

MINUTES
GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION
Monday, March 7, 2016
City Hall, Room 604
6:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Maribeth Conard–Chair, Tim Gilbert-Vice Chair, Ald. Jerry Wiezbiskie, and Lisa Hanson

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Sid Bremer and Heather Mueller

OTHERS PRESENT: Kevin Vonck, Paul Neumeyer, Mark Lyons, Tom Radenz, Jim Borysenko, Hanz Zietlow, Tim Cullen, Phil Langohr, Larry Langohr, John Oates, Frank Abnet, Brian Stenzel, Tim Ruenger, Zach Marquardt, and Mike Selner

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Approval of the minutes from the February 22, 2016, Plan Commission meeting

A motion was made by Ald. J. Wiezbiskie and seconded by T. Gilbert to approve the minutes from the February 22, 2016, Plan Commission meeting. Motion carried.

COMMUNICATIONS:

1. Requests by Ald. Mark Steuer for the following:
 - A. A zoning map and short report showing the locations of R1, R2, R3, R4, and MF in the City and the percentage of each against the zoning district.
 - B. A land-use map and short report showing the locations of SF, 2F, and MF in the City and the percentage of each against the total land use.

A motion was made by Ald. J. Wiezbiskie and seconded by T. Gilbert to refer to Staff the above listed requests from Ald. M. Steuer. Motion carried.

2. Request by Ald. Tim De Wane to reconsider the zoning code at the 1200 block of E. Mason Street.

A motion was made by Ald. J. Wiezbiskie and seconded by T. Gilbert to refer to Staff the above mentioned request from Ald. Tim De Wane. Motion carried.

3. Request by Ald. Randy Scannell and Ald. Mark Steuer to set aside funding for the Velp Avenue Corridor/Brownfield Redevelopment Plan, also referred to the Economic Development Authority and Redevelopment Authority.

A motion was made by Ald. J. Wiezbiskie and seconded by T. Gilbert to refer to Staff the above mentioned request from Ald. R. Scannell and Ald. M. Steuer. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

4. (ZP 15-17b) Discussion and action on the request to create a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for several parcels on the 2400 Block of University Avenue, submitted by Larry

Langohr, University Avenue Center, LLC. (Ald. D. Nennig, District 6 and Ald. J. Moore, District 5)

P. Neumeyer stated this request is to create a Planned Unit Development (PUD) along the current 2400 block of University Ave (2400 block of Sturgeon Bay Road). This is the second step in the zoning process for the redevelopment of the area. The Comprehensive Plan recommends commercial uses throughout the area and is the catalyst site for the redevelopment plan. The future development includes four lots: Lot 1 will be the proposed Kwik Trip, Lot 2 will be the proposed Festival Foods, Lot 3 will be a proposed multi-tenant building, and Lot 4 is under the control of the developer, with no current plans to develop the property. Not all areas have been acquired by the developer which may require a future amendment to the PUD.

A draft PUD was created, which is included within the meeting packet, along with several exhibits. P. Neumeyer briefly went through the exhibits with Commissioners which included elevations for Festival Foods and Kwik Trip site.

P. Neumeyer briefly went through the draft PUD and pointed out the differences between what staff would like to see and what the developer would like done.

Page 2, D. Architecture: Item # 3; Four-Sided Design and Item# 4: Proposed Lot 3. From staff's perspective, this is an important entry way into the City of Green Bay and would like to see higher standards related to this building. Due to the way the building sits, it is a three-sided design. They would like for it to be considered a four-sided design. The building is a stucco building and staff would like to see more of a masonry exterior, and something compatible with Festival Foods as far as materials and color is concerned.

Page 3, E. Lighting: Staff's issue is regarding stray lighting from the property. Staff is suggesting the maximum height of light poles to be 25 ft. in overall height.

Page 3, G. Site Plan Review & Standards: P. Neumeyer briefly discussed roof mounted mechanicals being screened. This is a standard requirement in the zoning code and any new commercial site plans that come in are required to comply. The developers are looking for an alternative to this requirement, but staff does prefer to see the screening material.

Page 3, F. Signage: There is no formal sign proposal at this time; however, staff is proposing something different. Most commercial sites use pylon signs in the development. Staff is suggesting a monument type sign. Most Festival's and Kwik Trip's use the pylon signs that are about 15-20 ft. tall.

