial tenant or the office tenant, office community service use, on the corner would be all brick on that first floor to kind of give it that presence that you're on the corner. Let me see, one issue that we staff did come up with on this elevation itself, is you'll notice the entrances, there are multiple entrances along the East Walnut side. We are concerned that some of these entrances have no, example would be, this one don't have any type of covering over the door. So we are going to be recommending either some type of canopy or roof structure or other type of element to be approved by staff over those entryways. Thank you. Well, there's the site. It looks much nicer around the site when you can see it. So again, the building is west, east parking lot is behind the building, almost completely screened from East Walnut, and pretty dominantly screened even from North Roosevelt, with a big portion of the building as well as an enclosure for dumpsters and that type of thing. And landscaping to kind of block that parking. The parking itself, now that I'm on it, is 56 stalls. You'll notice six of those sets of stalls. I'll just get up here and talk about 'em. Six of these sets of stalls are double stacked. So those would be assigned a six individual, three bedroom units. So there are two stalls on top of each other. There would be 10 stalls that could be used by the commercial entity, which, again, is on the corner. And those stalls could be shared between what we call daytime users, which is an office space or a community service space and nighttime users, which is a residential space. The developers also utilized quite a bit of bicycle parking in the back, sort of this back corner, which also helps to reduce the parking call necessary. Only access to the site will be off of North Roosevelt. It's a little bit short of the required distance. I believe it's at 115 feet, and I think we require 155. The traffic engineer has looked at that and feels that it is also appropriate. So really with the PUD, oh, the one thing we did wanna point out is there's pedestrian access obviously on East Walnut, on Roosevelt, into the prime part of the building. But that area where the bike parking is also is an entryway into the facility as well. And also to access the back area, the parking areas. So staff is gonna be recommending a walk leading out to the North Roosevelt frontage to the back of the property as well. So the PUD designation is really needed rather than just the straight OR district for basically five different reasons. One is the density. So density increases are required. They would be required to have about 2000 square feet per unit of lot area, and they are at about 1225 per unit. So increase in density. The maximum height as I had mentioned, which is 35 feet, may be going to 41-42 feet. An overall height. Increase in the maximum pervious surface coverage from 60% to a proposed 80%. Again, I mentioned the distance from the driveway to the intersection required to be 155, it's at 115. And a reduction in the buffer yard sizes, including the side yard on the west side from 15 feet to 5 and a half feet. And the rear, which is on the north lot line, proposed 6 feet from the required 15 feet. We believe that the density is very appropriate. This is a very walkable area. And again, you had heard in a previous petition, the walkability score, that is also in the petitioner's packet for this one as well. They are about, I would say a fifth of a mile from multiple parks and about a half a mile. So Navarino, Joanne's, Whitney, and I think about a third of a mile from Main Street and from Webster Avenue, which both have commercial elements on them. So a very walkable area. There's also bus lines as mentioned before, all over this area and very, very close to one specific bus line. And the other thing, I guess I'd like to point out is that area itself, even though there's a lot of very small homes there, I wouldn't say small homes, large homes. There is a lot of multi-family homes. There's a lot more multi and twos than there are singles in this immediate area. So that density, a much smaller lot. So average lot size out here is about 7,000 square feet. So that density is not something that this neighborhood is not used to. The height, primary reason for the height is it's wanted the stories, but

a flat-roof building would meet height requirements. The choice of roof is really to match the neighborhood. Neighborhood doesn't have a lot of flat roofs. It's more of a downtown, a strict downtown thing. So that is one of the reasons for that. And the setback exceptions, that 15 feet down to 5 and a half and 6 feet, those were specifically talked about at the neighborhood meetings held by the petitioner. There was not a lot of concern, primarily because they are placing landscaping and you can see that in your landscape plan as well as a solid opaque vinyl fence. Also, this is very urban. People are used to being very close to each other. The houses are close to each other. The Tesary buildings are right there. The lawns are small, so staff does not find much of a problem with that. So with that, I guess, I don't know if there's no recommendation. So, there you go. The basics.

- All right. So at this public hearing we're now looking to hear from anyone who'd like to speak on this. Is there anyone willing, looking to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak?

- I would like to.

- Oh! Oh, I'm sorry. Come on forward.

