



MINUTES OF THE GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION

**MONDAY, JULY 9, 2018, 6:00 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 310**

A. ROLL CALL.

I. Members: Timothy Gilbert - Chair, Sidney Bremer - Vice-Chair, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, Lisa Hanson, Jacob Miller, Randall Petrouske and Jerry Wiezbiskie

Members Present: Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Lisa Hanson, Excused: None.

Others Present: Ald. Mark Steuer and Ald. Randy Scannell

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the July 9, 2018, meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commission.

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve and amend the July 9, 2018 agenda and move Item# 7 to after Item #1 under Regular Business. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the June 11, 2018, Plan Commission Meeting.

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Lisa Hanson to amend the minutes of the June 11, 2018, Plan Commission as amended by S. Bremer:

Under Item EI, the property owner should be Stone Ridge Holdings, LLC.

S. Bremer requested that Plan Commission minutes list the time stamps for each agenda item.

Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None.

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

I. A request to revise properties located at 1003 Pine Street and 1000 Main Street from Medium Intensity Retail Office Housing (MIROH) to Commercial (C) (Figure 22-4), submitted by Ronald L. Smits, property owner.

Timothy Gilbert read for the record the procedure of the Public Hearing. He then opened the public hearing.

Timothy Gilbert then closed the public hearing.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. (CPA 18-02) Consideration and possible action on a request to revise properties located at 1003 Pine Street and 1000 Main Street from Medium Intensity Retail Office Housing (MIROH) to Commercial (C) (Figure 22-4), submitted by Ronald L. Smits, property owner.

Randall Petrouske wanted it noted for the record that he does own one of the Whitney Townhomes, but does not have any financial interest in the requested properties.

Moved by Jerry Wiezbiskie, seconded by Sidney Bremer to revise properties located at 1003 Pine Street and 1000 Main Street from Medium Intensity Retail Office Housing (MIROH) to Commercial. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

2. (ZP 18-11) Consideration with possible action on the request to amend the previously approved Conditional Use Permit to allow a car wash in a Community Center Commercial (C3) District, located at 1053 Velp Avenue, submitted by Kurt Boulanger, Stone Ridge Holdings, LLC, property owner (Ald. R. Scannell, District 7).

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Jerry Wiezbiskie Petrouske to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Sidney Bremer; No- None, Abstain- None

Timothy Gilbert closed the floor.

Moved by Jerry Wiezbiskie, no second. Motion failed.

Moved by Commissioner Jerry Wiezbiskis, seconded by Randall Petrouske to approve to amend the previously approved Conditional Use Permit to allow a car wash in a Community Center Commercial (C3) District, located at 1053 Velp Avenue subject to the following:

- a) Compliance with all of the regulations of the Green Bay Municipal Code not covered under the Conditional Use Permit, including standard site plan review and approval.
- b) Hours of operation for the car wash shall start no earlier than 7:00 a.m. and end no later than 10:00 p.m. per the daytime hours as part of Chapter 27.203 Regulation of Noise, Public Peace and Good Order.
- c) All lighting shall be of the sharp cut-off variety and shall comply with the requirements of the Zoning Code.
- d) Retention of the existing east elevation façade transparency.
- e) Approval of a circulation plan and signage that permits one-way travel behind the subject building acceptable to the Zoning Administrator, City Traffic Engineer and the applicant.

Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- Sidney Bremer, Abstain- None

3. (ZP 18-17) Consideration with possible action on the request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a two-family home in a Low Density Residential (RI) District at 891 Howard Street, submitted by Adam Doyen (Ald. B. Johnson, District 9).

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Jerry Wiezbiskie to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

Timothy Gilbert Closed the Floor.

Moved by Randall Petrouske, seconded by Sidney Bremer to approve the authorization of a CUP for two-family residential use within the Low Density Residential (RI) District at 891 Howard Street, subject to the following conditions:

- a) Compliance with all other regulations of the Green Bay Municipal Code not covered under the Conditional Use Permit.
- b) Compliance with the applicable Uniform Dwelling Code (UDC) building requirements related to a two-family dwelling.

Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

4. (ZP 18-18) Consideration with possible action on the request to consider an amendment to the previously approved Conditional Use Permit for a shelter facility in an Office/Residential (OR) District located at 1660 Christiana Street, submitted by Joel Ehrfurth, Mach IV Engineering & Surveying, on behalf of House of Hope Green Bay, Inc, property owner (Ald. J. VanderLeest, District 11).

Moved by Sidney Bremer, seconded by Randall Petrouske to open the floor for discussion. Motion

carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Jerry Wiezbiskie, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Jerry Wiezbiskie, seconded by Randall Petrouske to approve an amendment to the previously approved Conditional Use Permit for a shelter facility in an Office/Residential (OR) District located at 1660 Christiana Street, subject to:

Approval of the request, subject to:

- a) Affected Tax Parcels are combined into one Tax Parcel.
- b) The capacity of facility is limited to 27 bedrooms and there shall be no expansion of the use without Plan Commission review and approval.
- c) Compliance with the former program statement and operating plan.
- d) A site plan is submitted and approved by staff as part of the standard site plan review.

Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

5. (ZP 18-19) Consideration with possible action on the request to consider an amendment to the previously approved Conditional Use Permit for a shelter facility in an Office/Residential (OR) District located at 411 St. John Street to permit a temporary summer shelter use, submitted by Alexia Wood, St. Johns Shelter. (Ald. R. Scannell, District 7).

Moved by Randall Petrouske, seconded by Jerry Wiezbiskie to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

Timothy Gilbert closed the floor.

Randall Petrouske stated he wanted it on record that he does work across from St. Johns and they have no issues with the shelter.

Moved by Randall Petrouske, seconded by Jerry Wiezbiskie to approve the amendment to the previously approved Conditional Use Permit for a shelter facility in an Office/Residential (OR) District located at 411 St. John Street to permit a temporary summer shelter use, subject to:

- a) The temporary COTS emergency homeless shelter is limited to the former St. John's School gym located at 411 St. John Street (Tax Parcel No. 13-106) through October 2018. Hours of operation are limited to 9 pm to 6:30 am and no residential occupancy shall be permitted on the second floor of the structure.
- b) If the temporary emergency facility use at 411 St. John Street is discontinued, the operation is dissolved, or if the Green Bay Catholic Diocese of Green Bay no longer manages the facility, the use shall terminate immediately. The use/operation shall not be renewed or reestablished without the

Plan Commission and City Council review and approval.

c) At the discretion of the Common Council, Plan Commission, or the Planning Director a review may be required by the Plan Commission and Common Council to ensure compliance with this conditional use permit and identify any areas of concerns with the temporary emergency homeless shelter including but not limited to: Police calls, other documented safety concerns and inadequate facilities.

d) Sex offenders required to register under §301.45, Wis. Stats., are prohibited from any stay at the facility.

e) A mandatory background check for all shelter residents is required.

f) St. John the Evangelist Homeless Shelter staff shall maintain a history of residence during the temporary use.

g) A site plan is submitted and approved in compliance with Chapter 13-1700 Green Bay Zoning Code.

h) Approved building plans shall be made available to staff and available on site.

Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

6. (ZP 18-20) Consideration with possible action on the request to create a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for the development of an apartment campus at 1060 Gray Court, Submitted by Jon LeRoy, Mau and Associates, on behalf of Gerald and Gloria Bigelow, property owners (Ald. R. Scannel, District7).

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Sidney Bremer to open the floor for discussion.

Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

Timothy Gilbert closed the floor.

Moved by Jerry Wiezbiskie, seconded by Sidney Bremer to approve the request to create a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for the development of an apartment campus at 1060 Gray Court, subject to the draft PUD Ordinance. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

7. (TA 18-04) Consideration with possible action on the request to amend the Green Bay Zoning Code Sections 13-1500 and Section 5 of 13-200 as related to Historic Preservation.

Moved by Lisa Hanson, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to open the floor for discussion.

Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

Timothy Gilbert closed the floor.

Moved by Jerry Wiezbiskie, seconded by Randall Petrouske to approve to amend the Green Bay Zoning Code Sections 13-1500 and Section 5 of 13-200 as related to Historic Preservation, as

proposed in the attached draft text amendment. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Special meeting scheduled for July 12, 2018, at 6:00 pm in Room 310.

2. Date of next meeting: August 13, 2018.

3. Director's Report.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Commissioner Lisa Hanson, seconded by Commissioner Jerry Wiezbiskie to adjourn. Motion carried.

Yes- Jacob Miller, Jerry Wiezbiskie, Lisa Hanson, Randall Petrouske, Sidney Bremer, Timothy Gilbert, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Welcome to the Monday, July 9th meeting of the Green Bay Plan Commissions. First item on the agenda is roll call. Chair Timothy Gilbert is here. Vice-chair Sid Bremer?

- Present.

- Alderperson Veronica Corpus-Dax?

- Present.

- Commissioner Lisa Hanson?

- Present.

- Commissioner Jacob Miller?

- Present.
- Commissioner Randall Petruske?
- Present.
- And Commissioner Jerry Wiezbiskie?
- Present.
- Next item, approval of the agenda for the giant meeting.
- Motion to approve.
- Tim?
- Yes?
- Question.
- Yes, Alderman Steuer?
- I don't know if I can make a request to move up item seven.
- Number one, I'm at a numbered meeting on town services.
- Well, we have to do the public hearings first.
- Public hearing first.
- And then we probably should take a request right after it, so we could move it up to number two on the regular business.
- Will that be all right?
- Thank you.
- I'm accepted, you guys.
- So move to approve the agenda with that change?
- Second.
- Okay, we have motion and a second to approve the agenda as recommended.
- All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Next item, approval of the minutes of the June 11th meeting of the Plan Commission.
- I'd like to move to approve the minutes, subject to correcting the property owner's name for item number one on the legal Stone Ridge rather than the spelling Ride Holdings, and also subject to the insertion for each item of the meeting a timestamp for the video record.
- We have a motion. Do we have a second?

- Seconded.

- We have a motion and a second to approve the minutes per the change. All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Next item, public hearing. This public hearing has been properly posted and public notification has been published in the Green Bay Press-Gazette. The Plan Commission is interested in hearing public comments on the subject event items. We invite your comments and ask that after your name has been called, you state your address, whether you represent a group or association, whether you favor, oppose, or are only providing information on this matter, and your comments or concerns. We also ask that you provide your testimony to facts related to the proposal on hand and avoid repetitive testimony. You must be recognized by the Plan Commission in order to speak and please address your comments to the chair. We will now open the public hearing on a request to revise properties located at 1003 Pines Street and 1000 Main Street from Medium Intensity Retail Office Housing to Commercial. Submitted by Ronald L. Smits, property owner. Is anybody...?

- Would it help if we held the presentation by staff first to remind people?

- It's okay, I can do a background information if that helps.

- That would be beneficial.

- That's perfect.

- This request is a common plan amendment, from Medium Intensity Retail Office and Housing to Commercial, so the property is located, generally speaking at Main and Webster here. It is currently a used car sales business here, Nearly New Auto. The plan is to expand that use further south. The current zoning, let me put the button through, the current plan calls for that Medium Intensity Retail Office or Housing, so there really is no other Commercial land usage in this particular area, so this would kind of stand out with that land use change. Looking at the zoning map here, the red or the General Commercial or the C1 zoning for that use to occur or expand, they would need a C2 or Highly Commercial zoning, so we need to change the future land use to a Commercial designation so they can go ahead and proceed with the rezoning. There is C2 adjacent here, but there is Office Residential zoning further to the south. There are some Commercial developments north of Main Street, PDQ is to the east, CVS is to the west. There is some Lower-Density Residential to the south and then Whitney School redevelopment town homes. It's kind of kitty corner or southwest from that particular area. So yeah, this is a change from Medium Intensity Retail Office or Housing, which is kind of a mixed use, to a straight Commercial district, which will allow the applicant to apply for rezoning to a district that would permit those auto sales. But general information.

- Thank you. Does anybody wish to speak on this matter?

- Yeah, thank you. My name is Ron Smits, 3777 Mighty Oak Trail, Green Bay, Wisconsin. I'm the owner of the property. If it's okay, I'd like to just present some pictures of present and future.

- Thank you.

- Thank you.

- You're welcome. You're welcome. I kind of put together, I guess, my own t bar of the positives of the change here. You can see by the pictures, I'd like to clean up an unattractive property downtown Green Bay. I'd like to create more jobs by promoting the growth of a small business. We can create better than entry-level paying jobs. We can grow a business without any major traffic changes here. We're not going to be a fast food restaurant or a Grand Central Station that's going to bring a significant amount more traffic to this intersection. Positive of working in conjunction, the city can work in conjunction with a small business that's gotten successful on Main Street for over 30 years. I have a lot of positive feedback from the plans that I've showed you, including my closest neighbor, which is Red Lewis of PDQ Car Wash. He's very excited about the change and he also mentioned when he remodeled the old Denil Cadillac and turned it into the auto gallery, how a lot of his neighbors in the immediate area also changed their businesses for the good. We've had a lot of positive

feedback from other neighboring businesses. The use will actually make the whole square block here in uniform use with auto detailing and in auto sales. We've received no negative comments from approximately 50 letters that we've sent out to adjacent property owners and in the immediate area. We offered our cell phones and our email on there and we've got just positive feedback. We're a business that's not looking for city dollars, we're not looking for any TIF dollars or any grants that are available. This'll be all self-funded. We've had positive feedback from the Main Street Program. We've had positive feedback from the alderman elected to our area. We've had positive feedback from the Whitney Park Group, positive feedback from the Whitney School developers. This change will help promote a business that collects more sales tax dollars per sale than any other business on Main Street. The bottom line is that this'll be the best this property's ever looked since the inception of the property. If you can hand this down, one of my customers brought the original picture of the property from, I think, that's the 20s or the 30s. From an economic standpoint, I think it'll be the best use of the property since the history of the property. The change will be good for the state, it'll be good for the city, it'll be good for small business, it'll be good for Main Street. It's a win-win-win for all parties involved. We had a meet and greet with the 50 letters that I sent out. We just had a few people show up but again, everything was positive.

- Any questions, I guess.

- Just one. With the few people who showed up, it could be anywhere from three to 20. About how many?

- That showed up for the meet and greet? Out of 50 letters, we had two people show up, and I guess there was some other people, some other positive feedback that couldn't make the meeting. We had Jeff Marcus from the Main Street Program, Rick Chernick from Camera Corner. I met with the alderman, Randy Scannell. Garritt Bader from Whitney Park, Lance Writt from the Whitney Park Association, I met with Andy Nicholson, I met with Glenn Sanderson, he owns Sanderson Photography. I think it's a new vestaggle with the Whitney School Project, I met with him, I met with Red Lewis. Like I said, there's 50 other contacts that I had given our personal email, personal cell phones. No negative feedback. Thank you.

