

MINUTES
GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION
Monday, December 9, 2013
City Hall, Room 604
6:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: M. Conard–Chair, L. Queoff-Vice Chair, S. Bremer, T. Duckett, Ald. J. Wiezbiskie,

MEMBERS EXCUSED: T. Gilbert, J. Reck

OTHERS PRESENT: P. Neumeyer, R. Strong, N. White, J. Mongin, W. Townsend, D. Burich, N. Sparacio, E. Schwenker, D. Kroetz, T. Nockerts, J. Frazier, K. Kops, C. Henrickson, B. Dorff, J. Spitzer, D. Lindstrom, Ald. A. Kocha, Ald. M. Steuer, Ald. Tom De Wane, Ald. Tim De Wane

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Approval of the minutes from the November 11, 2013, Plan Commission meeting

A motion was made by L. Queoff and seconded by T. Duckett to approve the minutes from the November 11, 2013, Plan Commission meeting with the following underlined revisions on Page 6.

S. Bremer added that Plan Commission minutes Page 6, 3rd paragraph from the bottom, should have the word “not” added to read; but did not go through for various reasons.

Motion carried.

M. Conrad indicated that Item 7 would be moved to the beginning of the meeting.

COMMUNICATIONS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

7. (PP 13-08) Discussion and action on the recommendations of the Mayor for 2014 Business Improvement District (BID) Board members including Military Avenue, On Broadway, Inc., Downtown Green Bay, Inc., and Olde Main Street, Inc

Neil White – Economic Development: N. White stated the Plan Commission now has a formal role in appointing BID Board Members. The new process consists of the BID submitting candidates to their office to see if they meet the qualifications given by the BID Handbook along with a resume. They then go to the Mayor for approval. A goal of involving the Plan Commission in the approval process is to provide more connectivity to the BID operating plans that the Plan Commission also reviews each year. Tonight some of the new BID Board Members from Military Avenue wish to introduce themselves to the Plan Commission.

Wendy Townsend – 850 Ernst Drive, Military Avenue BID Board Member: W. Townsend stated she works for the Green Bay Area Chamber of Commerce and has been a resident of the Military Avenue area for about 20 years.

Joe Mongin – 501 S. Military Avenue, Military Avenue BID Board Member: J. Mongin stated he did not grow up far from Military Avenue and has been working for an insurance company with his father since 2005. He is looking forward to improving the area physically as well as increasing property values and decreasing vacancies.

Dan Burich – 1301 S. Military Ave, Military Avenue BID Board Member: D. Burich stated he is the owner of Bay Motel and Family Restaurant. He stated he has lived in the area since he was a child. He stated he is a 3rd generation owner of the Bay Motel and Family Restaurant.

M. Conard stated she was speaking on behalf of Greg Polacheck. She stated that G. Polacheck is very happy to be a part of Military Avenue. He is not currently a property owner or a resident of the area but served as the chair of the Military Avenue Corridor Plan Citizen Steering Committee and brings his commercial real estate expertise to the BID.

A motion was made by L. Queoff and seconded by J. Wiezbiskie to approve the recommendations of the Mayor for 2014 Business Improvement District (BID) Board members including Military Avenue, On Broadway, Inc., Downtown Green Bay, Inc., and Olde Main Street, Inc. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. (ZP 12-52) Discussion and action on a request to amend the conditional use permit authorizing 82 units of supportive housing for veterans and for buildings that exceed the height limitation in a Public Institutional (PI) District located in the 2900 block of Saint Anthony Drive. The requested amendment is to extend the life of the conditional use for an additional 12 months and is submitted by Cardinal Capital Management, petitioner. (Ald. J. Wiezbiskie, District 1

N. Sparacio identified the location and explained the zoning and comprehensive plan designations for the site. This request was approved by the Plan Commission about one year ago. The item has been brought back to the Plan Commission because the original approval will expire, as construction did not start within 12 months. It has taken additional time to secure the WHEDA tax credits needed to fund the project. Most of the project is identical to the original request with a few updates and minor changes. N. Sparacio showed the new parcel that has been split off for the development, the unchanged building rendering, the slightly modified site plans, and the concept plan for the Brown County research and technology park on the balance of the County Farm site. The County and City Planning Departments will continue to work together on the plans for the research and technology park, which would come back to the Plan Commission for a Comprehensive Plan amendment at some point. The Planning Department recommends approval of the 12 month extension with the original conditions of approval.