- Hello, Alyssa Proffitt, 1262 Cherry Street in Green Bay by this project. So, and just representing myself. Overwhelmingly very much in support of this project. I think we heard a lot in the beginning of this meeting tonight, there is a need for housing overwhelmingly in Green Bay. I think this area and this acreage to go to three- Three stories and have all these units is a huge opportunity. And one I think we should definitely pull the trigger on. With the roofing, when you drive that neighborhood and my family walks it very often, the way that it's presented would fit perfectly with the neighborhood. So I love that aspect of it. My only concern, this has already been press released and you know, mentioned with the mayor's office and the wording makes it appear that it's a done deal and you know, some verbiage of being held hostage was kind of brought up when the neighborhood meeting was brought up, we were, you know, hoping for a little more communication and I just, in terms of other neighbors have voiced concern that they feel this project is already done and they, you know, kind of being held hostage in their neighborhood. Again, overwhelmingly in support of this project, I think it's a huge opportunity and we should push forward. But I think there's caution in how it's presented to neighbors that don't necessarily understand this process and that it's not already a done deal. So if there are neighbors still willing and wanting to voice any of their concerns, I just don't want them to be shut down. Having seen all of the news stories that have already picked up this project and making the verbiage appear. My only other minor thing that I brought up at the neighborhood meeting was the back fencing that goes to the housing. I just would like to see 8 feet rather than 6. And that's just because I also have a huge multi-family in my backyard, and those 2 feet make a huge difference, just in privacy for a single family house neighboring. So, those were my only, but again, overwhelmingly very excited to see this project in our neighborhood. Thing's gonna do great, thanks. Thank you.

- Thank you. Is there anyone else wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there anyone wishing to speak? On the record to reflect that no one that came forward and this public hearing is now closed. Moving into the corresponding actionable item. Item number 12, consideration with possible action on request to establish a planned unit development at the 1100 block of East Walnut Street to permit a mixed use office and multiple family residential development submitted by MF Housing Partners llc, applicant, City of Green Bay redevelopment authority, property owner.

- Thank you Madam Chair, we are recommending critical request for the planning unit development with four conditions. One, the adoption of the draft PUD, a consolidation of the individual lots into a single lot, pedestrian access from North Roosevelt Street to the building's rear entrance be provided and building entrances on East Walnut facade include a canopy, or their roof elements over the doorways in some type of lighting with approval of the department of community development.

- Can we do anything with screening as far as that 6 foot versus 8 foot? Fence?

- Sure. I mean you could increase the fence legal height or decrease it in purview. I know the petitioners are here though, so if you'd wanna open the floor, you could probably inquire. That would be.

- Motion to open the floor? Second.

- Motion by Commissioner Poradek, second by Commissioner Rovinski to open the floor. All those in favor?

- [Commissioners] Aye.

- Any opposed? All right.

- Can we briefly just comment on the fence?

- Absolutely, yeah. Just state name and address.

- Okay.

- And then you don't have to give a whole presentation or anything.

- Oh, no worries. Hi, everybody. Jack Klister, MF Housing Partners, 229 East Washington Street in Appleton. Just briefly on the fence. We have looked at that and we are putting more preference and importance on the opaque and material of the fence versus the height. We get that, you know, that the two feet may make a difference. However, we have priced it out and we are really trying to, in all facets of the project, keep it budget friendly to keep these rents as affordable as possible. So that's why we had that in as six foot opaque fence versus an eight foot chain link or some lower-quality fence, so. But if there's any other questions, I'm happy to answer 'em.

- So the fence, you won't be able to see through it?

- Correct. It would be a vinyl material.

- Okay.

- So no car lights or no dogs being able to see, you know, residents, so.

- But that wouldn't be the case with an eight foot fence? Is that what you're saying?

- I'm saying the six foot versus eight foot is strictly because of budgetary reasons. It's larger than you would think to just go two feet. So that's why.

- Saying, I guess the other thing that I would comment, what we typically do as a planning staff when we look at site plans is, our six foot is the maximum height of fences typically in a residential area. But the combination of the fencing with the required landscaping, which is like one tree every 50 feet or 40 feet, I can't remember exactly, those become overstory and create a higher level of canopy that isn't solid because it's a vegetation, right? But it creates that canopy and then you have the human scale, car headlight, noise emissions, all that kind of stuff. Blockage with that solid fence. So we try to do that in a combination. They do have a concept plan, landscape plan in your packet, but again, that would go through regular site plan review and we're pretty confident that that combination will be successful in the neighborhood.