- Does anybody else wish to speak on this matter? Okay, is there anybody else wishing to speak on this? Is there anybody else that wants to speak on this? I'm hearing none. This public hearing is now closed. Next thing is Regular Business, item one: consideration and possible action on a request to revise property located at 1003 Pine Street and 1000 Main Street from Medium Intensity Retail Office Housing to Community.

- We're moving on.

- This one did that.

- Let me just follow up on, I think, some graphics that we got. This is a central site plan from the applicant. This kind of shows Webster and Pine here. This is a portion going there with the left. There's a front portion that would be removed, so the idea here is that this'll be demolished and the parking lot be improved and to obviously vehicle sales, so the basic extension down to the south to Pine Street. Not sure if you have that graphic or not. This is a better picture that shows that. So this is looking southeast. This is Webster and Main, this is the existing dealership here, here, a garage, and this is a portion brewing that would be kept, refaced, so to speak, with parking out front. So just wanted to kind of explain that a little bit more. So as part of any sort of Comprehensive Plan amendment, there are certain subcriteria that we use to evaluate, and that's included within the agenda tonight. The concern the staff has with Commercial land use like this is we feel it's the sort to intrude upon or protrude into the neighborhood. It's really not a compatible land use that we feel for the adjacent Residential properties. A change to their Commercial land use might be a short term fix here. We feel a better long term fix would be the existing land use that's recommended as part of the Comprehensive Plan, which is that Medium Intensity Retail Office and Housing. Again, it's colored here for consistency with other properties in the area. Mixed use development would be a better long term option. We did notify property owners within a couple hundred feet here, we did notify on Main, we notified associations, we really haven't received any calls or written comments on this, but our recommendation tonight is denial of the request.

- Commissioner, Mr. Chairman?

- Whatever. What is the zoning for PDQ?

- C2, that's the highway Commercial zoning.
- So what's being requested here is the same zoning that is next door.
- It is, it's a land use category, so we go to Commercial, that would improve, and it'd come back for rezoning to highway Commercial, so it'd be a sister, it'd be a compatible extension of this zoning to that property if land use has changed.
- So your concern about the lack of compatibility has to do with the Residential area south?
- South and southwest. So what's really going on with the school here is existing Residential in this area here.
- And CVS, that is currently...?
- C1, same zoning. So for auto sales, auto repair, those all kind of fall into that C2 category. It's a unique zoning to that particular table items.
- I want to be clear now, C1 for CVS. This is a request for... Oh, right, we got to do the comparative plans first, right?
- We got to prime and then we have to do this.
- In order to lead to the C2, but it's not currently being requested, but PDQ is already C2.
- Right, that's been there for a number of years.
- Yes, thank you.
- Sure.
- So all the red is Commercial at this time, so that's the current zoning, but a Comprehensive Plan calls for that all to be mixed-use.
- Over the long term, yes, but that would change to be more of a mixed-use district, so Commercial zoning is more of an intensive use. As I said, you could have some Commercial as part of that mixed-use development, but it should be a Commercial portal.
- Thank you. Is there any discussion among the commissioners? Commissioner.
- I really appreciate the thoughtfulness of the staff's recommendation here in their approach to this, but I am having trouble thinking why, understanding why something that's next to a current highway Commercial should not also move in that direction, particularly because this half block is between the CVS and the PDQ. I do understand that the Comprehensive Plan is forward-looking, but the CVS is pretty new and as Paul said, PDQ has been there for a very long time and this is an owner who's showed himself to be concerned with the appearance of things, and I do appreciate that very much. I'm not sure that a kitty corner sales lot across from the new Whitney development is particularly concerning. If it were right across the street like that, I would feel somewhat differently, but that kitty corner makes a difference, so that's kind of where I am at this point and I'm eager to hear what my colleagues have to say.
- I tend to agree with you. I, again, I understand that Comprehensive Plan wants us to remain Medium Intensity Retail Office Housing, but there's nothing to say that a MIROH couldn't be zoned to that. It presented itself. So yeah, I also don't see the big concern of changing this to Commercial, especially since everything along that is already Commercial.
- Any other concerns? Well then, we start.
- Signature. Paul, could you put that subplan up again? Oh yeah, bleak. You know, I guess my first reaction looking at this is that there's a lot of parking right on that corner, and it is such a vital corner in the downtown

area. Was there any consideration by the owner to look at the different configuration of the property and have the building in closer to the intersection?

- The building already exists.

- The building exists. Go ahead.

- Sorry, the building is existing. It really absolutely wouldn't be feasible to move the building, and I'm attempting to remove what some could possibly consider the ablated building that's there now. It's not like I'm trying to buy this property subject to I've owned it for a number of years. At this point, there are no other options. I don't have another plan. If this doesn't happen, I'm not going to sell the property. I'm just going to keep it. It's been used as a power tool building and warehousing for the past 50 years.

- I can see the conundrum or some of the problems that might happen if you're looking to rezone and you're looking at the Comprehensive Plan, because, you know, we're doing plans along the belt and we did it on Military and University and Main Street and we're looking in the future, but a lot of times, things come up, and you have to deal with it accordingly, but then it kind of seals the deal a little bit. If this goes through, that will seal the deal for that property, but it's difficult when you plan. When planning, you might say, five years down the road and 10 years down the road, something else may come forward that would be a little more beneficial if you will, or a little more adherent to that area. I understand that you're limited but I'm just... I'm not fully convinced yet, but I think you made a good presentation. It's all I have, thank you.

- Commissioner Hanson.

- So remind me again, how many years out are the smart-grill plans, the Comprehensive Plans. Are they 20 years? I guess, how many years was this one starting out to be. 20?

- 20.

- Okay. I mean, I love mixed use properties, but I also have a really hard time telling a current business owner that they can't expand their property when there is property available and vacant right next door to theirs. I don't know, especially since you look at the current zoning and it's just a sea of Commercial. I don't know, I feel like I would support that, the Comprehensive Plan change.

- Yes, Commissioner Petrouske?

- First, I think it's appropriate to disclose that I own one of the Whitney Park townhouses that's immediately on the other side of the CVS, so I don't have a direct financial interest in this property but probably tangential. I think it's appropriate to put that on record. I'd like to hear a little bit more from the staff, on the distinction between C1 and C2, because that may be important, it may not, but I'd like to hear a little bit more about that, I request that, the Commissioner.

- So C1 is more of the general Commercial district, allows offices, retail, personal service business services, so a wide gambit of uses. The C2s zone in the highway Commercial is more narrowed towards drive-through facilities, gas stations, R-vehicle sales and repair. It's really more dependent on the auto use, so to speak, so there's a distinction between those two.

- In that corridor, are the majority of those businesses currently C1, so the more general use as opposed to C2?

- I think that's fair, yes. There are some C2s that you might find some gas stations on, maybe a car lot or two, but generally it's C1.

- Does the staff feel that C1 is more consistent with the plan than C2 would be?

- I think with the proposed land use, a mixed use certainly would be a more appropriate neighborhood setup, an Office Residential type use. It could be a candidate for a downtown zoning, but there's really no adjacent downtown zoning, so it's probably Office Residential neighborhood center is a better candidate.

- Thank you. Commissioner Miller?

- Hard to say, confirmed there was no comment from either Main Street Inc or the neighborhood businesses. It wouldn't hurt them.

- I received no formal comments. I did talk to Jeff Marcus today. They were non-committal on there. This is not part of the old Main Street district, it's adjacent to, so that doesn't mean. Breaks right at that southern line, but they didn't offer a recommendation.

- I guess my thoughts on it are probably similar to a lot of the other commissioners here. I think we can all agree that this is not the highest use that we'd like to see for any area adjacent to downtown, but at the same time, it's surrounded on both sides by fairly comparable uses. I guess I feel comfortable allowing it to go to C2, simply because it's not putting in us in a situation where it's something we can't come back from. It's not like we're changing it to a use that would put up something that wouldn't be able to be fixed later on. It's mixing up all the parking lots, as you can always build on top of them, so I don't feel too uncomfortable that we're going to be put in a situation five years, 10 years down the line where we can't undo it if the market states that something else should be there. That being said, I kind of agree but just barely so far.

- Thank you. Commissioner Wiezbiskie?

- Kind of in agreement with what I'm hearing here, basically, yeah, I have a hard problem, and I'm going to set the pace for the meeting, I guess. Turning people down who want to improve things, and any improvement is a greater improvement. This is not really a parking lot, this is a display of auto cars, as far as I can see, am I correct on that?

- Yeah, it's no different. If you drive by a CVS at four o'clock in the afternoon, that parking lot is full of cars from one end to the other. I want to do the same thing here, I just want my cars for sale.

- So I guess I can see it more as a display area, not a parking lot, so I kind of just scuttle that for it, but the same token, getting back to what I originally said was, I'm all for development and it's his property, he's come with a great plan. Let the man make his living and clean things up. He's cleaning it up, I think that's more important than anything else. I would say that maybe in the future, maybe he'll put a high rise there or something, who knows, but you never really know what you'll come up with, but for now, I think this is the best that we've got to deal with. Let's quit chasing these people away who want to develop things and improve things. I've seen too much of that in my tenure. I see nothing wrong with it, really don't. Thank you.

- Thank you. Any further discussion? Commissioner Corpus-Dax?

- Here's something I'm in agreement with everyone else, as far as... Allowing him to move forward with this. My issue with it is that we have a block that is all cement. There's no green space here. It is that something that you can look at, instead of just having one big cement block, I want to mix that lot. Can we add some green space here?

- Well, we certainly want to maintain the green space. Oh, sorry, thought she was directing.

- That's something we got there, just for staff and just want to open up the park. There's one point, the northern part of this plan.

- Is it?

- It's pretty busy, so the only change would be to the southern part. I don't know if we could make any demands or requests--

- Okay, I wasn't sure if that was across the space or not.

- Anyway, now this item is strictly chained to its current assignment?

- Without reviewing the site issues, it's just for your information that this is a concept of what it could look like.

- So in the future, we would be able to deal with that.
- Well, if it just come down to staff and the ordinances that are in place, so if this goes through and rezoning occurs and the site plan is submitted after that, if it needs a code, then it's good to go.
- Just a second, though, if rezoning occurs, that would be the next step that would come to the Plan Commission, right?
- It would, but you wouldn't have the oversight on the design, necessarily. The straight rezoning from C1 to C2 and the codes would just kick in.
- It would be an opportunity to discuss with the owner the possibilities of increasing the green space in the part of the lot that's being redeveloped and particularly the boundary and across the lot, if that helps.
- You could, but you couldn't put any conditions on these.
- I understand that, yes.
- But in any case, that's a huge irkle.
- Does C2 call for any green space?
- It does, 20% of it.
- Okay.
- Commissioner, if you have anything else?
- Nope.
- Commissioner Wiezbiskie?
- I would like clarification with performance right now. Declare this as a Commercial C, and it's the path to becoming C2?
- It's a generalized Commercial land use, which we're considering at this point.
- And that's what we're addressing tonight.
- Just the future land use?
- We're not addressing the C2, but this is the pathway to the current focus.
- I would like to make a motion to approve changing this to a C2, or C rather.
- I'll second that amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.
- We have a motion and a second, any further discussion? I ask that you place your vote.
- I don't have a potluck. I have nothing.
- I did once, I went back to the agenda.
- I'm back on the main page of the agenda.
- So do I just call voice vote and have the results here?

- You put down the vote here.
- We're going to call a voice vote in this matter. All those in favor of the recommendation?
- I put the recommendation in motion.
- And a motion. All those in favor say aye.
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed?
- Motion passes, unanimously.
- Thank you. Next item is item seven, which has been moved up. Consideration with possible action on the request to amend the city Green Bay Zoning Code Sections 13-1500 and Section five of 13-200 as related to historic preservation.
- Thank you. So you're probably wondering why you're looking at the Historic Preservation codes, since you are the Plan Commission, but the Historic Preservation ordinance is housed underneath the zoning codes. To get any new rules and amendments to that, we have to go through your body. So some background information on our Historic Preservation Commission: right now, they operate on monthly meetings and they are an advisory committee only, meaning that you're required to go before them if you're doing any exterior work to a historic property, but you are not required to follow their recommendations, so in theory, that should run pretty well, but in practice, it's a little clumsy. A lot of property owners don't really feel that it's a required step, so they try to sneak by without getting the approvals done. The meetings are hard to do because they're only monthly, so in the summer when people are doing a lot of work, it's really difficult to get people in for the meetings, so over the past couple years, it's been really hard work for property owners to get in line with the city's process. Last year, we put some staff people onto the commission to try to get it to run a little bit more effectively and try to see where the big holes are. With that, we've kind of gone through and revamped what the process should be and then from there updated the ordinance to adjust to those needs from both the property owners and for the city would like out of the commission itself. So right now, as you're looking to get a building permit for any exterior work on a house if you have a historic property, you're told you have to go through the HPC. Those meetings are held monthly and with that, you get only the advisory view, so it kind of feels like you're waiting for a whole month for something that you could just do anyway. So with the proposed process, we're hoping that we will be able to do the building permit applications still, so you'd still be required to do anything with our other missful codes, and then from there, you would have the availability to go to a new reformed Landmarks Commission, which I will discuss later, or have a staff review available so that we can get a faster permit, so that way for the smaller projects, you're able to come in, have staff review it, usually within 24 to 48 hours you'd be able to get that building permit. From there, the review would be binding, so you would have to have what we would call a certificate of appropriateness in hand to get your building permit to say, this was approved by the historic body, now you can get your building permit and do the work. If you look in the staff report, we have some information about the Comprehensive Plan. Within the Comprehensive Plan, there was quite a bit of information about wanting to have a more effective and active role of our HPC. With that, they're also looking to do some different updates. We were advised in our Comprehensive Plan to make it from advisory to binding, but even in the Comprehensive Plan it said if you're going to do binding, don't make it very restrictive. The community's not in favor of that. So we really took that into consideration while writing this ordinance update. They also had some other ideas for us that would be pretty financial-dependent, so we would do new intensive surveys. Ours is older than I am, so it's not very effective anymore. Doing literature drops, doing education, and all sorts of things, but all those have a financial impact that the city just can't herd in without additional support. So what we really want to do, it's kind of a three step thing. There's some technical updates to this, this code hasn't been revised in years, so there's a lot of state statutes we had to catch up with, renaming some of the things that we work on, but the three major points would be the first, that we want to create a Landmarks Commission. This ordinance would disband our HPC as it exists now and then we'd be reformed as the Landmarks Commission. We would be able to go to two meetings a month, similar to the Plan Commission or a lot of our other commissions, or we could stay at one meeting a month or just do double in the summer because people are doing more work in the summer. But with that, we may need some other requirements, so right now, we still require a registered architect, a historian, a real estate broker, an alder, and three citizen members. We have adjusted this a little bit