Ald. J. Wiezbiskie asked P. Neumeyer if the developer is in total agreement with the draft ordinance. P. Neumeyer stated no, and that he hoped the developer will discuss their concerns during tonight's meeting. Ald. J. Wiezbiskie then asked if they can expect different offerings of what they are recommending. P. Neumeyer stated yes and the PUD is to tie up some loose ends and is mostly cosmetic.

M. Conard asked about the signage on the multi-tenant building on Lot 3. She wanted to know if the spots for signage on the front of the building will also be placed on the back of the building. P. Neumeyer stated that this is something they will be working on with the developer. If some agreement can be made, it can come back as an amendment in the future. At this time they will be sticking to more of a stringent requirement.

Ald. J. Wiezbiskie asked if they will be adding anything to “soften” the building as it looks like a warehouse. P. Neumeyer stated that they have made suggestions from a code perspective. M. Conard asked if staff is asking for the developer to change how the building looks. P. Neumeyer stated that is correct, but not how it should change, but to consider something more transparent with their building materials.

M. Conard suspended the rules for public comments.

Tom Radenz – REI Engineering: T. Radenz stated he is the design engineer working on the site. He then introduced the developers working on the redeveloping. They included Hanz Zietlow, Director of Real Estate for Kwik Trip; Phil Langohr, AIG Properties; Tim Cullen, TLC Sign; Jim Borysenko, Civil Engineer with REI Engineering; Larry Langohr, AIG Properties; John Oates, Architect from Somerville; Brian Stenzel, Director of Community Involvement for Festival Foods; Frank Abnet, Vice-President of Operations for Festival Foods.

T. Radenz thanked staff for working with them to get this project moving forward as there are a lot of moving parts associated with a development of this proportion.

T. Radenz stated there are three points they are not in agreement with regarding the draft PUD. Those items included page 3, F. Signage; Items #2 and #6 and G. Site Plan Review & Standards; Item #3 regarding roof mounted mechanical screening.

The first issues developers discussed were regarding signage. They stated that doing something tastefully is the key. The concerns they have with a monument sign is the 8 ft. for overall height. They want people to be able to see either over the top of the sign or underneath the sign for traffic reasons and that it is a safety issue. They feel this cannot be done with a monument sign.

M. Conard asked what the reason is for only monument signs. P. Neumeyer stated the sign they are proposing is a pylon sign and the intent is to change the overall look and feel of the University Avenue Corridor as this is a catalyst site. They have the ability to change or modify the signage requirements because they have a PUD to set the tone for change of the look or feel of signage. It may result in a wider sign, but won't have the vertical height. They still feel the monument sign is appropriate. T. Gilbert asked if staff is looking for uniformity along University Avenue. P. Neumeyer stated yes. K. Vonck stated one of the things staff looked at as being a catalyst site is the importance to follow the University Avenue/Brownsfield Corridor Plan they had worked on. The actions they take now will set the bar for other redevelopments that may come into the corridor. The reason for the monument signs, long term, is to reduce the visual clutter and provide more aesthetically appealing reasons for enhancing the corridor. They don't want University Avenue looking like it does now.

Ald. J. Wiezbiskie stated there is no reason why a pylon sign can't be used, the sign they have presented tonight looks well-made and does fit in with the area. He asked where they draw the line on changing signs. A discussion continued between Commissioners, P. Neumeyer, and K. Vonck regarding the differences between pylon and monument signs and why staff wants a monument sign rather than a pylon sign and the ways either sign can be set up regarding tenant panels. K. Vonck did make the point that if someone wants to replace their sign with a monument sign they have some TIF dollars available to help. The placing of a monument sign, in this case, is to set precedence for future development and where they want to be as a city. If the Commission is not strongly against the monument sign, he strongly advises keeping the height down to around 15 ft. and make sure that materials are used in line with the building to make it a little more structured and blend in with the architecture.

M. Conard asked Festival Foods representatives if they have any stores that have monument signs. They stated that all stores have pylon signs with a handful having both a pylon and monument sign. M. Conard asked P. Neumeyer if they did approve a pylon sign, if they can specify that it be done with materials that architecturally match the building and specific heights. P. Neumeyer stated yes.