- So there's gonna be berms? There's not gonna be berms?

- No.

- Okay. No, the berm-

- Yeah, this is very flat area.

- Yeah.

- Yeah, the berms are stuff are typically industrial and intense uses next to residential.

- Do we have any more questions for the applicant?

- Okay, thank you.

- Okay, thanks.

- Motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- Motion by commissioner Poradek, second by Vice Chair Miller to close the floor. All those in favor?

- [Commissioners] Aye.

- Any opposed?

- All right, question for staff on the double parking? I'm sure it happens informally, but I'm not aware of any complexes that have that arrangement on there. In addition, I don't believe you can park on Walnut, right? Those are bike lane belt right there and I'm not sure Roosevelt.

- Yep.

- So is there any concern in terms of like visitor parking, just where they'll go, that type of thing there?

- Well, there was some concern, a little bit of concern and discussion. Well then, so Roosevelt has limited parking on it.

- Okay. On one side of Roosevelt there's a lot of driveways, but there is parking on Roosevelt directly across from the, what would be the office portion of the development. But you're correct, there is no parking lot on Walnut. And again, for residential use is on street is not that important because you can't park overnight.

- Sure.

- So yeah, the parking is slightly, I wouldn't say tight, but it is, they utilized a lot of the exceptions to make it an alternative transportation-type place. But still, they're very close to the, to the parking count, even if they didn't use the allowances given for bicycle parking in day and night. And that's only like about five spots, I believe, yeah. I assumed it was gonna be pretty tight with that footprint, but no, that makes sense.

- Yeah, would we like similar parking, one and a quarter per unit?

- Yes.

- And if this site was not so tight, we would try to get that as much as possible, or you know, again, if we have parking lots around there where they could lease some spaces for something that would be good as well.

- Okay.

- Question for staff, just 'cause it was raised in the open forums, about notifying the neighborhood associations and working with the neighbors, just to review that.

- Yeah, so we had a neighborhood meeting, two, three months ago. I think, I can't remember the exact time we had the neighborhood meeting and there was discussion from the neighborhood association and the developers. I thought the communication, from my memory, the communication was a lot about the final design of the building. Some especially associating, and correct me if I'm wrong, but associated around the art installation. So this project would also have an art element to it. That is not yet determined whether that's gonna be part of a building material, or a formal piece of art, traditional piece of art. I think the indications have been they're gonna try to incorporate it into the building possibly with using the roofing or railings or whatnot. And I think at that point, when they get to that stage of doing their final, they can correct as well, their final design where they're coming through before they submit for their building permits, they would probably go back out to the neighborhood association. But I think Mr. Klister could probably agree or disagree with me there. I don't wanna speak for you.

- Yep. Yeah, exactly. They might not have had all the details but the...

- At the time, yeah. And that neighborhood meeting, like all the neighborhood meetings we have, is really a due diligence thing. So they did make some changes to their plan after the meeting based on discussions with the neighbors, which is how we want it to work, right?
- Yes, yes. That's right. That's good to see, just to clarify.
- I was trying to go down, I went to the wrong one. Sorry.
- Motion to approve.
- Second.
- We have a motion by Commissioner Poradek, second by Vice Chair Miller. Any further discussion?
- Just clarify with the, as the presenter, the contingencies.
- Oh, right. Yeah.
- Staff.
- All right, we'll go ahead with the voice vote. All those in favor?
- [Commissioners] Aye.
- Any opposed?
- All right, and with that, we'll move forward then to the city council for March 7.
- All right, item adjourned.
- Thanks guys.
- Item number 13. 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 that after your name has been called, you state your address, whether you represent a group or association, whether you favor, oppose or only providing information in this matter and your comments or concerns. We also ask that you confine your testimony to facts related to the proposal at hand and avoid repetitive testimony. City staff will provide a presentation during the public hearing and questions raised by the public may be asked, but they will not be answered by staff until the upcoming action will 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. We'll now open the public hearing on item number 13, public hearing on request to create a text amendment to chapter 44-1075 Floodplain Overlay District, submitted by Department of Community and Economic Development.
- Thank you, Chair. So this is a follow up to what was approved by this board back in October to the Floodplain. Deaner came back and said, "Hey, when it comes to your floodplain panels, update it to 2023." So these are just updates in your panels that no change is here for 2023. Simple as that.