to add the option for a licensed contractor or a license appraiser in case we have some faults getting professionals from the community to want to be a part of this. And then we've also gone to the citizen members. Of those, two of those would have to reside in a historic property or on that historic property, so I guess people will have a lot more of a vested interest in historic properties and also know the cost of construction on historic properties, the ability to help out their neighbors with this process. So I think this is probably the biggest selling point for the new ordinance update is that right now, we're running three members short on our HPC. Some of them don't live in the city, so they don't really have a vested interest in the community. This would make sure that professionals are on that board, that's mayor-appointed, and also that people who are their neighbors and who understand how historic properties are operated are also making those decisions for them. The second major change would be that we would allow staff approvals. Right now, every single thing that happens on the exterior of a historic home has to go before the HPC, so you can thank the NSP who want to put up a fence. You have to wait a month to do that. If you want to chainsaw some shingles, you have roof damage, you have to wait a whole month to do that. With this, this is the comprehensive list of what we would be able to do with staff, so the staff would be myself and then Jason Flatt, who's our Historic Preservation specialist. It could be anybody within our department, though, so if Jason and I got in a horrific accident, we all died, somebody would be able to do it for us. But this would be the staff approval one, so people would be able to come in, they would have to have the application, the specs of the project, we could review those based off of what information we have about their property, and these would be the things they'd be able to do right away. Most communities offer staff approvals, but it's for very small things, like some of the repair work, some fence work, storm windows. Ours, we've added quite an extensive list of things that a lot of people do in the city, so we're making sure the most applications that we receive are the things that the staff can do on their own time. But this list is amendable, so if there's anything that you see that you think that should be something that historic property owners should be able to get approval for very quickly, this would be the part of the ordinance that's probably going to have the most flexibility so that way we can see as people come in and make those applications, which ones we need more of and which ones we need less of. The other part of this is that the city of Green Bay is not a certified local government, and what that means is that there are a variety of communities within the country specifically in Wisconsin that are certified local governments that mean that we have a binding design review so we are able to do in-house reviews of Historic Preservation projects. If you are a certified local government, you are open to \$25,000 worth of grant funding each year, so it's not taxpayer dollars, it's not even state taxpayer dollars, this comes from the federal government. It's earmarked from I believe oil reserves, so a small portion of that, less than 1%, is reserved out to go to certified local government communities. With all the things in our Comprehensive Plan that they recommended us doing that we just don't have the budget for, this \$25,000 annually could help us fix that gap, so you apply for the projects for what you'd like to do, how much money you think it'll cost, and then each year they divvy up that between the Wisconsin areas. There also are technical assistants, so if we have a large project, like say when the Northland first started, we could have had someone from the office come offer us technical assistance for our HPC and say, this is what you should be doing with this property, along with having architects and engineers and all those things. These people are specifically trained to help municipal governments with technical assistance. Also, there's a lot of information out there about how having historic ordinances, specifically binding ones, they can really help you maintain or increase your property values, so they do a lot of research and have a lot of data that isn't available to all municipalities, so certified local governments get this information about their own municipalities and municipalities that are like them throughout the state. Having that information I think would be very helpful. The process for this would be that if we would have our commission created or recreated as the Landmarks Commission, we establish this binding ordinance through this process, we apply with the state to start a preservation office, and then from there they accept you into the program and then you could apply for those monies. That would be the CLG process. Something to keep in mind here, a lot of times when people think that we're going to do the binding ordinance is that we're changing a lot of what we already do, but in theory everyone is supposed to already apply to this department on any sort of Historic Preservation projects. They would get the approval, they would get the review done. This is just adding a level of credibility, in my opinion, because we're going to staff with more professional people who work in the field, we're going to have people who are their neighbors and we aren't outright prohibiting anything. There are a lot of Historic Preservation ordinances that would say you can't do vinyl, you can't redo your windows, those sorts of things. We don't have anything like that. This is the least binding ordinance that we can possibly propose and still get certified local government status. In our department, we've created these little cheat sheets that we call them, so each property we have all the defining features of that property, the architectural style, and then also any work that's already been done on the property, so if we say, those windows have already been replaced, go ahead and replace them, you know it won't be that big of a deal versus if you just can't replace your windows in an ordinance, it kind of serves up everybody's process. We just look at these, it'll all be case by case. Each house is different, so a property owner

will say, well, can I do this? It kind of depends on what your house is. How old is it, what are the defining features, is it next to a house that has the same types of defining features and those are original and you're going to change yours out, so it'll be really noticeable. These are the things that we're going to be looking at. Another thing that's really important to remember is that Green Bay is Wisconsin's oldest city and I think that we forget that a lot. We don't really celebrate a lot of our historical value or integrity because a lot of the buildings, we just assume that the property owners will be able to protect them on their own. This step offers a certain level of protection to stop this from happening. These are some of our established districts, most specifically Astor. Everything that's here in pink has already been demolished or destroyed. We're trying to stop the loss of historic value within our own community because once we have the CLG status we can apply for money for different tourist events, educational opportunity and outreach. When you're part of a certified local government, you can use this as a tourism space, basically, so being the oldest city in Wisconsin, we should be utilizing this more. We really just don't have the funds or the staff or the ordinance to back us up to do those things. Along with protecting existing properties and property values, we just want to stop the general loss of historic value within our city. With that, we did have a public meeting. I've met with the Astor board, which is the largest of ours, they hold 76% of our historic properties, the Astor Neighborhood Association. So I met with their board, neighborhood association, we've had a public meeting. All these with relatively positive feedback. There are a lot of people that think that this outright infringes on property rights, just the same as any municipal code, that anything would be further in position. I tend to disagree, only because I think that it is very important that people have a certain amount of safehood in being able to purchase into a historic district, so when you buy into that property, you buy into a neighborhood that you know that your neighbors cannot destroy the integrity of your home by destroying the integrity of theirs. I know that there are some people in the audience that are here for this event and Mark Steuer is our chair of the HPC. I'm sure he's got a lot to say about it. He's been very passionate about historic preservation in the city for a number of years. I've been working on this specifically for about a year and a half. If you have any questions, I can talk about this for about six hours straight but I won't do that to you all. So you do have a copy of the clean ordinance that we're proposing, and then the draft is showing the changes but again, most of those are just technical updates, changing the names of those sorts of things, and then also we provided a quick facts sheet, this one that was in there. This is what we handed out to the neighborhood associations, people who came to the public meeting, those sorts of things. So with that, we request another look here.

- Thank you. Any discussion? Commissioner Petrouske.

- I have a question as it regards to the unilateral approval process. Is the unilateral decision restricted to approvals, or would the staff be on a unilateral basis be able to deny requests?

- Any COA that would be on this list, so anything that would come before us on this, we could approve or deny. If staff level is denied, it can be appealed to the Landmarks Commission and anything can be appealable to the city council, so all these wouldn't just automatically go to the city council like some of our items do. These would just be going to the Landmarks Commission, but everything is appealable to the city council, so even if we have the ordinance in place, the city council is generally like, no, that was a terrible idea. They can appeal every decision and it wouldn't degrade our ability to be a CLG.

- So essentially, the staff approval process doesn't create more bureaucracy, it creates a quick answer to property owners who are looking to make a minor change?

- Yes, so even if they come in and we are adamantly opposed to something, they can still run it to the next meeting and have the Landmarks Commission be their advocate as well. And if not that, it can also go to city council.

- But perhaps more importantly, if it's conforming, they can just get basically a staff, you're good to go, and you don't have to wait to go through the commission.

- Yeah, it would be a meeting at your home, basically, depending on staff time.

- So I see it says painting existing unpainted brick. What about non-brick houses?

- Then they wouldn't have brick?

- Painting in general, just of a wood-sided house.
- That would be considered a general maintenance, so we wouldn't have a-- I mean, if you have orders to paint your house because the paint is peeling, you wouldn't have to come to us to fix that, so we wouldn't do any color choices or tell you a type of paint to use or anything like that.
- Oh, okay.
- So this is only if you have original unpainted brick, so if you had painted brick, we wouldn't have a say in that.
- Okay.
- Commissioner Hanson.
- First, my question follows directly from that because I thought at one point that I read was just a lot of paperwork with no paper.
- Yeah.
- I'm still struggling with that. I thought there was something about maintaining the visual appearance of the historic structure. The color pink can have a lot to do with that, so when we got to the later point that said or the quick facts sheet that said the paint color or painting would not be under the purview of the staff or the Landmark Commission. I got confused by that.
- This is pretty much across the board. Any sort of historic preservation commission or anything that oversees historic preservation. Doing the color is really far overreach in my opinion, only because yeah, it might make it look worse, but I think that's an individual property rights thing that people should be allowed to paint their home whatever color they want to paint it, even if it is a historical. There are some larger historic areas, like if you go to New Orleans, they monitor everything because that's kind of their thing, but first a coat like this, and even when I worked in Beloit, that's a pretty strict CLG area and they did monitor color. They gave suggestions and recommendations and people would come to them to utilize that, but when it comes to painting, we typically just let people do what they would like to. The same thing in picking the materials, as long as it's appropriate for the home, we're not going to say you can or cannot use this, but you guide someone in the right direction. If they're going to go from original wood to vinyl, we're going to say please don't do that, but also if you want to, you could keep the original wood under and put your vinyl on it in case somebody wanted to come back later and take the vinyl off and restore that wood. There are a lot of creative solutions, it really just depends on the house, but also when it comes to maintenance, we have a closet here that you do all the maintenance that you want as long as it's the identical appearance of what you're changing out.
- I certainly appreciate the flexibility that has been built into this in many different ways and I'm glad to see us moving in a direction of value in our historic properties. I should say first as a matter of personal reference. I taught in an urban studies department largely because of my awareness of the cultural history of cities and how that impacts people and that sense of continuity in history. The feeling that your city does not just radically change on you overnight is one of the most important positive aspects of peoples' feelings toward their cities, so I think the general move here is right on. In keeping with that historical piece, though, could you put up again the proposed people who would be on the commission? I don't understand why a historian or a licensed contractor. I could understand a registered architect or a licensed contractor, but it would seem to me that a historian would be kind of necessary.
- We go back and forth on this quite a bit. Jason isn't here because he's in Scotland for the summer. He is a historian and he's on our staff, so right now, we're filling in. We also have the caveat that if one of these roles can't be filled, the mayor can make an appropriate change out of the different profession, but the registered architect is kind of across the board that that's a requirement. The historian we thought was really important as well and a licensed contractor is usually really hard to come by with someone who lives in a historic property or lives in Green Bay or knows historic renovations very well, so we thought between the historian and the licensed contractor, those two are pretty hard to come by, so we thought one of the two should be on there, but asking for both is going to be really hard to fill. Basically, that was just looking at the availability in the city to think, we

don't have a lot of those people here, so we wanted to make sure that this was an easy list to fill as well, because this might already be hard to do.

- Thank you.

- Commissioner Wiezbiskie?

- Is this unique with just the Green Bay area or is this throughout the United States or whatever? Do they have these types of commissions most likely?

- Yes, certified local governments are throughout the United States. Wisconsin, the closest one is De Pere.

- Does it go to city council final approval also like everything else does?

- This ordinance change would, but the actual applications themselves wouldn't.

- The recommendations basically. Do they go to city council for approval?

- We don't have it right now. We could, but then it just prolongs another meeting, especially because city council only has one meeting this summer and we would want to double our meetings in the summer, so I don't know that that would help anybody. I think it would make it a longer process because right now, they don't go to city council. Our HBC does not report to them.

- Okay, so this is going to make your commission makes the decision and that's it?

- And that would be appealable to council if they don't agree with that decision.

- Oh, could be appealed. All right, thank you.

- Any further discussion?

- Translation, Lisa?

- I'll get him, it's all good.

- Other than that, hearing none. Motion to open the floor?

- Motion to open the floor.

- Second.

- We have a motion and a second to open the floor. All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Who has the next question?

- Yes, Alderman Steuer.

- I'm going to go stand.

- If you would, please.

- Thank you, chair and committee. It kind of hurt my feelings when Stephanie, who I-- Stephanie and Jason Flatt have done a fantastic job on this and I do chair the Historic Preservation Commission, but when she said that she's younger than the previous document, I actually worked on that document. So yeah. It's okay, I didn't take it personally. I could talk six hours on this as well. I won't do that, but I will say that there are almost 70 certified local governments in the state of Wisconsin right now. We are not one of those, and being the oldest city in

Wisconsin, I really feel that we need to look to that. I think all too often in this city, it's been half empty versus half full when we talk about our historic structures and folks that live in the city and have seen things develop or come down over time. Back in the late 80s, I moved to Green Bay in 1981. I worked in the plan office and we went out and took pictures of old homes and we went in front of committees, we went in front of the Astor group, and tried to appeal to them for an ordinance. We had a lot of property owners that, "don't you tell me what to do with my house", so we learned a valuable lesson over a couple of attempts to try to do this and I think the way we're doing it is the correct way. We're taking our time, we've done our research. Like Stephanie said, it's not as binding as you would think. I think a lot of times people think what the Historic Preservation ordinance is going to be, "don't you dare tell me what to do", but the Landmarks Commission that would be set up would be a professional group that is skilled in many ways and you could go to them for advice. Many times you might be able to talk to somebody before it even gets to a meeting state and they can help you along with that. I would think that most people that live in a historic district or a historic home already have a sense of history in their community and they want to make sure that it's correct for the entire area. I guess the one slide, it is a bit of a shock when you talk about Astor. You know, 15% of the homes have been erased or altered appreciably. Granted, it's near the hospitals and near the river, but like I said, you get to a point where who's to say that it's not going to come down here and creep down here and before you know it, you don't have a district anymore. The quick facts sheet that she brought together. You know, the Landmarks Commission is very important and I think you would have professional people that could really help with that. I think the fact that we are not a certified local government, once we are, we'll be able to apply for various grants. We do need another intensive survey, if you will. We did this back in 1987, '88, so you know how old stuff is.

- How young Stephanie is.