L. Queoff asked if there was a cemetery located on the map.

N. Sparacio pointed out the potential burial locations. At this time we don't know what steps would be taken to monument or designate these areas. Planning Staff has been more focused on the land use and how it interacts with the neighborhood and traffic patterns. However, this is an important item and will be looked into in the near future.

S. Bremer stated that in the staff report it mentioned that there may be consideration of whether or not to include phase two in the CUP; however, there is no recommendation from the staff. She also asked N. Sparacio if he felt there was not enough information at this point for the 2nd phase.

N. Sparacio stated that was a question for the applicant. In order for them to move forward with the tax credit application, it was initially necessary to include all 82 units of housing. The original CUP approval was for the 52 apartment units, and they then would have to come back with solidified operations and site plans for the additional 30 transitional units.

Erich Schwenker-President of Cardinal Capital Management - Madison, WI. E. Schwenker stated he wanted to make clear that the delays were related to one end of the financing regarding the tax credit. Tax credits are highly competitive in this state, and they originally applied in May of last year but were not approved at that time. They then reapplied last summer under a different program which was awarded to them. They have received half the credits and are promised the other half the first quarter of this coming year. They already have buyers for those credits.

S. Bremer asked whether it would be necessary to consider approval of phase 2 at this time.

Erich Schwenker explained that they have no problem coming back with further details on the 30 transitional units at a future time. This will not impact the tax credits in any way.

A motion was made by J. Wiezbiskie and seconded by S. Bremer to amend the conditional use permit authorizing 52 units of supportive housing for veterans and for buildings that exceed the height limitation in a Public Institutional (PI) District located in the 2900 block of Saint Anthony Drive. The amendment extends the life of the conditional use approval for an additional 12 months. The previously established conditions of approval continue to apply. Motion carried.

2. (ZP 13-15) Discussion and action on the request to rezone 117 N. Ashland Avenue from Low Density Residential (R1) to General Commercial (C1) and to rezone 107-109 N. Ashland Avenue from Highway Commercial (C2) to General Commercial (C1), submitted by John and Robin Heinz, LLC. Referred back by City Council on June 18, 2013 (Ald. J. Warner District 9)

P. Neumeyer stated this is a request from a few months back and there is no further action to be taken at this time. The recommendation is to receive and place on file.

A motion was made by L. Queoff and seconded by J. Wiezbiskie to receive and place of file the rezoning of 117 N. Ashland Avenue from Low Density Residential (R1) to General Commercial (C1) and to rezone 107-109 N. Ashland Avenue from Highway Commercial (C2) to General Commercial (C1). Motion carried.

3. (ZP 13-33) Discussion and action on a request to amend the Planned Unit Development (PUD) for a proposed Youth Education Program operated by the Green Bay Area Public School District (GBAPSD) located at 2430 Finger Road, submitted by David VanDyke, Girl Scouts of the Northwestern Great Lakes, Inc (Ald. A. Kocha, District 5)

P. Neumeyer stated that this request was before the Plan Commission on November 11 and at that time it was tabled due to concerns expressed by adjoining property owners. The concerned neighbors did meet with the school district regarding the request. There were few new details to pass along but, representatives from the Green Bay Area Public School District GBAPSD were present to answer any questions regarding the program. Staff's recommendation was the same

as the one from the November 11, 2013 meeting. In addition, the staff did recommend that the Planning Director be given some discretion that if there are complaints and/or police calls, may bring this item back to the Plan Commission to review the approval of final request within a one year time span.

M. Conard suspended rules to allow for speakers.

Tom Nockerts, 2460 Finger Road, Bay Dental – T. Nockerts stated he did meet with GBAPSD and some concerns waived. He did talk to the Boys & Girls Club. He summed up his feeling about the program as “unremarkable”. His main concern was loitering. He stated the Boys & Girls Club have not had any problems or complaints, which made him feel better about the whole situation. He stated loitering is still one of his main concerns, especially near his office and the K-5 grade school and how they will control the students. He stated P. Neumeyer was going to send a copy of this new PUD, but has not received it yet. Before passing the school program, he would like to know what other types of businesses would be able to move into this property. He would like to see the specific constrictions he was under also be placed on the business. He asked if the GBAPSD has purchased the building.