L. Hanson stated she was curious if each spot is going to have their own sign, or is this going to be a comprehensive sign for all three lots. It was stated that the Kwik Trip will have their own pylon sign. She then asked if they were addressing the Kwik Trip sign or the Festival sign. P. Neumeyer stated both. The idea is to have one monument sign per lot, so there are four lots with each monument sign specific to that lot.

L. Hanson clarified with P. Neumeyer that the whole reason they are moving away from the pylon signs is because this area is the entrance to the City of Green Bay. P. Neumeyer stated that was correct. T. Gilbert asked if visibility will be an issue with a monument sign. P. Neumeyer stated there shouldn't be a problem as there should be enough right-of-way. H. Zietlow stated that with one pylon sign there would be too much clutter with all the name plates for the tenants and it just wouldn't look appealing. He also stated that they do prefer pylon signs over monument signs.

L. Hanson then asked if Kwik Trip will have their own sign, and what other names would be listed on the Festival sign. They stated nothing, which would make the pylon sign even cleaner looking. T. Radenz stated that they would be fine with separate signs for both Festival Foods and Kwik Trip and they don't need to have the smaller shops listed on the pylon if they could have signs on the back side of the multi-tenant building as well so they can be seen coming from both directions.

M. Conard asked P. Neumeyer if that was acceptable. K. Vonck then clarified with T. Radenz that this is for lot three and the small shops; that they would forgo any of the ground signage, if they can have wall signage on the front and back of the building. K. Vonck stated that if they created the back to look like the front and add some of the design things in as added to the draft PUD, in exchange for reducing some of the clutter that is something that staff could look at and agree upon. T. Gilbert asked if there is any type of signage proposed for the east side entrance off of University Way. T. Radenz stated there is no large scale signage proposed for that area.

M. Conard asked if the Festival Foods sign or Kwik Trip sign will block each other's view. They stated they are far enough apart that visibility of each of the signs is not an issue. Ald. J. Wiezbiskie asked if the signs will be the same height and stated it would look nicer. L. Hanson asked if they would be the same width. Developers stated the width may differ slightly as the Festival Foods sign will be square and the Kwik Trip may not be.

L. Hanson asked what the next step would be if the staff will be working with the architects or are they giving them direction. K. Vonck stated that maybe amending "F" Item #3 to read having no ground zone but will add wall signs on the back per code. And for "F" Item #2 adding maximum height and size for each of the panels for each sign and breaking the ordinance into separate parcels and leaving Lot 4 as directed by staff until it's occupied and bringing them back at a later date to amend the PUD. Lots 1, 2, and 3 will need a more definitive direction.

M. Conard then confirmed that once direction is given, Commissioners will trust that staff will handle it without further direction from them or would it come back to them. K. Vonck stated it would depend on what they want to see. P. Neumeyer also stated that timing is an issue and

they will make every effort they can to work with the developers. Commissioners agreed they do not need to see this come back.

K. Vonck stated that for Lot 3, it would be a fair trade-off in terms of no ground signs and allowing wall signs in the back per our code.

A motion was made by Ald. J. Wiezbiskie and seconded by T. Gilbert to approve amending Item #6 in section F. of the signage to allow for signage on the back of the building, per our code, for no ground mounted signs. Motion carried.

K. Vonck stated in terms of Lots 1 and 2, each will have a separate sign with a Kwik Trip sign on Lot 1 and a Festival Foods sign on Lot 2. Direction is needed on height and width. K. Vonck is recommending the PUD that was placed forward by staff. If the Plan Commission wishes to do something else, it will be at their pleasure.

J. Wiezbiskie stated that if they are looking at a monument versus pylon sign he would recommend making a motion to proceed with the pylon sign. K. Vonck stated that if they are going to say a pylon sign, he would like some clarification on the maximum height of the sign. M. Conard also stated that the sign would need to architecturally match the buildings and both signs would be similar in height and rectangular in shape. A suggested motion from developers was the max sq. ft. of 150 ft. with the sign aesthetically resembling the building.

Ald. J. Wiezbiskie agreed with the motion seconded by T. Gilbert.

M. Conard is still concerned with the 150 sq. ft. sign, and that it might be too large. A developer stated that the Kwik Trip sign is 120 sq. ft. Even though they may look different on paper, it may not look that large in the open space. M. Conard wants to know if it's OK to have something smaller than 150 sq. ft. and to have both signs at 120 sq. ft. P. Neumeyer stated staff has actually suggesting 100 sq. ft.

