

**MINUTES**  
**GREEN BAY PLAN COMMISSION**  
**Monday, November 10, 2014**  
**City Hall, Room 604**  
**6:00 p.m.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Maribeth Conard, Linda Queoff, Ald. Jerry Wiezbiskie, Sidney Bremer, and Heather Mueller

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Tim Duckett

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Kim Flom, Paul Neumeyer, Dan Lindstrom, Mark Nysted, Phil Carlson, William Sieber, Wanda Sieber, Jim Grzeca, Jim Metzler, Debby Cesar, Barbara Brebner, Pat Kaster, Jack Baldschan, Gerald Brebner, Jackie Grzeca, Mark VerHeyden, and Tina Bunker

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Approval of the minutes from the October 27, 2014, Plan Commission meeting

A motion was made by L. Queoff and seconded by J. Wiezbiskie to approve the minutes from the October 27, 2014, Plan Commission meeting. Motion carried.

**COMMUNICATIONS:**

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

1. Discussion and action on the request to approve the site plan for the placement of a primary building entry for a new detached single family home at 3351 Beach Lane, submitted by the Planning Department. (Ald. J. Wiezbiskie, District 1)

P. Neumeyer stated this is a request for approval of a site plan for the placement of the primary building entrance of a new single family detached home. The area is currently zoned Low Density (R1) Residential which is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The property is within the flood plain and did receive a variance from the Board of Appeals for the placement of fill. The current site plan does not have the front door facing a public street. According to 13-1602, Residential uses, a single-family detached dwelling, in all residential districts, the primary entrance shall be located on the façade fronting a public street. The owners did contact the police department and fire department and have received their approvals. Planning staff is recommending approval, subject to the following conditions:

1. The site plan approval is for the placement of the front door only.
2. All other standards and approvals shall be obtained prior to occupancy.
3. The address of the dwelling shall be placed fronting Beach Lane.

L. Queoff wanted to know why the neighboring residents were not informed. P. Neumeyer stated that since it is strictly a site plan approval. S. Bremer asked where the numbers would be placed on the house. P. Neumeyer stated he did not know, but she could ask the applicants as they are present this evening.

M. Conard suspended the rules and opened the floor for public comments.

Wanda & William Sieber – 1773 Keehan Lane: Wanda Sieber answered the question from S. Bremer regarding the placement of the house numbers. They will be placed on the mailbox and on a lit solar lantern pillar to help illuminate the walkway to the house.

L. Queoff asked if they had spoken to the neighbors regarding their plans. W. Sieber stated that they did inform the neighbors of their intentions.

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

Ald. J. Wiezbiskie stated he is the Alderman of the district and approves of this request.

A motion was made by S. Bremer and seconded by L. Queoff to approve the site plan for the placement of a primary building entry for a new detached single family home at 3351 Beach Lane. Motion carried.

2. (ZP 14-37) Discussion and action on the request for a Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) designation in an area generally located north of Finger Road, west of Northview Road, south of Catalina Drive, and east of Erie Road, submitted by Erie Road Development LLC and Humboldt Investments LLC, property owners. (Ald. J. Wiezbiskie, District 1)

D. Lindstrom gave a brief overview of Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND). The Comprehensive Plan recommended location was shown for the development on the far east side of Green Bay. The new development should include a strong pedestrian emphasis in neighborhoods, neighborhood design incorporating sidewalks, street trees, narrower local (minor) residential streets with modest front setbacks, interconnected streets, nearby shops, and convenient access to transit.

D. Lindstrom explained the TND ordinance. He stated a TND is development and redevelopment of land consistent with the design principles of traditional neighborhoods, including:

- Compact and designed for the human scale
- Mixes of complementary land uses
- Mix of housing types, styles, and sizes
- Interconnectivity throughout an area (car, bike, pedestrian, etc.)
- Retains historic or cultural elements
- Incorporates significant environmental features

Graphics were presented to show the difference between Conventional and Traditional Neighborhood Development.

A breakdown was given regarding the subdivision process to include the typical development process and the TND development process. A typical development would include a preliminary plat submittal, staff/agency review, approval/denial based on state and local codes. A TND development process consists of an initial consultation with Planning staff, a conceptual plan approved by the Plan Commission and City Council, with a final plan being approved by the Plan Commission. If the concept plan was to be approved the applicant would then have 12 months to submit a final plan to the Plan Commission. Final requirements include:

The discussion is whether or not the proposed TND meets the concept plan requirements for a traditional neighborhood. The proposed site is the area north of Finger Road, west of Erie Road, south of Catalina and buffering South Grandview Road.