L. Queoff asked if he spoke with the east or west side Boys & Girls Club.

T. Nockerts stated he spoke with the Executive Director of both east and west side Boys & Girls Clubs.

L. Queoff asked P. Neumeyer when the PUD might be mailed.

P. Neumeyer stated that he did send Mr. Nockerts an email that summarized standard permit uses and there were only two conditions of the PUD.

T. Nockerts stated he had a question regarding the one year probation and what happens at that point if we do have concerns. Do we then take away the PUD after they have bought the property?

P. Neumeyer stated that would be worse case scenario. It is an option for property owners to contact the City with any concerns that could be brought back before the Plan Commission for review.

Jay Frazier-2516 Pickard Circle – Owner of the lots to the east of the Girl Scouts. J. Frazier stated that Dr. Nockerts has covered most of his concerns. He stated he does not have objections to the school, just concerned about the loitering and parking. He asked if the kids are going to be bussed or dropped off and how many kids will be in the building. That corridor was zoned with a PUD in mind. Does the school conform to that and does this building make it a good parcel? He stated that he does feel that the zoning should be looked at.

Barbara Dorff-3375 Pebble Beach Ct. B. Dorff stated she is the Executive Director School Services and the Alternative Education Programs fall within her supervision.

Kathy Kops-W3295 Hwy 151, Chilton, WI. K. Kops stated she is the Associate Director and acts as principal for all Alternative Ed Programs that are offered.

Claudia Henrickson-200 S. Broadway. C. Henrickson stated she is the Executive Director of Special Education for the GBAPSD.

S. Bremer stated they want to know the number of students involved, their ages, transportation, types of programs offered, the use of the property, and if there is recess time where the students are outside the building or are they always inside the building.

K. Kops stated they are looking at having middle school and high school at the property. The age range will be 13 years to about 19 years. There are very few children in the Alternative program at the beginning of the school year with the possibility of 75 children at a time within the building. The middle school would be up to 25 and high school would be 50 at any given time. Since this is an alternative program, a second chance, due to some type of behavioral issue at their school, the goal is to try and get students to stay in school and be a part of the community. As for transportation, the kids will come by city bus. They are looking at having a hub on the East side where a yellow school bus will transport students from the West side and then taking city transportation over to the school. They have been in contact with the transportation department and looking into getting a bus stop around the school. The closest stop at this time is 2 blocks up and/or in the East Town Mall, which they did not think was convenient. They thought it would be a good idea to wait to move forward. There will be no recess time for middle and high school students.

C. Henrickson stated if the intention of this project is to keep kids in school and get them back on track with behavioral intervention and getting their credits up, having them in school is a much better option than having them out and about without the supervision. One of their goals is to help the students reconnect with the community. It is their hope that these kids having their own school would help with this goal. The students will not be milling about, they will come directly into school, much like a younger groups of kids, and teachers will be outside on bus duty to make sure there is not loitering. They stated they cannot say the police will never be called out to the school. They cannot say that for any of the schools in Green Bay as on occasion it does occur. They have had a lot of positive out of alternative education and many students have returned back to their regular school.

L. Queoff stated she would like for them to define the Chance for Change for both Special Ed and regular students. She wanted a little more information about the capacity of the building, and how they plan to keep middle school and high school kids separate.

C. Henrickson stated they have Chance for Change in the middle school program. It is a 2-hr program and are looking to expand the amount of time students are in school. They are trying to make a more formal school setting instead of contracting services all over the school districts. They do have commitments from business to help supply equipment and other resources, like counseling, to help get these students reconnected. A hold has been put on the curriculum until a decision is made, but it will be designed for a more hands on learning to get students reconnected and back to their home site schools. The majority of the kids are not all special education.

A school representative stated that as the principal of the students no different than any other students that are currently within attending Green Bay Public Schools.

Ald. Wiezbiskie asked if most of the students would be driving to the school. His concern is about creating traffic and people coming and going. He also confirmed that the bus stop for these students was on East Mason Street.

K. Kops stated that a few students housed at the Boys & Girls Club have had cars; but very few of our students have their own cars. Again they are working with the transportation department to make the best decision as to where the bus should stop. The bus does stop on Mason right

now. It is a city bus and stops near the fire station, about two blocks away. They are currently working on getting a bus stop closer to the school so the students do not have to walk as far.

J. Wiezbiskie stated he was not happy with their explanation or decision as the next intersection is a controlled intersection and not the one they were looking at for a bus stop. His other concern is if you have people coming and going on the East Mason Street side, creating more traffic at the back of the building for dropping off students.