M. Conard again went through the motion that was on the table. A maximum of 20 ft. tall, to resemble the architecture of the buildings, maximum square footage of 125 sq. ft., and one pylon sign on Lot 1 and one pylon sign for Lot 2.

Motion carried.

A motion was made Ald. J. Wiezbiskie and seconded by T. Gilbert for Lot 4 to remain as a monument sign. Motion carried.

The last item to be discussed was for Section G. Site Plan Review & Standards; Item #3 regarding roof or ground mounted mechanicals to be screened. The developers stated that their equipment is painted white to match the roof so it will blend in with the scenery. They did show views of the equipment from University Ave, intersection of Sturgeon Bay Road and Clement, and Van Duren. The mechanicals are covered by a parapet wall and can only be seen from Clement Street. F. Abnet stated that if you try and fence them in, you end up with an additional barrier that looks the same as the parapet wall. They are trying to prove that the fence is no different from the parapet wall. By painting the mechanicals to match the color of the parapet wall there are only a few places you can see the mechanicals from, which would be from Clement Street. The wall and paint on the mechanicals will be maintained by Festival.

M. Conard asked P. Neumeyer why is the fence needed. P. Neumeyer stated that it is a standard requirement in the zoning code; that roof top and ground mounted mechanicals need

to be screened. M. Conard asked if other businesses have done the same thing and screened them in. P. Neumeyer stated yes. M. Conard then asked what the screens generally look like. P. Neumeyer stated they come in all different shapes and sizes, some are fabric, some are metal, usually a proposal is made by the developer and staff will make sure it is in compliance. T. Gilbert asked if something will be visible whether it's the screening or the unit itself. P. Neumeyer stated yes, and they have to understand they can't get them to be hidden completely; however, try and have it blend as best as possible, but have it uniform in the city. L. Hanson asked if the other Festivals have the screens. A developer from Festival stated none of the new stores have the screening because they are off-set.

A discussion continued between developers and Commissioners regarding the mechanical units on the roof tops and their visibility. The reason they are putting the mechanicals on the roof is because they are not attractive pieces and they are spending the extra money to try and hide them and clean up the area.

P. Neumeyer then discussed with developers the view from Clement Street, where the mechanicals would be seen the most. P. Neumeyer stated that the most exposed side is going to be the back side of the store, which is facing the residential neighborhood. He also stated that the screening is a standard requirement and is not a new requirement.

K. Vonck reiterated that they have looked at this standard for all of the projects that they have. The views that are most impacted here are from the residential side. Another reason for the screening is to deflect noise back or up and away from the residential neighborhood.

T. Gilbert stated he does appreciate that the mechanicals will be up off the ground, but also agrees with K. Vonck regarding the noise. The screen would help minimize the noise and believes they will set a precedent if they allow this one not to be screened. Other businesses will want to know why they have to screen and Festival doesn't. A developer stated if it would be beneficial to just screen the back as that is the only part that is really exposed.

P. Neumeyer stated they can submit it with the site plan and staff will look at it and make sure it is compliant; however, he can't just say yes it's fine to do it at this point.

M. Conard does agree with T. Gilbert and added that it faces a residential area and to screen in the mechanicals would be visually more appealing. A developer asked M. Conard if the Commission would be OK with them just screening the back side. M. Conard stated as long as it is approved by Planning staff. Ald. J. Wiezbiskie also agreed.

M. Conard asked how the motion should be worded due to the information just discussed. K. Vonck stated that leaving the wording as is would allow for staff to work with developers.

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

A motion was made by T. Gilbert and seconded by Ald. J. Wiezbiskie to leave the ground-mounted and roof-mounted language in the draft as proposed. Motion carried.

A motion was made by Ald. J. Wiezbiskie and seconded by T. Gilbert to approve the request to create a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for several parcels on the 2400 Block of University Avenue. Motion carried.