- Surely if you went into the office about that time. Anyway, when I worked on that, we did maps, we did all sorts of things. We did a lot of research on this, but it's history so technically a lot of that information is still pertinent, but over 30 years, there's quite a few structures that have come down. My thought is that we're always involved in the act of reuse and if we can take the property and bring it forward. We recently just put together a downtown east side historic district. That was very good, I feel, for the city of Green Bay because we got to a point where the downtown changed quite a bit. Years ago, in the 60s and 70s. Now we're looking at it the other way. There's a paradigm shift going on and I think we need to continue with that. I'm also on the Brown County trust for historic preservation and we're looking at the entire county. I don't know if Gene's here. When we open the floor, Gene Hackbarth works on the De Pere commission and they've had quite a few successes and I just want to follow their lead on some of the things we're doing. I think that it's very important that we do that. I'm just going to say one quick quote, because I could talk on this indefinitely, I don't want to do that, I have another meeting, probably over by now. This was a quote by English socialist William Morris. He wrote years ago, "These old buildings "do not belong to us only, "they belong to our forefathers "and they will belong to our descendants "unless we play them false. "They are not in any sense our own property "to do with as we all like with them. "We are only trustees for those that come after us." Buildings can't talk. We're their spokespersons, if you will, so I think that it's important that we move forward. I think that the work that Stephanie and Jason did is fantastic. As city council president and alder, I'm going to push for this very hard at council.

- Thank you. Yes?

- My name is Gene Hackbarth. I live at 933 Oakdale Avenue in De Pere in a house that is within the Oakdale, the Randall Avenue historic district. Love it. I've also been actively involved as Mark said, in the Brown County trust for historic preservation, and I've been surveying for seven years now on De Pere's Historic Preservation Commission. One of my sidelines is, and I'm getting to strongly supporting this, one of my sidelines is I serve as the president of the Wisconsin Historic Preservation Commission. Taking into account all of those things, I too want to applaud city staff for the effort that they have put into bringing this recommendation to you tonight. The efficiencies that are part of this, the effectiveness that other communities have found in these types of commission activities or landmark commission programs is extremely important. It's also important for the city of Green Bay, it seems to me. The history, the cultural elements that the city has within the entire state, within the nation, if you will, is really important to embrace and to say to the community this is important. Your house, your Commercial property is important. We're here to work with you effectively, efficiently, and to the best of our ability to get the word out that we're happy to be part of this community, the oldest in the state of Wisconsin. I strongly support it.

- Thank you. Does anybody else wish to speak on this matter? Yes?

- I do. I am Cheryl Renier-Wigg, I'm here with two hats, one being the unfortunate person who's partly responsible for taking a lot of these properties out a long time ago, and taking out unfortunately a lot of other properties in the city of Green Bay, because they have been left to really go bad. We just recently had to take one down in Astor. Broke my heart, but the water had damaged it to the point that had to be removed. I fully support this to help try to save some of these old historic houses that we have in the districts right now. The other hat that I wear is I live in Astor at 626 South Jackson, so my house is about 120 years old, we bought it in '90, we've spent the past approximately 30 years restoring it. We just put the front porch back on a couple of years ago, which was our Labor capital-L of Faith. My concern as a property owner in Astor is that I'm investing this money in my house, and next door to me, they could pretty much do whatever they want to, which would depreciate my value. I really thought as I moved into Astor that there already was a CLG a long time ago because quite frankly, I would have probably purchased an AC here if I could have where I was protected for a historic district. I mean, let's face it, this is it. Once Astor is gone and I think, correct me if I'm wrong, Fort Howard was reviewed.

- It was surveyed and it lost eligibility.

- And it lost its eligibility because of all of the work that's been done there. So I really hope you support this to protect the district. Again, Alderman Steuer, I was going to say the same thing. We own our houses but let's face it, our house will be there longer than we are, so it's really important that some other entity comes in and protects those structures and their historic districts. I support the CLG, thank you.

- Thank you. Is there anybody else that wishes to speak on this? Is there anybody else? Hearing none, I'll close the meeting, close the floor. Any further discussion among the staff? Commissioner Wiezbiskie?

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- We have a motion and a second to approve. I just want to say as a history buff myself, one of my ancestors settled here in 1818. I wanted you to know that. When your family's here that long, that's a long side of time, so I can fully appreciate the request.

- It's taking that long, too.

- Okay, we have a motion and a second to approve. Any further discussion?

- I just want to thank staff for all the work that you've done on this because it looks pretty amazing.

- And share our thanks with Jason. Even if he's in Scotland.

- Okay, if there's no further discussion, all those in favor say aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Item two, consideration with possible action on the request to amend a previously approved conditional use permit to allow a car wash on a Community Center Commercial district located at 1053 Velp Avenue, submitted by Kurt Boulanger, Stone Ride Holdings, LLC.

- Doing good?

- Still on good.

- Thank you, Mister Chairman. This is a request to amend a previously approved CUP at 1053 Velp. Again, this is Atkinson and Velp Avenue here, this is the gas station in question. This was before the Plan Commission in May and in June. The request had changed during that time. The original approval was on the west side of the building, as you might recall. In June, the request was to change that location to the east side of the building. The staff had some concerns at that time about the placement of that car wash. There's a pinch point here, a

very narrow area, and the last discussion we had at the time, the Plan Commission had to do with the access around the building and concerns from the fire department, potentially. We reached out to the fire department, they have no concerns from their perspective to provide access to that building for life safety. However, our staff still has concerns and we are holding to our original recommendation of denial. We have concerns about circulation in this area. This is a perspective here, it's a very narrow area here to get through with two way traffic. There was discussion about maybe one way traffic but again, staff feels that that's concerning about or confusing, I guess, to people traveling behind that building or in that particular area, so our recommendation is denial of the request.

- Thank you. Any discussion among the staff? Thank you, Paul.

- I make a motion to approve the floor.

- Second.

- We have a motion and a second to open the floor. All in favor, say aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Floor. Does anybody wish to speak on this item?

- Yeah. I'm David O'Brien, 3323 Bay Ridge Court. The staff recommending that's a pinch point down there, one lane of traffic in your zoning code declares only 14 feet for one way traffic, which Kurt Boulanger, the developer, would prefer to see because all the traffic once in a while comes off their own bowl and tries to breakdance behind the building to get to the other street on the other side and he wants to try to eliminate that problem. Even for two ways of traffic, it's 22 feet. That building, when it's placed on that building, will be five feet shorter than the existing building footprint, so instead of the picture that you see, this area will be five feet to the north. I just don't see the problem here. It meets your zoning code for one way traffic. That's an opinion that's a pinch point. It's not a fact, because your code states 14 feet. In theory from the raised curb island of the pay station to the edge of the existing asphalt is roughly 30 feet, so if nobody's there, you can bypass both ways if you wanted to. If there's something there, one of my plans shows that you can get out, but only going one way, which would be to the south. Like I said, at the previous main, there would be a sign placed on the side of that car wash or painted on the ground, one way traffic only and similar to the portion in the back where stacking would occur for that car wash. The building facade itself would stay just as it sits right now.

- Thank you.

- So is what you're saying, just to be very clear here, that this change would actually reduce the size of the building and create five more feet in space?

- In the back, correct, yep.

- Right in the back area where the same spot that the staff was concerned that was currently a pinch point?

- The edge of the building is probably right here, so yeah, additional five feet back there.

- Of space?

- Yep.

- Okay.

- If you go like that.

- I don't know if four or five feet is good, it's on this side.

- Thank you. Anybody else wish to speak on this? Yes sir.

- My name is Kurt Boulanger, I'm the owner of the property. I guess there's a couple things that I'd like to go through. We originally were going to go on to the other side of the property. The CUP is Conditional Use Permit. Underneath your Act 67 Wisconsin law, you have to look at what the CUP is for, not what a personal preference. The building codes, the zones, those are two different things, so we're here asking for the CUP that we had approved on the one side of the building to be moved to the other side of the building. Some of the concerns were the neighborhood. When we take a measure point from the other side of the building to the closest house, it's approximately 130 feet to the house. On this side to this house that's right here, it is about 128 feet, couple feet different. I tried to meet with the city, I met with the alderman here, showed him some different things because if you remember, I'm the guy that also wants to buy the land up on the roundabout that the city planning feels is the gateway to the city. I own both properties on both sides of it. I've had these people, that house right there and the house next to it, were here last time. Under the Act 67, you can't listen to the consumer, if you will, not consumer, the people in the area, unless they can drastically show some kind of negativity. Same flip of the coin, Act 67 says, you have to actually look at not personal preferences, but is it someone that's trying to meet the codes, trying to do everything in their power to do what is necessary to comply? I've met with the alderman, I've got an email here from Wendy, reaching back out to me. It was dated the 21st of June. I replied on Monday the 25th, asking what her availability is that week to schedule a sitdown meeting. No response. Friday the 29th, Dave reached out to her asking what her availability is for the following week. No response. If I could actually sit down with these people, they might understand what we're trying to do is a little bit different than the normal car wash. The CUP that we had approved is a CUP with two conditions. One would be the timeframe and one would be that the facade of the building would remain the same. We are also looking to do a car wash that's different than what your typical car wash is. We're looking to do a car wash that has two sections of bays so you have a wash bay and you have a dry bay. In the dry bay, both doors can be shut while it's drying the vehicle, so that would also eliminate some of the noise concerns and that's why they put time restraints on it. But I can't even sit down with people because they've got their opinions. We came back and the fire's not an issue. It's now just a point of building code. Building code is not supposed to hamper under this act, the conditional use. I've been approved for it on the other site. There's nothing that stands out that makes it a significant impact than what was already approved. So I ask that you guys look at the business that I have there. This is supposed to be a Velp project, the gateway to the city. Don't you want my business to prosper? Don't you want to see more things there? Why wouldn't you guys let me buy that other property, do more things there, enhance the city, like you guys are pushing for? So all's I'm asking for is a fair shake. Follow not preferences, but follow what is right. That's all I'm asking for.

- One of the things that is of continuing concern to me is although there are neighbors currently who say that they are entirely in accord with your plan for the southeast side, there will be future neighbors there and I'm still concerned with how close the car wash is to that south east group of neighbors. You say that there's no more distance between the car wash and the closest neighbors there than there would be at the previously northwest side location. Could you put up the site plan again? Because looking at it, I'm having a lot of trouble understanding this.

- Yeah, so this is the grand finals, so this is where the car wash was previously approved, so if you go from here to that home, not the garage but the edge of the house, so that is about 130 feet. When I took it, I think I took it from right about here to the edge of that right there, not the garage, that was about 129. Of course it's going to be closer to the garage, but you're not living in the garage, not sleeping in the garage.

- Understood, I was actually comparing more.

- If you're going over here, I don't have that.

- No, yeah, I'm looking at the houses on the other side of Gray.

- You talking about that?

- No, way over there. Thinking about how far the northwest side car wash location was from that group of houses, because there're a whole bunch of them. They're quite a bit further from that northwest location than these houses on the southeast are from the southeast location. We're not just dealing with one house here, we're dealing with a neighborhood.

- I'm also composing something that's different, that's not out there. I'm proposing a longer car wash that has a wash bay system--

- Two different bays.

- It's from one room to the next room and there's three doors in there. And so when the dryers, the actual dryer, you sit in place and the dryer moves over back and forth, both doors shut. So the concerns are typically going to be noise. I think that would be everyone's concern.

- Noise and traffic. I mean, you still have the line of traffic going in.

- And so as far as noise goes, we can overcome that. As far as traffic, the city of Green Bay owns this property right here. In the beginning, they would take this knoll and drop it down in here. They stopped doing it only because I had to put a bump here. I had to put a bump here, I had to put a bump here, because cars would come off that roundabout, fly to Gray Street, and we literally had people walking out our back doors of the businesses almost getting dragged off. So truthfully, I don't really want to have too many traffic through that. If we can eliminate that, I have no problems with that.

- And I must say I really do appreciate your proposal of the one way traffic through there. I think that was a very smart idea and I do want to recognize that.

- Thank you.

- Is there anybody else that wants to speak on this? Ready?

- Sure. Sorry I'm late, I had a committee meeting. We took the staff too to find out all the objections because I'm not sure I quite understand. I mean, if this was a clean lot and someone came forward with a proposal for a strip mall that included a restaurant, a beauty salon, a gas station, mini mart, a liquor store, and a car wash, would we really say all the rest is good but not the car wash? It seems to me that the car wash adds value, it's going to help the owner, which is good, something that leads to the whole thing of prosper, and I'm not sure how it's detrimental to the neighborhood. I mean, if it was a new proposal with all those things together, I don't know that we'd say the car wash isn't a good idea. So to add it on now, I'm not sure why a car wash is a bad idea. That's what I want to hear, why is a car wash a bad idea? I think noise is a factor, but I think when we limited the hours and we've got this new design, that takes care of that. Concern about the fire lane, well, the fire could care less, that's not an issue, and then as far as traffic, directionally, I think that this actually makes it better and as far as the amount of traffic, well, it's a business. You're going to get traffic. I mean, it's going to be during business hours, so I don't know if the amount of traffic is really a concern either. So I'd really like to hear some reasons why this is a bad idea. To me, it just seems it's adding value. There is no car wash in the whole northeast to northwest side here. I can see when staff wanted this area here cleared for other development, because he wanted to put the car wash here, I can understand that argument, that argument makes sense, but I just don't understand why that's an issue. I haven't heard a reason yet that really makes sense to me why that's a problem. Seems like all the things that could have been problems have been addressed. Any time we can help a business be better, thrive, I think that's something we should do. Certainly we want to take concerns of the neighborhood, but I think this establishment altogether, from restaurant, beauty salon, the gas station, mini mart, alcohol, and car wash, I think it all adds value that the neighbors can appreciate. Calls I've gotten, there were a few against, more for. I kind of support it unless I can hear from staff another reason not to, and I haven't heard that yet.

- Thank you.

- Yes, Alderman Steuer.

- Thank you, Chair, I was just wondering, was there a preference study done in this area? You know, for this project, any kind of preference to it?

- No.

- No, okay. I'm looking at the map here, I view maps for a living, but I'm just looking, just the way you got it.