K. Kops stated that there will be no school bus drop offs. They will be bussed by City transportation. They are looking at an old bus stop that is no longer used and could place a sidewalk in from the bus stop to the school as it is an uncontrolled intersection with no crosswalks.

Ald. Wiezbiskie confirmed they had no recess time. In which they stated no. He asked if the students that are there, are there all day for education. He also wanted to know if there was any type of security offered and if there was going to be one main entrance if it would be secured or not. He also inquired about the driveway entrance off of Finger Road, if one would be dedicated as an entrance and one an exit and if this is where the busses would come in and load and unload students. He also stated he would like to see a fence along the sidewalk as a safety feature and would discourage any pedestrian traffic out from the back of the building.

A school representative stated that they will have only one controlled entrance. There will be teachers at the entrance following students into the building. They may also have the middle school kids enter the building at a different time than the high school students. There will be no busses dropping of children and some students will live close enough where they can walk. They talked with the neighbors about a fence and they indicated that they would prefer hedges along Mason Street because they did not want the fence to look so institutionalized. The school hours, which is not yet determined, would be during off-peak traffic hours. The students would typically arrive just before 9 am and leave after 2 pm.

T. Nockerts asked if they already own the building.

M. Stangel stated they do not; there is just an offer in to purchase it.

T. Duckettasked from a staffing stand point, how many people will be staffing the school.

C. Henrickson stated it would depend, but believed they would not need as much staff as they currently have.

K. Kops stated there are currently 10 teachers, 3 social workers, 1 First worker, an on-site administrator, and the option of one police officer on-site.

Ald. Kocha stated she was curious about the school bus issue and why there is no school bus transportation, and what are the students provided for lunch.

K. Kops stated they do not provide bus transportation for their high school students. They either have their own transportation or take the city bus. The schools provide students with bus passes. It is cold lunch, where they have to bring their own lunch.

L. Queoff asked about the elementary school that is directly across the school, and if they had any concerns about that school. She also asked if there would be adults riding on the bus that will carry the students from the school to the West side hub.

K. Kops stated they are looking to have some of their students go over to the elementary school and do activities with them, like read to them. The students will not be allowed to leave the building. There will be staff around to help avoid any type of loitering issues. They stated that currently they do not have any adult supervision on the bus besides the bus driver. However, if that would help and alleviate some safety issues they would consider that possibility.

Ald. Tom De Wane stated he has the majority of the residents in his area. He stated he has been getting a lot of calls regarding the age group and why they are being moved when most schools have Special Ed programs within them. His main concern is the students coming off the bus and walking away, worried that putting that many children together with different issues could result in more issues outside the school and into the neighborhoods.

M. Conard stated it was her understanding that when students are leaving the school, there will be somebody supervising as they leave to their appropriate supervision.

K. Kops stated that all staff is expected to be supervising as students enter and exit the school. The reason for this school for this students to have extra support staff and could be monitored better. They want to open the details of the school to the public for feedback on how to improve the needs for the students and keeping the community comfortable and feeling safe. Students will be signing a contract regarding rules and regulations. If any are broken they could possibly be expelled. They are working with the police department to have them provide extra patrol.

Ald. M. Steuer asked if this is going to be a situation where the children will be here for a while and then go back to their school.

C. Hendrickson stated that their goal is to get the students back into their home site school, so basically there could be different kids here every couple of weeks.

M. Conard stated that one of the recommendations for condition of approval is that "at the discretion of the Planning Director, if there are neighborhood complaints, police calls, or zoning violations within a one year time period of final approval of this request, the Planning Director may bring this item back to the Plan Commission for reconsideration of approval or to add additional conditions of approval."

T. Duckett asked if some of the kids go back to the Boys & Girls Club after school or to any other facility or do they go home.

C. Henrickson stated that some do go to the Boys and Girls Club, don't know how many. They stated they do not have a relationship with the Boy and Girls Club where the students go from one supervised area to another. A majority of the kids leaving usually go home.

S. Bremer stated there have been other major issues raised along the way, which you have been responsive too. She suggested they should add to the PUD something about a provision for a protective hedge on the Mason Street side of the property, sidewalks from the bus stop to the building exit / entry door, and adult supervision on busses to route the students movement into and out of the building with the cost to be paid by the school district.

K. Kops stated that staff supervision on the school buses would be problematic. This would be dependent on the transit system and the price to incorporate another stop on the bus route. But there will be supervision on and off the bus and into the school.