13-1408(a). A general location map is included within the concept plan report.

Meets ordinance requirements.

13-1408(b). A preliminary site inventory and narrative can be found within the concept plan report. The report does not identify if soils are located within 42" inches of bedrock or list if there are locations of poorly drained soils.

Partially meets ordinance requirements. Report does not identify if soils are located within 42" inches of bedrock or list if there are locations of poorly drained soils. Does not list if either of these standards do not apply.

13-1408(c). The concept plan included within this report lists the existing contours and not the proposed contours as required by the zoning code<sup>1</sup>.

Partially meets ordinance requirements. Does not show proposed contours.

13-1408(c)(1). The report includes a land use table that coincides with the concept plan. The table includes all the contemplated land uses and the associated density of residential land uses acres. It does not include the height and approximate floor area of non-residential development as required by the zoning code. See below for an additional breakdown of the proposed land uses.

Partially meets ordinance requirements. Lists all the proposed uses and percentages, but does not list the height and approximate floor area for nonresidential development. The following requirements have not been met:

13-1415(1). The proposed single family detached land uses have a density of approximately 3 (three) units per acre. The code requires a minimum of four (4) and no more than eight (8) units per net acre.

13-1415(2). The proposed single family attached land uses have a density of approximately six (6) units per acre. The code requires a minimum of eight (8) and no more than 12 units per net acre.

13-1415(3). The proposed multi-family land uses have a maximum density of approximately 12 units per acre. The code requires a minimum of 10 and no more than 20 units per net acre.

13-1415(3). The senior housing/community living arrangements listed on the plan would be determined by a conditional use permit.

13-1416(c)(1-4). The total land area devoted to non-residential *development* is approximately six (6) percent (below the 25 percent maximum).

13-1417(a-b). The report meets the area and distance requirements for open space. The Parks, Forestry, and Recreations Department expressed concern regarding the several lots that directly access the south branch of Baird Creel located on the unnamed cul-de-sac in the southwest portion of the development area.

13-1408(c)(2). The concept plan report does show the location of all principal (non-residential) structures and associated parking areas as required by the zoning code. A more detailed parking plan would be required under of section 13-1426 during the final plan review.

Partially meets ordinance requirements. The unknown sq. ft. does not allow for estimated parking calculations.

13-1408(c)(3). The concept plan report does show the proposed location of the street and circulation systems. The proposed road pattern meets the objectives of a multi-modal transportation circulation system listed in 13-1420 to 13-1422. The proposed layout includes interconnected system of

greenspace, sidewalks, and pathways that allow for increased non-vehicular circulation; however, according to the TND ordinance and the Subdivision and Platting code, sidewalks would be required throughout the development on both sides of the street. The proposed street layout established a neo-traditional street grid that functions within the allotted developable land.

Partially meets ordinance requirements. Does include greenspace connections, but doesn't include a complete sidewalk network. Pedestrian trail should be listed as multi-use trail. Bike network should include bike lanes where appropriate.

13-1408(c)(4). The concept plan report does show the proposed parks and open space. It does not specifically designate the type of open space for each area.

Partially meets ordinance requirements as it does not list the proposed uses for the parks (passive, active, recreational).

13-1408(c)(5). The concept plan report does reference a proposed native landscaping material.

Meets ordinance requirements. Does reference a native species list from the UW-Extension office.

13-1408(d). The concept plan report does include a conceptual stormwater management plan that identifies the proposed patterns of major stormwater runoff, locations of infiltration areas, and other significant best management practices as required by the zoning code. It does show the proposed stormwater pond locations, and does list how the water will reach each facility (stormwater drainage basins).

Partially meets ordinance requirements. Does not show how these would be impacted by road pattern.

13-1408(e). The concept plan report does not list or identify the primary architectural styles of residential or non-residential buildings. Planning staff would also prefer to see sections 13-1427 to 13-1429 either listed or referenced in the future final plan report.

Partially meets ordinance requirements. Does not show architectural styles, but does list an excluded material list.

13-1408(f). The concept plan report is attached to this packet. The report does list policies and objectives that are to guide the proposed development. It does not list any potential covenants, easements, or agreements to guide the development.

13-1408(g). The concept plan report does not list a sole developer. Northeast Wisconsin has not typically seen large companies become the sole developer for an area of the proposed size. The petitioner has stated they *could* be the developer if selected by a potential client, but they will not be the only developer.

13-1408(h). The concept plan report does not list any phases of development; therefore does not meet the ordinance requirements. Staff notes a project of this size will be required to be completed in phases and thus a phased report should be required.

13-1408(i). No other documentation is required at this time.