- Excellent. All right, is there anyone wishing to speak? Is there any one wishing to speak? Is there one wishing to speak? Well, let the record reflect that no one came forward and this public hearing is now closed. And moving on to the corresponding action item. Item number 14, the consideration with possible action to update chapter 44-1075, article 13 of the Green Bay Municipal Code, Floodplain Overlay District Ordinance submitted by Community and Economic Development.

- And we recommend approval to the updates of Article 13, subject to revisions by city attorney staff in case they wanna change the order or anything there at all, so.

- All right.

- Yeah, not much to this one.

- Move to approve.

- Second.

- Motion by Vice Chair Miller. Second by Commissioner Poradek. All those in favor?

- [Commissioners] Aye.

- Any opposed?

- All right, moving on to informational director's report. Mr. Stechschulte!

- That's the only thing, it is 8:39, I'm available for any questions anybody has any.

- All right.

- I've gotta hit you with one.

- What?

- I know there's so much can be shared on what's going on with the Bay Lake City Center, but I just, there's so many closed session meetings that are in the area, just hoping to glean something out of it. And I never get anything there. It's just, I know that's no one's first choice. It's just like it... I guess I don't have any other question besides, is that really what we're gonna be going with there?

- Well, just to give you a quick recap for other commissioners, essentially there was a request to the RDA to essentially, for the condo association to acquire the northeast corner of the building and then also for us to provide a 30 foot no-build easement on the parking lot side of the building. Short version is, is let it appears both of those things, and originally the intent around 2015, 2016, that was the intent to do those things to the point where there was actually action taken by RDA at one point to do, at least transfer the northeast corner. That did not ever get executed, for some reason. We haven't been able to track down why that there was no document ever that that has never happened. So essentially that the condo association brought forward the request again in the context of they're looking at possibly the, one of the owners is looking at converting and adding about 72 residential

units on the second floor of that existing structure. There's been lots of conversation, I think certainly from planning staff as well as RDA calling for that original structure to not be there anymore.

- Great.

- So essentially, I think the authenticity plan actually calls for that building to go away, essentially. But because the, now it's essentially, there's at least I think there's at least 16 different owners in that building. I think there's a lot of things going on with it. It is actually built remarkably well for a, an old large format retail space, it's-

- I worked at that Boston store in the nineties.

- It's built remarkably well.

- Not gonna lie, 4.95 an hour, man.

- So the current owners had a couple different ideas they tried to get in here. This is the latest. There's probably some concerns, I would say, arguably against the project. And so really again, it goes back to the conversation, yes, we need housing units. We definitely need, we need affordable units. Though I think probably the most controversial part of it is there'll be like an insight, there'll be an exterior series of apartments that will have new windows put in, would have direct light, there's a series of internal apartments, essentially, that would only have direct light through skylights into the hallway.

- Huh.

- Yeah, so it's interesting. Interesting a lot. It didn't meet code. So essentially, we don't have there, there's not a building code issue directly with that project. It is allowed by the zoning. So we do not have a zoning issue on that either. RDA's position was to deny both of those requests because they had concerns with the project. So now there's certainly some interesting ramifications that we're still trying to figure out exactly what that's going to be. Now that that has happened, we believe the applicant has a way to proceed forward with that project to meet code without those two aspects. So I think now RDA just has to decide if they're still willing to maintain their position and if the project's going to move forward anyway. It could involve breaking in all the windows and doors on the parking lot side of that. Essentially removing the access on that side of the building. We believe is one of the avenues that the current owner is considering at this time, which would not require any approval or a difference from us. So it would meet code. Certainly, I think one of the things we were hoping for, if anything happened in that building, regardless of the use, there would actually be more windows and doors and maybe more activation. So it's a difficult situation, as in they're just trying to figure out exactly what that's going to do. If the RDA ends up keeping that property, there are building code issues because there's, it essentially is a separate parcel right next to each other that a building is essentially built across now. So it will involve the installation of a party wall for fire code purposes, which could be really, really, really, really expensive, from what I understand. So we're trying to decide if that investment is worth it to maintain that little 1700 square foot corner. And again, it seems like a lot of the decisions that were made back five, six years ago, that was the intent to do those things. But for some reason what we cannot find is why those things were never executed before, so. That is the, where the church is, correct?