S. Bremer asked if they could comment on the appropriateness of having an educational institution in the midst of professional buildings. They were asking how this makes sense to have a PUD a youth facility.

C. Henrickson stated she didn't know how to answer that as she does not know what the division was in that area. She stated they want to be a good partner / neighbor to the community.

Ald. A. Kocha was looking for clarification in terms of the PUD. She asked if we were changing the structure to meet school occupancy or if the requirements that exist in the current PUD are going to remain the same in terms of office or school and the signage issue.

R. Strong asked P. Neumeyer if the PUD uses are the same, but just adding conditions to this parcel of land to allow a different use of what is already allowed in the PUD. He also asked if the school would have to live up to the same standards, such as signage, as the rest of the area.

P. Neumeyer stated we are only changing the permitted use on the site as right now it is only used for Girl Scouts Headquarters and that is the reason it is here now. The PUD would need to be amended to allow for educational facilities. The rest of the PUD will remain the same and at this time he is not aware of any type of signs or building changes.

S. Bremer stated that she would like the amended PUD to include the specifics they talked about along the way. One possibility is to include them in the permitted use section or to possibility create a whole new section. The new provisions to include a hedge protection along East Mason side along the school property, a pedestrian sidewalk from bus stop to entry / exit door, and adult supervision on school buses and student movement into and out of the building with costs to be paid by the school district.

L. Queoff stated she is skeptical that this would be a good fit for the neighborhood, but does not want to diminish the affect it may have on the area.

T. Duckett asked S. Bremer to clarify what was meant by sidewalks.

S. Bremer stated she was identifying direction from point A to point B, from the bus stop to the school entrance.

Ald. Kocha inquired if the school district would approve the recommendations that were proposed and would bore the cost of the projects.

M. Stangel stated they would have to find out from Transit if they would be able to add a stop back in the corner, which is a block away.

M. Conard asked if this was not the correct location for this, what kind of location would be the correct one and if they had looked at other sites.

M. Stangel stated they have, but they are here tonight to talk about this one.

P. Neumeyer stated that the Comprehensive Plan recommends a HIROH. Although the building is what it is, he feels the use is still appropriate in that general language category. Based on the Comprehensive Plan, it still doesn't fit in this neighborhood. It is about density as well, as kids is on the higher side, therefore, and need an educational use in this district.

R. strong asked if they wanted to put this school in the city, what zoning district would allow it.

P. Neumeyer stated possibly a commercial district with office and residential and residential by conditional use is possible.

R. Strong stated that because of this PUD, they found a site in a commercial district that did not have a PUD overlay.

A motion was made by S. Bremer for approval with the insertion of three provisions as stated above.

J. Wiezbiskie stated there are two things going on here. One, the school already said they could not afford to put the sidewalk in and two, would like to know what people's thoughts are now after they had already spoken and with these provisions. We are here to represent the people.

M. Conard re-opened the floor for questions from the public.

T. Nockerts stated he still has the same concerns as before, the control of the students. Will there be loitering and them getting in and out before, after, and during the day. He is concerned about how this will affect his business.

J. Frazier stated he would have liked to have seen a real plan of operation so it could be explained on how exactly things would be.

M. Conard returned the meeting back to regular order of business.

A motion was made by S. Bremer for approval with the insertion of three provisions as stated above and seconded by J. Wiezbiskie for discussion.

Ald. A. Kocha stated there is another side to this. The school district is combining facilities to try and save money. It is possible putting all these children in one building and the teachers knowing all these kids need special attention. She stated anything can happen in any school, not just one dedicated for alternative students. She suggested bringing this back after the first full year to be reexamined.

Ald. Tom De Wane stated that putting 75 – 80 troubled kids in the same school is a concern.

Ald. M. Steuer asked if this is the first time that an alternative school has been brought forward and are there other structures or schools like this that are out there in the Green Bay School District. A school representative stated no.

J. Wiezbiskie addressed R. Strong and stated that they have several opposed conditions and the person applying has already admitted that they cannot afford to some of the conditions.

R. Strong stated at this point we do not know where transit will be putting in a stop. If Transit would agree to drive around to the front of the building then no sidewalks would be needed. The further away they go, the more costly it will be for the schools to install and also to maintain.

A motion was made by S. Bremer for approval with the insertion of three provisions as stated above and seconded by J. Wiezbiskie. Motion Denied (2-3 Nay - M. Conard, T. Duckett, and L. Queoff).