- Straight up's Atkinson Street from there.
- Okay, so you're south, correct?
- It was the old grocery store.
- The old grocery store. Because I think one of the concerns was maybe some of the traffic or some of the residential area to the south, if they'd be affected, and the fact that you're talking about a one way street.
- It's an existing complex, just looking to add a car wash.
- Okay then, I'm good.
- Okay, thank you. Does anybody else wish to speak? Anybody else? Hearing none, I'll close the floor. Any further discussion among-- Yes, Alderman, er, Commissioner Wiezbiskie? Sorry.
- You can call me Alderman. Actually, call me the mayor of the east side! I gotta agree with the alderman here. I'm sitting here thinking too, why are we picking on this guy? Are we back to the same old thing, we don't want to improve things? No, we don't want new things? We don't want to increase the taxes and make it more comfortable for the business operators who come to Green Bay and improve his business? Wow, I see nothing wrong with it. I think that he's addressed the issues at hand. He's changed the hours for running the car wash. I think that's a big thing for somebody to really try. The guy is almost bleeding his heart out, trying to improve his business, improve the taxation of the property, and help the city of Green Bay grow in the right direction. Without any further ado, I would make a motion to approve it.
- Thank you.
- Can I suggest two things, possibly?
- Yes.
- If you do consider approving, there should be some conditions that go along with it as previously approved on the west side, so you may want to consider that as well. Maybe to better explain the circumstance here again, maybe I didn't make myself clear, is the confusion for the motorists. It's not a traffic, it's not a volume issue, it's simply people considering going around the building for a shortcut or going a different direction. Their travel lane is drive-through, for the car wash. You can have one way traffic, I suppose, if you can physically constrain them, but cars coming this way, trying to get around the building, are going to be stuck here. They're going to try to go around this queue lane here, and possibly find another car or another object or something else that's going to be in the way where they just can't get around the building. The building is tight to begin with. The only issue staff has is to travel, and the confusion it's going to cause for motorists wanting to go around the building if they do. Just confusing, so that's our simple point about that. If you're going to consider conditions, I would revisit those conditions from the May meeting that include the west side car wash portion.
- Thank you. Okay, we have a motion, do we have a second?
- Okay, do we know what those conditions are that we should add those to the motion?
- Is that the hours and stuff again?
- The hours, the facade was part of that, like the transparency in the facade.
- One way street takes care of all your biggest issues we just brought up. Why aren't these conditions in here already?
- Because we didn't recommend approval of the request. You can have a one way direction, but again, you need to have a safety lane to get out of that traffic as well. So in essence, you're creating two one-ways out of it, so it creates confusion for the motorists who might be heading back towards Gray Avenue. Again, it's a very tight

area that's back there. Moving the building or backing off that space is good, but you can see that there's a shuttle bus that's parked there. I don't know how you're going to get around that parked vehicle.

- It's probably just going to get a cup of coffee.

- Right, but as a motorist who doesn't know that and you're trying to get around the building or get off the property, you're going to be stuck in a position. You might have a car coming directly towards you. You can sign it and can physically limit it, but it's going to be challenging for the motorist who just thinks, I want to just get around the building. That issue didn't really present itself on the west side. It was a different circumstance, it was a greater difference, greater separation.

- We're still looking for a second on our motion.

- Yeah, do you have a comment other than the second?

- Yeah, but I think we need to have a second so we know we have the motion on the floor.

- So we can have a discussion, okay. Is there a second to this motion? Then the motion dies for a lack of a second. Is there any further discussion? Yes, Commissioner Bremer?

- I do want to pick up the issue, that Alderperson Scannell raised. Number one, we're not talking about whether there should be a car wash or not. We already approved having a car wash, but it was a car wash in a different location, so the issue is the location. Quite honestly, I appreciate very much your double bays and the advantage that that's going to create, but I'm still hearing in the back of my mind the lengthy conversation about the location of the Kwik Trip car wash next to Festival Foods on University Avenue, where two homes were razed in order to get them out of the nearest space to that car wash. Clearly, the concern was not noise alone, it was noise plus lights plus traffic. Although you've managed the noise part of it nicely, the lights and the traffic are still a part of the deal, and the need for people to go around the back here despite your one way, so I do think Paul raises a good issue about confusion coming into the location. I also want to note, however, that I wish that you and the city had been able to work out the purchase of the property you originally wanted or some way of making that a possibility for you. Sorry about that.

- Thank you.

- I'm not, however, ready to make a motion to deny. So if somebody is?

- Okay, is there any further discussion?

- I have a question for staff.

- Commissioner Petrouske.

- As far as the restrictions we can place or the conditions we can place on this CUP, can we require that the land owner, in order to get the CUP, create one way traffic and install signage, or is that too restrictive?

- I think I can do that, but I don't know logistically if that still solves the issue of circulation. But doing that, sure you could do that.

- Thank you.

- If that is done, and an issue still occurs, then the onus would be on the property owner, would it not?

- Well, right, sure, but it's the responsibility, I guess, of the city, the staff. That's why we have off-street parking requirements to help avoid some of those potential situations. Will something happen, maybe, maybe not. It just doesn't seem like an appropriate situation.

- Commissioner Wiezbiskie?

- Would it be appropriate that we would vote on or make up these conditions and include it in my motion? Does that sweeten up the pot? I'm looking at something that's almost harassment for this person.
- Oh, come on.
- It's my opinion. I'd like to see him move on and do the things he's trying to do. Sounds like he's just trying to make these talks and he can't get anybody to talk. Don't know why, but.
- Perhaps Commissioner Wiezbiskie would prefer to provide some response to concerns that have been raised by other members of the commission? We are not harassing this gentleman.
- Okay.
- We'd like to sort our way through some things that we have some issues with.
- I agree that we already come up with some conclusions and how to improve it. Signage, one way street, hours regulated. I'm very sorry to get swept up in a bout of passion because I have been an alderman and I actually recognize the alderman for his opinion. I don't know if he's falling out. Have you learned that, yeah? Seems like we're just going back and forth here, you know.
- I learn something every day.
- Good for you.
- Yes?
- I think there's a path with getting conditions in there. What I think might be a little bit trouble to some is trying to get the conditions that match up with what we're trying to do. Putting a sign up that says one way doesn't necessarily stop somebody from entering that way, right?
- What could be done to make it almost, not impossible because there's no way, of course, how we're going to be able to dictate that. What kind of traffic county measures would we have to go through to really get to that point is what I think we have a little bit of trouble with. Seeing a sign is probably not going to be enough, so we're going to have to be very specific with the conditions if we do want to go that way.
- I've been thinking, perhaps is there some way to make some physical features, some potted trees or posts or something that would help?
- I just wonder if fire at that point, because you're stopping traffic from being able to go around then it's a fire hazard of some sort, because I was thinking pylons or something. If traffic's not supposed to go through there, just put pylons up, but.
- I wasn't so much thinking there as into the front end, because it seems like he was concerned about traffic.
- Coming off the road.
- Coming this way, so if we had some things out here to direct traffic this way and to make it clear that this way is not a way to be going. So it wouldn't be over here, it'd be over here, which is more open. I don't think that would necessarily block. If you have signage and some physical barriers that would attract the eye as well as give it--
- You see those semitrucks there. I don't know if the semitrucks need to be able to get around the building, too.
- Yeah, I don't know. Somebody still might go around it.
- We take our orders so far.
- And I don't think it wouldn't be so far up here or to be kind of more down here.

- I don't know that that would be--

- Yeah, I don't know.

- Those are all buildings proposed, so if we can get through that.

- Yes, Commissioner Petrouske?

- I want to get to a place where I can approve this for this business owner. I'm trying to think this out. You know, people, especially in driving, are creatures of habit. If we can create some, I guess, standardized lane demarcations beyond just the one way entrance signs, people tend to follow lane demarcations, so if we could somehow create some painted, for lack of a better word traditional lane demarcations entering from that roundabout, even though it's not technically a thoroughfare and it's not actually a thoroughfare for it, either, if traffic is utilizing it as a thoroughfare, why not get a little creative here, create some lane demarcation coming off the roundabout so people who are driving off it can see, well, the lane demarcation goes this way, so I must go this way. Any driver understands how a lane demarcation works. If the property owner is wanting to accommodate that type of condition, it's not a particularly high expense in my opinion to create some lane demarcations on the road or on the driveway leaving the roadway. I think the traffic 99% of the time is going to follow the lane demarcation because that's what we're trained to do as drivers. Does anyone else have any thoughts on that?

- Yes, you would think they would do that, but people don't always do what even common sense would dictate.

- Sure, I just don't think we can get to a perfect solution, but if we can get to a really good one that's going to deter them or guide, not deter but guide the vast majority of drivers into the way they're going to go. I work on a one way street on Jefferson. That doesn't mean people aren't driving the wrong way down the street all the time. We can't make it perfect, but if we can make it good, I think that that's a good solution.

- With signage that might point toward car wash that way, which is the opposite of what you would otherwise expect.

- That's a good point.

- Commissioner Miller.

- I guess what I get uncomfortable with now is none of us are traffic engineers, much less architects, and I don't want to be putting conditions in that I have no training to do in that regard. What's coming to me possibly is, is there some verbiage, some wordage we can put in there, in the condition that says it has to be, hits a certain threshold of signage or something that we can do without necessarily doing what somebody that's more qualified than us should be doing.

- We could have the conditions first of all that Paul had on the previous okay for this, adding on the requirement of the one way to which our owner has already agreed and a traffic plan that is deemed suitable by the planning department and the traffic department. There you've got your expertise. Doable?

- I think there should be two lanes of travel, of course, one going to the car wash and one that would go around, that queue lane as well. So I think you're going to have two lanes of traffic that you're dictating that that be one way traffic. This is my understanding, just to be clear. Because I think you still need to have vehicles be able to pass around those in the queue. Are there going to be many in the queue, maybe not. We require two at most.

- My major concern would be the issue... I lost it, Jake raised. That we need to have experts looking at this and figuring out what's necessary. The fire department has okayed this, and I appreciate that and I'm glad we tabled it so we know that information, but I am still concerned about, as you suggested, having people guided in the right direction, and I'm not sure you want to guide them back to there, that is to the corner of the car wash. I think you want them going around the whole darn building, coming out the car wash from the back, and that suggests the one way circulation, that is counterclockwise, but I don't know that because I'm not an expert. So Jerry, you want to add in the circulation pattern?

- I believe that if traffic engineers say you probably have the answer right away, I agree with the fact that we are not here to make decisions on traffic flow and patterns. I think that we do have the experts that can come up with an answer right away. The director of DPW probably will go, thank you, guys, just do it like this.

- Just the part of clarification, on the part of right of ways, a traffic engineer is involved. He also does review on-site issues, but this is a zoning requirement, not a building code issue, so this is our requirement and you can dictate the travel motion. If that's what you're after, you can certainly do that, staff or traffic can only get guidance from his profession.

- I would think that the owner would be very compatible with working it out.

- You don't have to dictate it, I think he's going to accept it just to move ahead. Hopefully.

- Probably avoid some possible accidents that way, if you can get that kind of... So Jerry, would you build that into your motion?

- Yes, I would.

- With approval of a circulation pattern?

- And proper signage or whatever. I've seen it where it gets so rash that they actually put spikes up in a different direction. I never did like the fact that they're coming off that roundabout and coming in there. What the heck is that, that seems like a...

- So we have a motion with the conditions you described.

- Just so I'm clear, pending approval from, did you say the zoning administrator and traffic engineer?

- Yeah.

- Is staff coupled, as well?

- I think instead of trying to design on the fly, yeah, okay.

- I second the motion.

- Okay, we have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? Hearing none. I ask that you cast your vote.

- And that did include the previous conditions?

- Yes.

- What is your vote?

- Huh?

- What is your vote?

- Oh, I haven't gotten it up. Yeah, we haven't gotten down here yet.

- Just call it in the first five minutes.

- All those in favor say aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion passes. Item three. Consideration with possible action on the request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit for a two-family home in a Low Density Residential District at 891 Howard Street, submitted by Adam Doyen.

- Thank you. This is a request to have a two-family home at a R1 zoning district, so as you guys are familiar, to have a two family home, it has to have a Conditional Use Permit. This property was previously used as a three family home under the grandfathering. It had lost occupancy for over 12 months and now there's a new owner who is going to take this unit from a three family to a two family, still requires a conditional use permit. With that, the Comprehensive Plan is pretty much a sea of yellow, indicates Low-Density Residential, and the zoning is all R1, which is the same kind of Residential. This is a Google street view of the property itself, so this is the driveway. They did get approval to build a garage in the back here, so there will be a garage in the rear. The lot is pretty solid. They can go to the court of appeals to have the impervious space reduced, so that has already been approved and taken care of, so this is the site plan that was provided. The home up here, again, this used to have the three units, this will be converted into a two unit. The drive is being redone. They'll have two parking cells in front of the garage, one for each unit, and then an interior lot for each of 'em. With this redo, a neighborhood analysis of 300 feet, so everything is kind of hard to see. That's outlined in the orange here. These parcels are all two family homes. Everything's that got the yellow marking over it is a multi-family. Usually those have up to four in this neighborhood and this is the subject property that we're discussing. With the neighborhood analysis, about 26% of the neighborhood is already a two or a multi-family, which is teetering on a request that we're going to look at, so we are recommending approval of this simply because it's always been used as either a two or a three family home and the new property owners are going forward with a substantial amount of work to this property. Previously, it kind of had a little bit of a nuisance property. There was always orders against it. The new property owner is putting in a lot of work for this property, so we think that this'll be a benefit to the neighborhood and it does fit in pretty well considering that immediately next to it, there's some multi-families, but there's a two-family that's very close to it. With that, we do have the standard commissions that they have to follow the rest of the municipal code and the UVC.

- Thank you.

- Oh, I'm sorry, I'm informed that there's an email that came in after our staff report. Somebody within the 200 foot notice area who is opposed to the request, citing some of the things that they are fixing through the renovation process.

- Thank you.

- Stephanie, just following up on your last comment there, have all of these issues been addressed that are in the email?

- Pretty much, there's some things that we don't really deal with, like if people are parking on the wrong side, usually certain section officials would have something to do with that. Some of these things are just between property owners, like pets going the wrong places, we can't really do that. But the parking, the green space, all those have already been taken care of either through the board of appeals or this process or through the site plan review that they're doing for the two family home.

- And how about the concern about adding to the density of the multiplex?

- That's what this analysis is supposed to take care of, so it's already been used as that, so it isn't technically adding anything. I could see that while it was vacant, I've seen less people in the neighborhood, but this isn't adding three more families, it's only adding two more, so we usually just try to do a percentage-based analysis and usually 30% is a pretty good mix for a neighborhood, so it's just under that at 26.

- Any discussion among staff?

- If anybody wishes to speak to this from the floor, I move to open the floor.

- We have a motion to open up the floor. Do we have a second?

- Second.

- We have a motion and a second to open the floor. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Thank you.

- Yes, ma'am?

- So we walk up there?

- Yes, if you would, please. And state your name and address, please.