- Correct. Yeah, Spring Lake Church is one of the key tenants in there, absolutely, yes sir. Actually, and they're not a tenant, they're actually an owner. They're a condominium owner in that building. So they're actually one of the owners.

- So they would stay? Or maybe?

- Right now, there's yeah, absolutely. There would just be like, we think they're understanding what David said now, whether or not if they proceed with the, there may need to be some relocation of access points and windows for that user. In fact that was, that was the action that ends up going forward, so. So that's kind of a real convoluted answer that helps take break, what's going on there, yeah.

- I was just trying to figure out what the heck is going on with that.

- Yeah.

- Related question. The Adams Street lot is not actively being marketed right now or is it just kind of open?

- The RFP is technically still open, I guess, and that would only be probably be looking at kind digging more aggressive approach. Mayor's kind of ask us to really get that out and try to get something going on that site. We do see, in a perfect world, if you could wave, wave a magic wand, we've talked a lot about trying tonight, especially talking about how to get future pieces that you don't necessarily control to go the way you want to go. Ideally this would be, you know, we'd get a really great nice high-density, some elevation project on that Adams street lot to the point where it generating enough increment that maybe there's an ability to acquire and do something else with that building. That would be a perfect scenario!

- Ideal.

- I'm looking for my checkbook. I don't have it quite on me. But that would be, I mean, that would probably be, I guess, the hope still at this point is that that would still be possible.

- So Monroe?

- Yeah, I was just gonna ask about-

- 200 North Monroe is absolutely, we've had recent conversations with the developer on it, which actually was Mr. Matkom tonight. He's actually developing this one, he and his partner on his own, it's not technically the only project, but he is still working with them. Essentially they have, they're working through trying to attempting to get HUD financing right now. There seems to be a bureaucratic check box that was not made because the city acquired that lot. And the RDI acquired that lot prior to completing a phase one environmental analysis, which I believe we did. 'Cause there was concerns that the county was going to acquire and simply keep it as a surface lot. So I think we moved extra fast to get that done. We have since conducted a phase one and we know pretty comfortably what we're dealing with there. But the HUD, essentially, the process looking at there, there's some concerns with having that, you know that there's, there could be unending groundwater

contamination that has to be dewatered all the time. 'Cause underground parking is what's causing the main challenge with the environmental concerns at this point. So one is either we need to find probably some additional financing for Mr. Matkom to proceed or we need to ask him to try to figure out how to get his parking out of the ground and try to get it up out of the ground and do something different with that. So we're kind of hoping, we really like the design on this one. This is not one that we're, you know, like zone's just, heck with it, throw it all away and start it over again. We didn't really like it anyway. Everybody really, really tends to like the design of this one. It's very, very neighborhood-centric. Starts off higher-end on the more busy street, goes down, ratchets down in elevations, it goes into the residential areas behind it. It's a nice design, it's a great project. So we're really hoping that we can find a good solution solution on doing that. So right now we're still proceeding with it as if he will be moving forward, hopefully with some remediation activities this summer and then possibly construction this fall. But there's some loose ends that need to be tied up to keep that on schedule. So how did the remediation get started so quick on the WPS site?

- Because WPS is doing it voluntarily on their own.

- Oh.

- So that's an EPA, that's actually an EPA Superfund site too.

- I saw that.

- So yeah, so it means it's even extra nasty in terms of the things they really need to deal with contamination.

- I believe that, yeah.

- So yeah, so they're doing voluntary cleanup on those certain sections of the site.

- Got it. So, cool.

- Good questions.

- Next meeting's March 13th, I believe.

- Date of next meeting? March 13th, 2023.

- Motion to adjourn.

- Second.

- Motion to adjourn by Poradek, second by Vice Chair Miller. All those in favor?

- [Commissioners] Aye.

- Any opposed?

- All right, we're adjourned.

- I could rip out the curtains.