A motion was made by S. Bremer and seconded by T. Duckett for approval with the insertion of the protective hedge along the east side property and adult supervision on school buses and student movement in and out of the school with the cost to be paid by the Green Bay School District. Motion denied (2-3 Nay- J. Wiezbiskie, L. Queoff, and M. Conard).

A motion was made by L. Queoff and seconded by J. Wiezbiskie to deny the request to amend the Planned Unit Development (PUD) for a proposed Youth Education Program operated by the Green Bay Area Public School District (GBAPSD) located at 2430 Finger Road Motion carried (3-2 Nay - T. Duckett and S. Bremer).

4. (ZP 13-36) Discussion and action on a request to amend the Planned Unit Development (PUD) for modified signage at 2926 Finger Road, submitted by James M. Spitzer, D.D.S., property owner (Ald. Tom DeWane, District 2)

P. Neumeyer stated this PUD was done in the late 90's. This PUD did not allow for signage on the south side of the building and this is the request that is before you this evening. The idea is to open up more visibility to the East Mason Street traffic. This is a non-illuminated 30 foot sign with individual letters. This sign does fit with the other buildings in the area and is very subtle. Planning staff is recommending the approval of the request.

Dr. Jim Spitzer – 2926 Finger Road: J. Spitzer stated he is the owner and operator of Sunridge Dental. He stated that with the PUD it seems that the neighborhood had developed and it is easy for traffic to go by and not recognize his office.

A motion was made by J. Wiezbiskie and seconded by S. Bremer to approve the request. Motion carried.

5. (ZP 13-38) Discussion and action on a request to create a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for a single-family development The Preserve, located in the 100 to 300 Block of North Huron Road, submitted by Jason Mroz, Appletree-GB Two, LLC (Ald. Wiezbiskie, District 1)

P. Neumeyer gave the staff report and recommendation. The request is for a Planned Unit Development for the Preserve subdivision plat located on North Huron Road and Whittier Road. In 2005, this area was part of the original Baird Creek Preserve, a conservation-by-design subdivision. The property changed hands over time; the market dropped and it sat vacant for a number of years. The Baird Creek Preserve subdivision plat was finally recorded in January of this year and the eastern portion of the property was sold off. The western portion of the property is part of the request and is approximately 27 acres in size. The reason for the PUD is that this is a non-traditional type of subdivision. The lot widths are smaller, less than the minimum frontage of 75 feet. The development is unique in that it is a sort of quasi-gated community. They are also creating additional green space with the Outlots that contain ponds to enhance the overall development. As part of the PUD, there are a total of 86 lots; 85 of those are single-family detached dwellings. The remaining lot will contain a club house, a pool, and a small parking lot for the residents. In addition to that, they are offering five different home styles to prospective buyers. There will be additional deed restrictions for buyers as the result of a Homeowners Association. Affected property owners have been notified. Staff's recommendation is to support the request subject to the draft PUD and the approval of the Preserve.

S. Bremer wanted clarification that the Commission is being asked to approve the entire single-family subdivision. P. Neumeyer said that was correct.

J. Wiezbiskie questioned an elevation. P. Neumeyer explained that the developer is working on that.

J. Wiezbiskie is in support of the request.

S. Bremer asked if the reason the development was considered somewhat gated was due to the two entrances to the development that will contain signage. P. Neumeyer said there would be gateway markers, and there will be a fence around the stormwater pond that serves as an enclosure.

S. Bremer questioned the limit to the amount of restriction in a Homeowner's Agreement. P. Neumeyer said there are no limits – it is a private agreement that is brought to the Register of Deeds' office. If homeowners agree to it, they are bound by the restrictions therein.

A motion was made by J. Wiezbiskie and seconded by S. Bremer to approve the creation of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for a single-family development as part of the Preserve located in the 100 to 300 Block of North Huron Road subject to the draft Planned Unit Development (PUD) and approval of the Preserve subdivision plat within one year of the adoption of the draft PUD. Motion carried.

6. (TA 13-03) Discussion and action on the request to repeal and recreate Chapter 13-1300 to be compliant with the flood plain regulations of NFIP 60.3(d), and the adoption of two revised FIRM panels, submitted by the Green Bay Planning Department.