5. (ZP 16-09) Discussion and action on the request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to authorize two, two-family dwellings in a Low Density Residential (R1) District located along

the northwest corner of Sun Terrace and Phasianus Street, Tax Parcels: 21-4899 and 21-4900, submitted by Mike Selner, property owner. (Ald. A. Nicholson, District 3)

P. Neumeyer stated this is a request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for two, two-family dwellings at the end of Sun Terrace. The Comp Plan shows them as Low Density Residential to match the surrounding uses. The current zoning is low density residential. These will be identical units and front elevations were presented. There is a mixture of single and two-family homes in the neighborhood; many homes were developed as twindominiums or zero lot line duplexes. Affected property owners were noticed of the request. Staff did not receive any calls or questions regarding this request. Staff is recommending approval of the request subject to the following conditions:

- A. Staff and the applicant agree to landscape along the south end of the property adjacent to the pedestrian walk to reduce headlight glare and provide a transition between uses.
- B. Compliance with all of the regulations of the Green Bay Municipal Code not covered under the Conditional Use Permit (CUP), including standard site plan review and approval.
- C. Compliance with Chapter 13-1602(4), Green Bay Zoning.

Mike Selner – 516 N Erie Street, De Pere: M. Selner stated that he intends to build two duplexes to match the ones that are already there. He stated the consensus from the neighborhood is that they wanted the same duplexes built. He stated that he originally wanted something different there like an office building, but that didn't work out as planned.

A motion was made by Ald. J. Wiezbiskie and seconded by L. Hanson to approve the request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to authorize two, two-family dwellings in a Low Density Residential (R1) District located along the northwest corner of Sun Terrace and Phasianus Street. Motion carried.

6. (ZP 16-10) Discussion and action on the request to authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to operate a minor auto repair in a General Commercial (C1) District located at 1744 S. Ashland Avenue, submitted by Zach Marquardt & Timothy Ruenger. (Ald. G. Zima, District 9)

M. Lyons stated the site is located near the northwest corner of Ashland Ave and Victory Blvd and was previously occupied by American Auto Transmission, which also did minor auto repair. The site has been vacant for years and lost non-conforming status. A CUP is required to reestablish an auto repair shop. The Comp Plan does recommend commercial land uses for the area and is currently zoned commercial. A site plan was submitted by the petitioner and was displayed for Commissioners showing that the site is almost all impervious surface. Staff would like to see some type of flower beds and landscaping to beautify the white concrete block building. Staff is recommending approval of the request subject to the following conditions:

- A. Compliance with all of the regulations of the Green Bay Municipal Code not covered under the Conditional Use Permit (CUP), including standard site plan review and approval.
- B. All vehicle parts shall be stored inside of an enclosed building.
- C. Foundation landscaping along east façade.
- D. There shall be no expansion of the conditional use without Plan Commission and City Council approval.

Ald. J. Wiezbiskie asked about parking. M. Lyons stated they do not have a lot of parking. There are 7 spaces required for this specific use and they have 1 parking space per bay as the vehicles they will be working on will be inside the bays. M. Lyons stated this is not that intensive

of a parking use. The proposed owners are here and their repairs are basically fixing dents and not any type of major auto repair.

M. Conard suspended the rules for public comments.

Tim Ruenger & Zach Marquardt – 1744 S Ashland: T. Ruenger and Z Marquardt are the petitioners for this request. They stated they would answer any questions Commissioners may have.

Ald. J. Wiezbiskie confirmed with the petitioners that they will be doing light body work and asked if that included oil changes. They stated that they are fixing dents and there will be no painting or oil changes done on site. Most work done will be one day service.

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

A motion was made by T. Gilbert and seconded by Ald. J. Wiezbiskie to approve a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to operate a minor auto repair in a General Commercial (C1) District located at 1744 S. Ashland Avenue, subject to the above listed conditions. Motion approved.

INFORMATIONAL:

OTHER:

Director's Update on Council Actions

K. Vonck reported the following information:

- The following actions were approved/moved at the March 1, 2016, City Council meeting:
 - Adopted Ordinances included the northern section of Sitka Road.
 - Change in use for the Farmory on Chicago Street.
 - The rezoning for the Kwik Trip on Shawano Ave
 - The southern portion of Sitka Road dealing with Gilbert Drive.
 - The rezoning for the Duck Shack.
 - The two-family uses for Eaton Heights.
 - Discontinuing of easements for Festival Foods Project.
 - The CSM for with Festival Foods.
 - The initial zoning for Festival Foods Project.
 - Council also received and placed on file two other items that were approved.

- At the special Council Meeting the street vacations were approved.

SUBMITTED PETITIONS:

A motion was made by Ald. J. Wiezbiskie and seconded by L. Hanson to adjourn. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.