- My name is Michele Salzsieder and I live at 908 Howard Street. I've lived there for about 25 years. I grew up in this neighborhood and I oppose this because we have been revitalizing our neighborhood with the Seymour Park Neighborhood Association. You can say that it's going, yes, from a three family down to a two family, but when you have a two family where one's in the front and one's in the back, the one in the front technically uses the front yard as a playground and it looks terrible. The person may be having great intentions of fixing it up and doing a great job and everything, then they turn around and they sell it, and so then you have somebody else that owns it and they don't care about who they are renting to. I live in this neighborhood, I'm invested in this neighborhood, I will be living in this neighborhood until I die, and I really don't think that having this and I don't really think the percentages really matter. Think about how you are living across from a house like this and you're sitting on your front porch and you're watching and you're seeing cars that make loud noise and toys and junk all over the front yard and in and out renters and whatever have you. And I've had my issues with a lot of different owners out in the gray one, the really big one next door, and actually went and talked to that person and said, "You know, I live across the street. "Would you like to look at your house?" The person who was fixing this, would they live across the street and want to look at this house? No, you wouldn't want that. You wouldn't want that in your neighborhood. We are trying to rezone this where it's single family so you get them to be more single family so you can get more people that want to invest in this neighborhood. Nobody is going to invest in a neighborhood that has a lot of rentals. I have fought other ones and succeeded to get them to be two families. They've been illegal three families in the neighborhood so people are already sliding under this so our percentages is up without your knowledge. I've raised my kids in this neighborhood. It's a great family neighborhood. We just have to promote it as a great family neighborhood and it's not when you have rentals. It just is a problem and when you change the zoning, I wish you would keep that when it changes to a single family that it doesn't get the conditional use. That's how I feel.

- Thank you.

- Yes, sir?

- Can I speak?

- I'm Adam Doyen and I'm the new owner of the property. I own 11 rental properties. My basic goal is to pave the whole driveway, build a garage, clean up everything. New windows, new doors, I mean, the sandbagging here looks pretty crappy. The biggest concern I got is the two houses. There's no way to transfer between them. The front one's got five bedrooms, two bathrooms, the back one's got two bedrooms, one bathroom. There's a big firewall, like one was built in a certain age and then the other one was built afterwards. There's no way to make it one family. It's almost impossible unless we bulldoze one part of it. So I'm invested into this neighborhood also, put a lot of money into it. This whole back is all gravel. I'm going to plant all grass there, putting up a fence, make it all nice. I had an uncle in one two blocks down, and I've been there since I was a kid. That's the reason I bought in this neighborhood, and I do want to clean it up. That's the reason I bought it. Thank you.

- Thank you. Yes, sir?

- Josh Kufahl, I'm 900 Howard. We have lived, Lee, my wife and I lived there for five years. I've lived in the neighborhood for about 12. I can tell you these multi-family houses are where all the problems end up coming from. This house currently has been a disaster for the five years we've lived there. There's a two bedroom right

here and also constantly are two families. I think it might even be a three right now. Constant every six, nine months, landlords kicking them out. I mean, it's constant problems. People are running from this house to this house when it was around, to that house. I think the multi-families in that area just end up being a lot more trouble and it's partially because of that neighborhood. As Michele had said earlier, there's a lot of good things that have been happening in there. I think if we continue to look at multi-families in there, we're taking down people like me who want to invest in that neighborhood in single families. I don't want to be listening to loud cars every day, I don't want junk out on the street, and I understand he's got a plan to fix it and everything else, but we've seen that with the one next to us, we've seen that with the one across. They fixed it up, six months later, it's demolished and they're back to square one. That's kind of what happens in that area. With that being said, I would pretty much not like that, having two families in there. Thank you.

- Thank you. Does anybody else wish to speak? Hearing none, we will close the floor. Discussion among staff? I will state that if this were a single family, and they wanted to convert it to a two family, I would probably be opposed to it for the reasons that have been stated, but this has historically been a two family. It's always been a two family or a three family. It was built as such. That's what it has always been. The fact that there are other multi-families in the neighborhood, for better or for worse, that's the way it is. So it is my inclination to support this request.

- Excuse me, but it's being sold as a one family online.

- No, it's several, it always was, but it's a two family and it's being requested to continue to be a two family. I would be inclined to support this request. Commissioner Bremer.

- I think I will also be voting in favor of the request, but I want to note two things. First of all, we are in an economic situation where more and more people need roofs. We do not have very much affordable housing and I want to confirm that it is the case that we hear here at the Planning Commission over and over that people who are in neighborhoods with a lot of rentals have a lot of trouble with the folks who are in those rental properties. Your proper recourse is number one, your courage in addressing somebody directly, and reminding them that you are a neighbor and that you have to look at their house. The other one is to call the city and submit a complaint, because that is the way the operations work as far as controlling misuse of property. So with that in mind, I do think that moving from three to two is an improvement and I appreciate the work that's already been done by the owner here.

- Thank you. Any further discussion? Yes, Commissioner Miller?

- Just bouncing off what Sid said, it is unfortunate your neighborhood has had some issues and there are ways to handle that, but we cannot hold back the property owner from improving the property and getting it to a better situation than it was before. Hopefully the renters that are in there next time are going to be better neighbors to you, but there's nothing that can really hold them back from doing that, so I will also support.

- One other, if I might add, we're talking about a landlord who lives in the area as well and who has made a commitment to that area. I have a sense that he will be looking for good tenants. I certainly hope that's the case.

- Thank you. Yes, Commissioner Hanson?

- I don't want to discount the neighbors' feelings toward this. I live actually a pretty quick jog away from here over on Allard. I drive down all the time and I pass this area, and I know that Howard is really, I feel like on the upswing. As a landlord myself who owns properties that were single family that had been converted before we owned it, I don't go in and try to fix it with the idea that I'm going to rent to people who are going to trash it. Like Commissioner Bremer was saying, if you have issues with the neighbors, contact the city, see if that's something that they're out of compliance with, because no one wants to have bad neighbors, but at the same time, we are short on rental properties in the city and we are short on apartments, so I would support the approval of this as well.

- Commissioner Wiezbiskie?

- This comes from an ex-landlord. It's the very reason why I got out of there. Got rid of all the holes, basically. I think the good side of this thing is that it's a three family going to a two family. Normally, it's been the history of

this planning commission to get back to a one family as soon as we can clean it up. As far as people not taking care of the properties and things like that, there is a system set up with the city where you can report them. I would encourage anybody that has any problems with properties that are not being kept clean, torn up, whatever. Your first process might be right through your alderman and you have an excellent alderman who has just gotten elected for that district. Colin, tell him what's going on. I almost promise you, that guy is going to respond and get things straightened up.

- We've had some problems in the last 30 years there.

- Yeah. When I was an alderman, basically, I had areas cleaned out on the east side of it, just as bad as, if not worse. I had to get after him and sometimes you go back and do it yourself. It's the aldermen that say hey, this isn't going to fly. But you do have the city behind you and you have legal behind you to not put up with that condition. Start with your alderman and try that. I'm sure that you can make amends. As far as changing the whole neighborhood to single family, I think that's a insurmountable chore to ever switch up all the orders to a single residence. Nice to do it if you could, but I think you just try to clean up what you have there, basically. Make it more pleasant. I think you're getting more top grade people in there, probably. Hopefully this gentleman who plans on doing what he's saying, but he's going to do it. I think you're headed in the right direction. The very fact that he lives there, he must have met a lot of you, so pretty well fed up with everything. He starts buying these houses, but--

- I see the logic endowed.

- Well, more power to you for being a landlord, man. That's all I got to say.

- Okay, thank you. Commissioner Petrouske?

- I move to approve the proposal for all the reasons that my fellow commissioners have stated.

- I'll second that.

- Okay, we have a motion and a second to approve the recommendation. Any further discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor confirm to say aye.

- [All] Aye. Opposed? Recommendation passes. Item four, consideration with possible action on a request to consider an amendment to the previously approved Conditional Use Permit for a shelter facility in an Office Residential district located at 1660 Christiana Street, submitted by a Joel Ehrfurth, Mach IV Engineering and Surveying, on behalf of House of Hope, Green Bay Incorporated.

- Hey, Mr. Chair, this is a request to amend a previously approved conditional permit, Conditional Use Permit from 2014. A single property at 1660 Christiana Street, it's this one big property here, Shawano Avenue, Perkins, Christiana actually is here, the front of the building is on Christiana. The request is to expand the use, the shelter use there under the Conditional Use Permit and to coming back for that review. They were able to acquire a few different parcels here, 1667 Shawano, which is a single family home, and 1776 Christiana, I believe, which is a former CVRF and kind of a campus-sized area, about an acre and a half in size, so to speak. The Comprehensive Plan recommends Medium Intensity Retail Office or Housing in this area, so this use is consistent with that. Back in 2014, we did two things. We did a rezoning to Office Residential, to include several parcels in here, including the House of Hope property. We also did that initial Conditional Use Permit at that time, as well. So this is a recent site plan of the area. Shawano Avenue on the top, Perkins, Christiana. The original shelter facility is right here. The single family home that they picked up, this here, will now become a parking lot. The former CVRF which they acquired will now be connected with the building in between, between those two structures, so again, it's an expansion. They need to amend the Conditional Use Permit and have come forward to do so. We've notified affected property owners, we haven't received any calls or questions regarding this and staff is recommending approval of the item subject to those conditions that are attached within the agenda.

- Thank you.

- Move to open floor.

- Seconded.
- We have a motion and a second to open the floor. All those in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? Is there anybody that wants to speak on this item?
- I'm here from Mach IV. If you have any questions, I can answer them, but don't have any other comments on this.
- Thank you. Are there any questions for the representative? No, thank you. Anybody else wish to speak? Okay, then.
- Motion to close the floor.
- Motion to close the floor, do we have a second?
- Seconded.
- Motion to approve.
- We have a motion to approve, do we have a second?
- Seconded.
- We have a motion and a second to approve the recommendation. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of the request say aye.
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? Recommendation passes. Item five, consideration with possible action on a request to consider an amendment to the previously approved Conditional Use Permit for a shelter facility in an Office Residential District located at 411 St. John Street to permit a temporary summer shelter use, submitted by Alexia Wood, St. John's Shelter.
- Hey Mr. Chair, this is another request to amend a previously approved Conditional Use Permit, that's for St. John's Homeless Shelter. This facility has a current CUP. It runs on a three year cycle at this point. That approval will end on November first of this year. This is an amendment to their operating plan which their operation typically is a six month window. It's from November one to April 30th. Into that April 30th time frame, they finally had some additional guests who had no place to go. So there was some attempts to work with other churches throughout the community and relocate some of these individuals and these guests to those facilities. It caught the attention of our fire marshal, who was very concerned about the housing arrangements. These churches had gym facilities, maybe classroom spaces. They were literally just to provide shelter, but it still provided an issue for our fire marshal and our staff, so we met with the applicant and we talked through some of the issues. The shelter is vacant during the summer months. We felt this was the appropriate location. This is an approved facility for up to 84 individuals, I believe. It's a facility that can handle a short term use like this, so this is a limited basis and conditions are kind of reflected with that. This is very similar to the original COTS program. This is a floor plan of the part of the former school. It'd simply be using the gymnasium portion of that building with limited facilities, basically providing basic shelter for these months up until November 1. We have notified affected property owners, we've received a few calls, but we haven't received any objections to this request, so we are recommending approval of the items subject to these standards here. This is kind of an abbreviated list that you might have seen previously on the original CUP approval. These are the conditions that we're recommending for approval.
- Thank you. Yes, Commissioner Bremer?

- Paul, the recommendation refers to a limitation of 30 beds. What is the reason for that?
- I think that kind of stems from the letter from the applicant. They talked about 27 individuals, we just gave them a little rounded number to work with.
- So based on the applicant's list.
- They indicated 27. We felt that was just an appropriate number.
- Thank you.
- So are all these conditions also part of the winter months as well?
- The winter months are probably a little bit longer. This is just customized to the summer and fall months, basically, but it really kind of narrows some of those conditions that we've seen before.
- Are there any here that are new?
- The only thing that is new is probably the last one and that was a request from the fire marshal, that they have building plans available. I don't think there were any other changes that I can see.
- Apart from the 30 bed maximum, again.
- Right, that changed the hours of operations, I'm sure.
- Is this the identical facility that has 84 bed capacity in the wintertime?
- It is, yes. The applicant is here and can better speak to how they utilize the structure, but you can see the areas that are crosshatched, those would not be the line, it'd strictly be in the gym facility, and the fire marshal did ask that it not be on the second floor of the structure, so it's limited just to the gym, the former gym.
- Is that because they still want the winter months? This restriction that you just mentioned.
- I believe they utilize that for other uses, other programming. I need to ask them regarding how it's fully...
- We can ask the director.
- Any further discussion?
- Motion to open the floor.
- Second.
- We have a motion and a second to open the floor. All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? Does anybody wish to speak on this? Yes, ma'am.
- All right, good evening. My name is Alexia Wood, I'm the executive director for St. John the Evangelist Homeless Shelter as well as the Micah Center, so you will be seeing us as Paul mentioned here in a couple months regarding our permit for the seasonal shelter, but tonight speaking specifically to COTS. So St. John's started 13 years ago to meet the need of individuals that were left without shelter options in the harsh winter elements due to either a long waiting list or eligibility criteria, and so I've been with the organization now for six years. We've certainly seen growth, both in our operations and as well as the need, and in the letter that I'd enclosed that Paul sent out with the packet, we speak to certainly the need that exists when our doors close April 30th. April 30th of 2017, we saw nearly 40 individuals who had no place to go when our shelter doors closed. The reality certainly homelessness exists beyond the six months of operation that St. John's is able to

meet that need, November through April. This year, we spent a year and a half intensively looking at addressing that summer need. Certainly it's been a topic of conversation for 13 years, but as you may know, we have lost four homeless individuals in a year's time to the streets to sometimes preventable causes, and so the two that had occurred in May of 2016 as well as May 2017, individuals had sought refuge from the elements in places not meant for human habitation and then tragically passed away. And so our proposal for COTS, utilizing the church model, is simply to provide a safe place to sleep at night. All supportive services continue at the Micah Center at our year-long daytime resource center. So in those conditions that were listed, one other change from the typical shelter season, the shelter, our hours of operation are 5 p.m. to 9 a.m. Here, we are simply looking to provide safe sleeping, just access to safety in whether it's heat, rain, thunderstorms, extreme cold in May and October as well and so looking to operate 9 p.m. to 6:30 a.m. They come in, they simply put down a mat, they wake up in the morning, they do their chores and they depart. Again, meals, case management, showers, hygiene items, all of that are provided over at our Micah Center location. And so much of that information I outlined in the letter to Paul that I know again was sent out to you guys with the proposal to move it on-site from the recommendations from the Green Bay fire department and the Green Bay police department. It provides a one-location access point for those two entities, so first should the fire department respond to a need for a paramedic, they know exactly where to go, they're familiar with the facility, they know the facility has all the building and fire code things in place and then for the police department, they are our primary referral source. They find individuals living on the streets at night and with so many patrol officers. They also, and I believe it's included in your packet as well that the letter from Officer Van Handel to have one location to know where to bring individuals when they're running across somebody on the streets in the middle of the night and instead of spending hours of law enforcement time trying to find a resource and referral for those individuals. So what we are proposing here is simply to use the gym space and then this is our women's harm reduction site in the shelter season, and then extending down to the bathrooms. The spot that's marked off on the first floor that's kind of accounted for there, that is utilized during the shelter season. Those are our programming space, our sobriety room, our preliminary, our women's programming area, but again, looking at simply providing access to safe overnight shelter in the summer months, just looking to limit similar to what a fellow would offer in a local parish. Just some stats on what we've seen so far with the church model here this summer, it's been in operation now for exactly 10 weeks, so 70 nights of shelter. We've served 144 different individuals since April 30th with 1007 nights of shelter, so certainly a need, and yet our average length of stay is just under a week and our average nightly guest is 14 and so this is not a long term housing option. This is not a housing program, this is emergency shelter until we can connect people with more appropriate resources and long term supports, and so the reality is these individuals need access to safe housing. We just heard about the lack of rental properties, lack of affordable housing for individuals living on a fixed income. We see that every year on April 30th, we also see it November first when our doors open, sometimes, and I will speak to that bed capacity, we are optimistic that our average nightly count has fallen between about 10 and 16 a night with that average nightly count of 14. We are somewhat concerned with what October could bring as the temperatures start to drop because we see that need November first. But again, we've worked with the police department, we've worked with the fire department, we met with the staff here at city hall to come up with a plan that ensures that all of our homeless neighbors, homeless brothers and sisters have a safe place to go 12 months a year while also respecting the guidelines that were set forth in our original Conditional Use Permit as well. So with that, I will open it up for questions. Yes, sir?