P. Neumeyer gave the staff report and recommendation. This is a request to repeal and recreate Chapter 13-1300 and to consider the approval of two revised FIRM panels. The City needs to come into compliance with the regulations of NFIP 60.3(d). The most current ordinance was updated in 2009. A few sections did not line up with the current regulations, and those have been highlighted. Compliance must be completed by March 17, 2014. Planning staff recommendation is the adoption of the draft DNR model. Adoption of the affected FIRM map panels (far west side of town) 142G and 144G.

S. Bremer asked if there was any consultation about this with Oneida Nation in the Duck Creek area, as it would affect a number of lots by the Oneida Nation. She suggests that a consultation be done.

P. Neumeyer stated that he believes there has been a consultation with Oneida Nation but that is with Brown County Planning and FEMA. He stated that as floodplain regulations become stricter, houses have been built better and less construction in the floodplains in general.

A motion was made by J. Wiezbiskie and seconded by L. Queoff to approve the request to repeal and recreate Chapter 13-1300 to be compliant with the flood plain regulations of NFIP 60.3(d), and the adoption of two revised FIRM panels, submitted by the Green Bay Planning Department. Motion carried.

INFORMATIONAL:

8. (PP 12-07) Update on the Downtown Master Plan process.

N. Sparacio gave an update regarding the Downtown Master Plan. Participation by the community has been very strong. He stated they are moving towards the first draft of the plan

and showed some examples of the kinds of recommendations that will be included in the plan. The 4th and Final Public workshop will be on Thursday December 12, 2013 at the Neville Public Museum from 6-8 pm.

9. (PP 12-02) University Avenue Corridor Brownfield Development Plan end of year update.

D. Lindstrom stated this was before the Commission earlier this year. The City was awarded a \$200,000 Grant for brownfield area wide planning in the subject area. This grant will help look at how to clean up the contaminated properties and how to reutilize existing sites in the future. D. Lindstrom stated they will be doing additional neighborhood meetings in January and February. This will coincide with meetings regarding the Brown County Mental Health property and county farm property.

10. (CP 13-01) Update regarding Sand Ridge Park South subdivision (Ald. Sladek, District 12).

D. Lindstrom stated this Plat is on the west side over by West Point Road. The developers stated this plat is taking a little longer, but will be going forward in the next couple months to the recording phase. 13 new residential lots are proposed.

11. (CP 12-01) Update regarding Largo Ridge Estates revised subdivision (Ald. Wiezbiskie, District 1).

D. Lindstrom stated this development is coming off of Lake Largo Drive. The developer has decided to revise the original layout once they found out the amount grading required in the area. They may reduce the may reduce the number of lots and may move the cul-du-sac over to preserve some of the wooded area. Construction is set for Spring of 2014. 13 new residential lots are proposed.

12. (CP 06-01) Update regarding Baird Creek Preserve revised subdivision (Ald. Wiezbiskie, District 1).

D. Lindstrom stated this development is off Huron Road. This plat was recorded earlier this year and 46 new lots were created. They City of Green Bay recently purchased one of the outlots for future park property.

13. (CP 13-02) Update regarding Sitka Acres Second Addition subdivision (Ald. De Wane, District 2).

D. Lindstrom stated this is the replat of previously recorded plat along Morningwoods Ct. The owner/developer purchased and combined the lots several years ago and has since decided to sell lots. The plat was recorded earlier this year and 8 new lots were created.

14. (CP 13-03) Update regarding Kristy Lee Estates subdivision (Ald. De Wane, District 2).

D. Lindstrom stated this plat is off of Sitka Street and came to the Plan Commission a several months ago for the official map amendment to establish the cul-du-sac. There will be 17 new lots and the developer is hoping for construction to begin in 2014.

15. (CP 13-04) Update regarding The Preserve subdivision (Ald. Wiezbiskie, District 1).

D. Lindstrom stated the proposed plat was presented earlier in the meeting. This is the platting of the outlots from Baird Creek Preserve 86 smaller frontage lots are proposed.

16. (CP 13-05) Update regarding Whitney Park Townhomes subdivision (Ald. Boyce, District 7).

D. Lindstrom stated that the plat is east of Whitney Park. The first phase of townhome project was done through the CSM Process. The plat of phase two includes a similar three unit building.

OTHER:

Director's Update on Council Actions

There is nothing to report from the Common Council.

R. Strong stated this was his last Plan Commission Meeting and thanked the Plan Commission for all their time and terrific work they have done.

A motion was made by T. Duckett and seconded by J. Wiezbiskie to adjourn R. Strong's last meeting. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:58 p.m.