- Ignore the number 30 for a moment. What's your safe maximum capacity for COTS under this design?
- This design could comfortably, between the gym floor and then that woman's facility right there as well, I would say comfortably 55 to 60 could be housed there.
- Under the building code, it could go to 84. There's a maximum capacity, it could be done.
- And the building code, that 84 would certainly account for the three additional programming spaces. Those have beds and living space and all of that. It's on an application process so it's not that we consistently have a ratio of the census, but we're looking to move people into those programming spaces and then the ebbs and flows of the gym floor are dependent on that during the winter.
- Commissioner Bremer.
- So then to follow up, since you had 40 people who were homeless at the end of April--

- Correct.

- Why did you not request more than the 30 that's being recommended here, actually less than the 30.

- Well, and our number did not request the number. I believe Paul inferred from the fact that I referenced the individuals and I have the exact number in here, that on April 30th of this year, 27 individuals did not have access to safe housing the following night.

- It's arbitrary.

- But again, the reality is it's not that we're providing access to safe shelter for those 27 individuals for six months, the average length of stay is a week, but we are seeing, and I shared in the letter, Green Bay Police Department had come across in the west side of Green Bay a 93 year old man that had been evicted and homeless and simply due to some memory concerns with his age could not grasp that he was evicted and it was somebody we had no prior history with, so we're receiving new referrals through police department. Those numbers could ebb and flow, certainly we could see the need for that number to be higher than 30, I'd say May, October. Right now, our nightly average is sitting at 14 and we're not trying to draw additional individuals in but we're trying to meet the need of anybody that would otherwise be on the streets of Green Bay and whatever that need is.

- And that's the nightly average using the COTS, rotating locations?

- Yes.

- Which I presume would make it more difficult for people to locate housing.

- At times. We market the location in different ways, but I would say the church model, the rotating church model which was also our attempt to include the wider Green Bay area in the conversation and not concentrated on the downtown Green Bay area. With that came some concerns with transportation, and so we saw the dip, for instance, we were at a church in Howard a couple weeks ago. Those numbers certainly decreased. It doesn't mean that the need decreased for that week but simply the lack of access, that having it in one location, having it in the location that the homeless in this community are familiar with could drive those numbers up somewhat and yet we are very cognizant of the fact that this is safe sleeping and so for an individual to come in and have a mat on the floor and simply have sleeping arrangements from 9 p.m. to 6 a.m. with the requirement to leave, we have not found people certainly looking to overstay their welcome, but they are grateful to have that option when they have no other options available.

- I'm presuming that you have some staff limitations too. I know you rely very heavily on volunteers and during summertime with vacations and all that's probably a lot harder to manage in large numbers. Given what you can reasonably expect for staffing and what you think you might expect for people in need, what number would you put out there?

- In this model, we do not rely on volunteers. These are trained staff, these are year round staff that are very familiar with the needs related to mental health, chronic homelessness, trauma, so they are all paid staff overnight. I would have a hard time picking a number because we have not offered this service before. What I can tell you is November first of last year, we had 42 people present for shelter and within a few days that number had risen quite significantly and so certainly there is a need for individuals with significant mental health. There is not a desire to be in close community at times with others when they feel safe living independently and in isolation and so we see thunderstorms driving numbers up, we see extreme heat, we see extreme cold temperatures. If I had to guess what the numbers more realistically would look like, those last two weeks of October, as the evening temperatures start to dip, I would guess that this number will more likely be in the mid to upper 40s and again, we are doing all we can to attach individuals to services and as I speak in that letter as well about our efforts to really decrease the number of homeless, the number of people seeking shelter period at any of the local shelters in town by attaching them to more permanent options, we are hopeful that COTS accounts for individuals sooner that we can have them in housing options prior to November first. So my optimistic belief is we'll attach with them in July, August, September, and have them attached to housing that they're not needing shelter in October and November. Based on temperatures and based on historic data, I would say perhaps upper 40s is what we'd see those last few nights of October.

- I'm asking the questions because I've been impressed by how well managed and how increasingly well managed over time the major shelter program, the winter shelter program has been and I don't want to set you up for failure. You know, one possibility is simply to increase those numbers up to something that's closer to what you think the demand might be within your capacity of staff, and I think you said 50-something from the fire department as far as what this part of the building could handle.

- The fire department has no bearing. It would be us from an operation standpoint when I threw up the number earlier.

- And the number was 54?

- I believe 55 to 60.

- So that's one possibility. The other is simply to encourage you to let us know if you need to increase the numbers, but I'm inclined to do it ahead of time. Paul, can you see any reason not to?

- No, we tore it to the Plan Commission to decide.

- Because if we passed it for 30, you would have to come back here if you wanted to increase it, correct?

- We could, we don't police it that closely, but yes.

- They'd sure like the record to show that they had.

- Right, and our current model in the winter, as it's well known that we do not operate with capacity, we have the building capacity of 84, which we hold fast to, and yet when that number exceeds 84, we do not turn guests over 85 away because again as the shelter of last resort, we understand we'd be turning them out to the streets in some harsh winter elements and so we have the overflow plan with local churches that the police department and fire department are aware of but given the fire department's recommendation to not utilize the churches as heavily that aren't up to fire code, for this model, it would be interesting for us to cap low and then have to use churches as overflow if the entire reason we're here tonight is to move out of the churches and into the main facility. Any other questions for me?

- Yeah.

- For me?

- So with your staff, would you be comfortable at 55 for this program?

- Yes, if the need presented and our numbers were at 55, we would staff accordingly and we would feel comfortable staffing for that. Is that it?

- That's it.

- Okay, thank you.

- Would anybody else wish to speak? Yes, ma'am.

- I'd like to speak. If you could go back to that first picture you had with the property, I own all this property next to the buildings. I'm called continuously for robbery, vandalism, people sleeping in my bushes. It never ends. I think that you're offering them to come back down there. If they're too drunk to get into the building or whatever's wrong with them, they're sleeping on my property. The police have to come, take them, wring them over. I don't think any of it's a great idea because I don't think it's organized as well as N.E.W. Shelter, but I know that that's a far reach from what they both are, but I feel that in the last 12 years, I've never been able to even rent my property, so it's a burden on me financially, and trying to get people out of my bushes, and I'm trying to help them find something. I don't think that it's more like a warming shelter. They're not progressively helping these people get to where they need to go because maybe they can't, but I think that doing this, talking about the

historical downtown neighborhood, that's why I bought all the buildings, to preserve them, and I can't. So I'm out a half a million dollars and it's a financial burden on me, so I recommend that maybe some of you drive around and go down there and go into the shelter and see what's going on there, and you'll be surprised. It's not what you think. I have a guy living in the bushes right now who can't get right off. He's got a really great setup. I tried to talk him into going. It's something that downtown Green Bay doesn't need. With all this change downtown, I think that taking some of these, they've taken all these buildings down now because no one will even rent them. If you notice when you go down Monroe Street a lot of buildings are gone now because you can't rent them because they're panhandling, they're drunk, it's ridiculous. But if they could get something to keep them coming to the right place or get it going correctly, I think maybe St. John's could have something going on, but I don't think they have the manpower and it's a very hard skill. But I don't feel, being a taxpayer, that I need to keep it going for myself, because I can't even give the property away. I can't even get rented for free. As a homeowner and trying to preserve the buildings, I'm kind of in a stalemate, so I would like you to consider it because I've done this since 2005, asking for help to stop this, creating it to getting it bigger and bigger and bigger. I'm just afraid something terrible will happen down there if maybe things aren't done correctly and you keep it open through the summer. I don't know, I'm not skilled in that area, but for the way it looks and how the whole around, it doesn't look great for downtown Green Bay. You know, my buildings, I try to do the best I can, keep them up. It's hard when you have people living in your bushes, and the police are there four times a week, so I'd like you to consider that, too. Thank you.

- Yes, sir?

- Thank you.

- Good evening, my name is Jim O'Neil. Ma'am, we don't know each other, it's nice to meet you.

- Yeah, you're on the other side, yes.

- I own the property right here, 403 South Jefferson Street. My wife and I bought the property when the homeless shelter was already established, so we knew what we were getting ourselves into. It is interesting to hear your perspective and I respect your perspective, but I will tell you, but for you making those statements--

- Could you address the--

- Oh, sure, I'm sorry. What I was going to tell her, the commissioners here is, I've been impressed with what I've seen in the downtown area. Now, I don't live at that building, but I work there. It's Randallton and Test. I spend most of my time downtown at that building, but in the sense of what I've seen are young families pushing baby strollers and lots of activities. Now again, the shelter is my neighbor and I support the shelter. That's the other thing, I don't want to say I'm biased, but I've also taken the position that the shelter is there and it's not going away, so what I decided a couple years ago was to start volunteering at the shelter. Right now, I'm the chair of the board of trustees for the shelter, so we oversee Lexi and the day to day operations and so the COTS program and the summer program and getting all the volunteer churches and all those things squared away. Those are all things I can attest to were well vetted by the board of trustees and by Lexi and the staff coming up with this plan. I can understand why the city came back and said, "well, wait a minute you guys, "you got a shelter that's sitting vacant for the summer. "Let's not move people around unnecessarily, "let's not create potential hazards and safety concerns, "let's utilize the shelter during the summer." So again, that's a proposal that we as a board of trustees have dealt with and now support what is now being presented. And I think from a numbers standpoint where you're talking about the numbers from 30 to 50+, those kinds of things, again, those are discretionary numbers and we would certainly appreciate that but I will say this: it's a shelter of last resort. I'm not critical of comments against the shelter. I wish someday that we'd be here someday asking for a rezoning to make it into something else other than a shelter. But it's not going away. In other cases before, this evening even, the concept of low-income housing. It is, it's in shortage in downtown Green Bay. We've seen, just within the last six months, this house went down, the house by it, newcomers, the funeral home went down, the house by Davis went down. And again, I get it, but I look at those houses now, my perspective has changed. I look at every house that's destroyed in downtown Green Bay and I'm thinking, there goes another opportunity for low-income housing. So again, that's not what we're dealing with today, but I just, this evening, would say first of all as a landowner there, yeah, there's issues with the shelter in the sense of the type of people that we're serving, but I can assure you that if we turn on our backs on these, the problem doesn't go away. And the staff that I've seen at that shelter and the volunteers is amazing. It is amazing. I would encourage all of you to visit

the shelter, whether it's during the summer season or certainly selfishly I'll say from November through April when we have volunteers. It's in my opinion a well-organized and structured shelter that are dealing with people that hopefully none of us have the issues that they're dealing with. I would just say from my perspective as a landowner downtown I support this change and would welcome it, and also as a volunteer at the shelter I would assure you that all of us, from the board of trustees to all the volunteers are committed to running that shelter in a manner that is respectful to people who are in desperate need. The volunteers and the shelter staff do the best they can, so I thank you for your time and attention.

- Thank you. Yes, sir?

- I'm Bob Arnold, I'm not a citizen of the city of Green Bay, I live in Ashwaubenon, but I am on the board of trustees and the treasurer for St. John the Evangelist Homeless Shelter. I volunteer there and I support that organization because I think as a community we have an obligation to all of our citizens and where some people might think, St. John the Evangelist Homeless Shelter is a problem, we're actually a solution to a greater problem within the community. I support it and I would encourage you to grant the Conditional Use Permit amendment. Thank you.

- Thank you. Is there anybody else that wishes to speak? Hearing none, I'll close the floor. Any further discussion?

- I believe the alderman's going to--

- Oh, Alderman Scannel.

- You don't need to floor for me, though.

- Well, technically we do.

- As an alderman?

- Yes.

- But anyways. This is in my district and I've been involved with St. John's and the Micah Center for a long time and I think Lexi does a fantastic job. It's a difficult job. I think the city has failed you, if you're having those problems, we need to do something as a city to help you. As a community, we have failed people who are homeless. They are not getting the services they need, and that is not St. John's fault, that's all our faults. They're doing the best they can with the clientele they have, but some of those people need greater resources than what are being provided in there. Until that happens, we're going to have problems, and if St. John's went away, that problem would just be... They'd still be in bushes. They'd still be in your bushes. No one should be living on our streets and no one should have to sleep out, no matter what the weather. For a while, it was an emergency shelter and the cold was the main, because you could easily die from exposure, but as we've learned, the heat and getting away from thunderstorms, no one should have to live in those conditions. I fully support this as again an emergency shelter until we can get people the services they need and into permanent housing, which should be our goal as a community that we're all working towards. That's a bigger than a city problem, bigger than certainly a planning commission's problem, but we can all do our little part and in this, it's giving people a place to go year round. No one should be on our streets.

- Thank you. Yes, Alderman Steuer?

- Thank you, chair and committee. I'll make it brief. I was involved pretty heavily in this issue back in 2012, '13, and '14, if you remember. I kind of came to the conclusion that a city, your city will be viewed not only with what the haves do have, but what the have-nots do not have. I just remember going in a homeless town some years ago. We were on the river and we found a john out in a cardboard box on the river, next to the river I should say. And we woke him up and he got up startled, and he said, "I got to get to work," and I remember going, I just, it blew my mind, for lack of a better description. I think, one thing that came up today, and being alders here and I work in the planning office for 25 years, and just understanding the need for housing. There is a lack of low-income housing. There's talk over on the Larson Green property of having some of it level housing, and people are like, "Oh my lord, now what?" But we really have to address that, so that's another, bigger issue, but this is

part of the problem that we're having now, because we don't have areas to go. We spent a lot of time trying to find our resource center, let's remember, and we were stymied on a couple occasions. I won't go into all the detail on that, but, and I understand your problems, too. I really do, I think we need to address those accordingly as well, but under the circumstances, I do support this. Thank you.

- Is there anybody else wishing to speak? Again, close the floor. Any further discussion? Commissioner Petrouske?

- I'm in a position to disclose, again, I'm a shareholder of the firm at 14 South Jefferson Street immediately across the street from St. John's. We've had no problems and I think it's interesting to talk about the problem as people sleeping under the bushes. Well, this is the solution. If there's someplace better for them to sleep, they're not sleeping in the bushes, and I think that's what the shelter's offering. A person sleeping on a cot in a shelter is safer, a. For themselves but b. For the community, so I would move to approve the proposal, but amend it to remove the maximum restriction. I trust St. John's to operate their facility accordingly.

- Thank you. Any further discussion?

- I'll second the motion.

- Was that a motion?

- It was.

- Randy here?

- Yes.

- Just based on the capacity of the building, it's not unlimited, but it's--

- Within the restrictions of building codes.

- Okay, we have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Recommendation carries. Item six, consideration with possible action on a request to create a Planned Unit Development for the development of an apartment campus at 1060 Gray Court, submitted by Jon LeRoy, Mau and Associates on behalf of Gerald and Gloria Bigelow, property owners.

- Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is going to seem very, very familiar to you. Much like the compound amendment you had tonight, this is actually step two in the process, where you saw the step one earlier. So just to fill in, familiarize yourselves with the property again, but a 98 part parcel in between North Buchanan, you have Gray Court here, this is Atkinson leading up to the highway. This is the car wash location right down here. So in March and June of this year, Mr. LeRoy and Mr. Bigelow came through to request a compound amendment for this site that's outlined in red. I'll give you a quick brief. We have warehousing on the north and the west. It's a single family home and some home sales as well as auto sales on the self, then leading into the sort of mixed-use neighborhood and then industrial cell tower on the east. So in March and June of this year, the petitioners came forward and had a Comprehensive Plan amendment so what you see here, the property's outlined in black. So the frontage on Velp remained Commercial, also that wrapped around over to the east, there's some Industrial on the west side, and then the core up on seven with the nine acres, and the center of this site was changed to Medium-High Density housing, primarily to support a six 12-unit apartment building campus with sort of a pot in the middle and I'll show you the site plan in a second. The zoning out here is all General Industrial, so even though the Comprehensive Plan recommends Commercial, and some now Medium-High Density, the zoning remains General Industrial. It's looking to be a little bit different. If you notice, I'm going to go back to this site. When we came through with the comp plan amendment, the Velp Avenue area-wide redevelopment plan showed this area to remain Commercial, to be sort of a large Commercial site and then also the frontage along Velp to stay Commercial. In order to do that, the petitioner willingly sort of cut off this parcel to just fit his development project. And then to the west is where his existing Industrial is. To do a straight zoning

would be difficult because as you can see, once that sort of brownish color is split from the rest of the parcel, there's no street frontage, so that becomes problematic. Also, the remnants on the south and east side are too small for a real redevelopment so the solution we came forward with is to do a Planned Unit Development over the top of the property, the property lines remain the same, but the area gets divided up into three sub areas so here are A, B, and C. Area A is the portion that's on North Buchanan. It's currently used for truck trailer storage and some warehousing. Petitioner would continue to do that there, so all the uses in Area A would be General Industrial and it would follow that zoning even though it's under a planned development. Area B would have an R3 designation and the Planned Unit Development, and then Area C would at this time be limited to only access over the top of it to get to the Area B until such time that it can be attached to neighboring properties and make a larger developable site. That point, it would fall into a C1 use category, use and dimensional regulations and all regulations. So to kind of familiarize yourself with this again, this was the 12 unit apartment complex, comes in off of Gray Court. The driveway was specifically designed in a manner that Gray Court could be vacated and come straight in, thereby making a sort of large developable site here and then allowing the Commercial to remain on Velp and then as you can see what's shown in gray there would be the existing truck storage on the west side which we continue to use with that. With all that being said, we are recommending approval of the Planned Unit Development request subject to the draft that's in your packet.

- Thank you. Any discussion? I believe we have entered us a 30s, so to speak.

- Motion to open the floor.

- Second.

- We have a motion and a second to open the floor. All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Yes, ma'am?

- Hi, I'm Deb Hamilton, I'm president of the Mather Heights Neighborhood Association and also a neighbor. I live about nine blocks that way, actually, square blocks that way. I'm not opposed to the low-income or additional housing, I'm just very concerned about traffic. As it stands, the Velp Avenue is like, trying to cross it is like Frogger, truthfully. I do not turn left onto Velp from Winford because the roundabout that's over here is just inadequate. People go down there, then it's way too fast. Adding additional people to this location is going to really have a negative impact on traffic and I think that needs to be addressed first before any further development. Just my opinion.

- Thank you. Yes, sir?

- Jon LeRoy, Mau and Associates, 400 Security Boulevard. This stays pretty much in line with what we had reviewed back in May. This is going to anger some very insistent to the area. Some further clarification, as David had mentioned the traffic going on to Gray Court, we have had confusions with Captain Gabe as far as fire goes now and to the property and with keeping this traffic flow the way it is, with an emergency exit going through what used to be those other property, which is Industrial, as long as we have some sort of access point, that could be gated but access for an ox-box. Fire Department felt okay with that. As we come to the actual engineering and finalize the site plan of that, there will be steps taken to go ahead and accommodate that. Does anybody have any questions?

- How much increased traffic do you anticipate?

- So it's 72 units in total. As far as the amount of parking stalls and garage stalls, it's 72 units, it's two bedrooms, the max we'll go ahead and say it'd be 72 times two would be around 144 or so. Typically, as far as people, a maximum of that. We do give it an amount of visitor parking on the property. A sort of ratio where you could fit more than that, obviously you could do as far as cars go, but we demonstrate on other projects. Can I give you, for example, out in Howard a large campus, 300+ homes that just lead to one access point over on Shawano Avenue. I'll grant you, Shawano is not as busy as Velp is, but it's just one access point for approximately five times my units and the maximum, we did a study at the peak hours of time, morning and afternoon. The max we got, had to see up there, is about five cars entering at one given time with a size that's five times the amount, so

it's not as though folks go ahead and all leave for lunch at the exact same time. Yeah, so with any development, there'll be more traffic, but Velp Avenue was made to go ahead and handle traffic. Unfortunately, it wasn't designed to go ahead and be the best for neighborhoods, it's designed to go ahead and move people fast. Once you're on it, it's great. To get onto it is not the easiest, but it was meant to go ahead and handle quite a bit of traffic from downtown to the 'burbs.

- Questions? Thank you.

- Thank you.

- Yes, Alderman Steuer?

- I think I should probably go up to the stand.

- Stay down in your chair!

- They won't let me do that.

- Oh, sure. Okay, just as an alder, Scannel's district, my district's right across the street and I have a lot of citizens that live in that area, so it's a unique setup because you have a lot of Residential to the south and you got a lot of Commercial and all that family, if you will, to the north. One thing that we did or that was done by the city some time ago was Lark Street, heading off to go and recharge that. I foresee if we have more and more development like this because we have a Velp Avenue plan that's calling out for a number of things, so I understand that we need to look at opportunities but I think one consequence from this will be differences in traffic flow, possibly to the south. Maybe you'll just have, like you said, you can't turn left off of some of these roads. So anyway, that's just one of the concerns. As far as the development itself, I went to some of the meetings and they were well-attended. I'll give the owners credit that they were looking at, they scaled back on some of what they wanted, which helped, and is it perfect? Possibly not, but I think we need to clean up this area. There's no doubt about it, and it's one of the entryways into the community. I don't know, generally I'm in favor of it. That's it.

- Thank you. Alderman Scannel?

- I think that I like this plan, I like that it brings more density. I think if we're going to get some retail and stuff down there, we need more density. I think this does that, I think it's a good plan. Traffic is a concern, traffic has been a concern on Velp. I hear that constantly, and I think the answer to that is we need a Traffic solution. You know, stop our developing, if traffic is such that there's problems on Velp, we need to look at what we can do to control that traffic or handle that traffic. For me, the traffic issue is a Traffic issue that needs to be addressed by Traffic. We should keep developing and I think this is a good development.

- Thank you. Anybody else?

- Let me just respond that I did speak with Dave Hanson, our traffic engineer. The one thing he did want to point out, he's not here today, is that it is zoned General Industrial. The previous recommendation was for Commercial, either in Industrial or Commercial use would generate two to three times as much traffic as a Residential use. So though Velp might be busy, the previous comp plans and the current zoning both, even though it's vacant now, both could generate quite a bit more traffic. I discussed Velp Avenue with them as well. He did say this is a primary arterial road, that it's possible that it's functioned more as a residential street because it had less development on it, but it is a large area that is designed to handle traffic. Traffic patterns may have to change as this alderman right here had mentioned. I just wanted to add that because we were talking traffic and we did check with engineering and he does not have a concern with this many units coming out of the one access point.

- Thank you, Commissioner?

- Actually, because as far as the comp plan, we could have put a big box toward here. Do you have any idea as far as traffic counts on that, I mean, it's a lot more than 144 cars over a 24 hour period.

- Well yeah, I don't have an idea of the traffic count and we still hope to get a big box possibly on the corner and Commercial along Velp as well, but I think the point that Mr. Hanson brought up as well was with Residential, you have two core times for traffic, so between seven and eight, nine o'clock in the morning and then again at four to six. With the Commercial and Industrial, Commercial, you're going to have a constant flow of traffic if it's a busy store or something like that, service industry may have constant traffic, although maybe less concentrated. If it's Industrial, you're going to have shift change traffic, potentially unless it's warehousing. Probably be the only one with less traffic. I don't have the exact traffic count differences, but Commercial is highest, Industrial, and it drops down to the Residential.

- Thank you. Alderman?

- Thank you, Chair. I just remember when we were talking about a big box here, possibly one thing we saw and we had, while we were looking at Broadway, the other location. I do remember them talking about 7200 trips a day from that establishment. You can have figures that somewhat as well.

- I think one of the main concerns is that we do want people from our neighborhoods to utilize the businesses on Velp and unless we can get there, we're never going to be able to utilize those businesses and we do want to have additional development, absolutely. We want to increase the tax base of that higher Residential property, increase the value, but we need to be able to use them and therefore I think the traffic patterns should be in part of the consideration.

- Yes, Commissioner Bremer?

- I'm trying to recall the Velp Avenue plan that was developed too. Didn't that call for some kind of pedestrian crossing? It wasn't specifically that, but clearly this is an issue and adding this may have the advantage of not adding too much, but adding enough to push forward the need for that traffic control. That would certainly be my hope.

- When I was representing this district on the city council back in 2003, I did actually push for traffic signals at the corner of Gray and Velp, and at that time was rebuffed for numerous reasons. For one thing, they didn't have the roundabout back then and it was too close to the next set of signals. But also, the redevelopment was in the future and they didn't want to do much until that happened. But I agree now that there may be some, there may be enough of a change that it might work, but you got to remember also, this is also a state highway and the state has to get involved in any traffic changes on it. That long could be found on Lark.

- No, the state has certainly supported roundabouts.

- I suspect that anyone here is probably not on Lark Street like you mentioned and even when Lark did go out to Velp, the on was a barrier, turn left, as my kids can all attest. So I died and I feel your pain, not the way you're referring to. I also agree with Alder Scannell that you don't stop development for traffic problems, you create traffic solutions.

- That makes a lot of sense.

- Is there any further discussion on this? Okay, at this time I'll close the floor. Yes, Alderman Wiezbiskie?

- Motion to approve.

- Okay, we have a motion to approve. Do we have a second?

- Second.

- We have a motion and a second to approve. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries.

- Thank you.

- Mr. Chair? I would like to add to that a request that the apartment make a formal request for a traffic solution to what we're anticipating is likely to be a problem. I don't want that to just die in this committee.

- Yeah, I think we can look at that, I think. Also, perhaps on behalf of the alders, communications to Traffic Commission that based as this at some other time to be looking at opportunity for some type of control or crossing at Gray.

- Thank you.

- And I just put that specific development, just wanted to thank that developer. I think the project has come a long way since it initially started to really kind of fit in with the Velp area involvement plan and again, you know, you take things as they come and it's not exactly to the specifics that are in the plan but I think the developer was willing to work with staff and then really get it in so that this is a good development that there's also future development paths available for this quarter.

- Thank you. Next, informational. Special meeting scheduled for July 12th, 2018, at 6:00 p.m. in this room.

- Encore presentation. It's long enough tonight. This is looking at PUD for the Whitney Park townhomes on South Van Buren, phase four. Spaced out in timing, getting the notices out, and also with our council schedule, the developer would like to get going later this summer, summer to get this on for a first reading at the next council meeting. Timing didn't quite fit with this, so if we can get a special meeting on Thursday, I promise to keep that to one item on the agenda and that will be for that.

- We'll be waiting.

- The agenda's been published.

- I haven't gotten it yet.

- Okay, well we promise, we will promise that it will be the only one item on the agenda.

- Thank you.

- Well, we've got a courtroom for that, right, as far as you've gotten.

- And the date of the next scheduled regular meeting is August 13th, 2018?

- Correct.

- And the next item is the director's report.

- All right, so reporting back to the June council meeting. We had the backup ordinances that were approved, the PUD for 215 North Webster Avenue, for the Whitney School apartments and townhomes, that was approved, as well as the ordinance amending our smart growth plan looking at Gray Court which was this before you today, so that's why we're starting the process for the zoning. And then also just ordinance, doing some cleanup work regarding CUPs and then some work, just about to get done, just turn something that's compliant with the ordinances or the changes that are planned with state legislation, and then also approve with the Plan Commission report, we're starting the process for the PUD at South Military, Western Avenue for the Martin expansion, the PUD at 865 Lombardi Avenue, which is tendering signage and approval of the safe routes to school. They planned with the school district, approving that, and then also starting the process for some other things with the expiration of PUDs and their ordinance also, following up with some state statutes.

- Thank you.

- Sure.

- Motion to adjourn.
- [All] Second.
- Motion and multiple seconds to adjourn. All those in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? We are adjourned.