13-1408(j). A legal description is included within the plan, therefore does meet requirements (with revisions).

D. Lindstrom stated that items that need to be considered are the Market realities post “Great-Recession” and plan requirements. The TND concept is recommended by the Comprehensive Plan. The layout of the plan is up to the developer and owner. Property owners within 500 ft. were notified of the request. Staff heard from five (5) people; two in support, two informational, and one opposed. Due to the nature of the proposal of this magnitude, Plan staff recommends holding over the request to allow the applicant the opportunity to complete the report and fill any remaining gaps at the direction of the Plan Commission.

M. Conard asked D. Lindstrom how long the TND has been a part of the Comprehensive Plan. He stated ever since it was adopted in 2002.

L. Queoff asked if there are currently any structures on the proposed location. D. Lindstrom stated that there are farms and homes included within the boundary area. S. Bremer asked D. Lindstrom to show where these properties are located.

S. Bremer asked if the state requires for a TND concept to be identified and located as part of the Smart Growth Plan and if a TND was specifically identified for this area. D. Lindstrom stated that the Smart Growth Plan state statutes do require a section of the code set towards a traditional neighborhood development and as part of the zoning code<sup>1</sup>.

Ald. J. Wiezbiskie inquired why there are still so many gaps within the concept plan. D. Lindstrom stated they have gone as far as they can but now need feedback from both the public and the Plan Commission.

M. Conard asked D. Lindstrom if it is the market realities of the TND they need to discuss at this time as she is not sure if there is something in the code that is varying in particular that needs to be addressed. He continued by stating the petitioner illustrated to staff that because of market realities, they are not meeting some of the standards and that is partially based on a single developer vs. multiple developers. D. Lindstrom stated the petitioner illustrated to staff that it would not be in their best interest as a land owner to be so prescriptive to a code.

S. Bremer brought up the issue of whether the code and / or the Comp Plan should be amended.

Ald. J. Wiezbiskie stated one of his main concerns is everyday services for the area to include garbage pick-up, police presence, and fire stations, just to name a few. D. Lindstrom responded that that is more of a development issue in general. Those concerns would need to be addressed whether it's a TND or a single family subdivision.

M. Conard suspended the rules for public comments.

Jim Grzeca – 3667 Finger Road: He is opposed to the TND with the density being his main concern. He suggested that whatever the development be, there should be a Homeowner's Association developed. He provided the Plan Commission with a letter regarding his concerns.

Jim Metzler – 442 Erie Road: He stated he is not against development in the area, but would like to see it more as a residential area.

Debby Cesar – 365 S. Grandview Road: D. Cesar stated she is opposed to the TND. Her major concerns are the construction of roadway close to her residence and the multi-family homes that would be constructed in the area.

---

<sup>1</sup> The statutes do not require a TND area to be mapped or designated in the comprehensive plan.

Barbara Brebner – 228 Erie Road: B. Brebner stated she is against the proposed TND. Her major concern is the density and increase of noise.

Pat Kaster – 1317 Lombardi Access Road: P. Kaster stated she has about 93 acres of property in that area and that it is intended to be an extension of the business park district, according to the Comp Plan. She is for this development. She is excited to see growth in this area.

Jack Baldschan – 311 Erie Road: J. Baldschan stated he is opposed to the TND and would like to see it developed as R1 residential. His main concern is density.

Gerald Brebner – 228 Erie Road: He stated this is an incomplete plan and does not feel there is enough greenspace or buffer around existing homes<sup>2</sup>.

Jackie Grzeca – 3667 Finger Road: J. Grzeca stated she is opposed to the TND concept. Her main issue is the fact that she will lose part of her property and trees on the property during expansion and construction of South Grandview road as a result of the development.

Tina Bunker – 825 S. Huron Road, Suite G: T. Bunker gave a brief history of the property and went through the Grandview Place Development Plan. She pointed out that her density ratios were much lower than what was recommended by the zoning code. She believes there is a need for this type of project in this area based on the research that was done. She did hold a neighborhood meeting. Some feedback she received from the meeting is concerns regarding commercial, how narrow the lots are, and density issues to name a few.

A discussion ensued between commissioners and T. Bunker. M. Conard asked about the existing homes. T. Bunker stated they are working with the home owners. S. Bremer wanted to know about the pace of the increasing density and where the park lands will be located. T. Bunker gave a broad timeline of where the building would start and the direction of the construction and showed where the parks would be located. She also asked if there were sidewalks being included in the plan. T. Bunker stated there are many sidewalks in the plan, but they can make that change to add more sidewalks. S. Bremer asked if they would consider lowering the density. T. Bunker stated they are already below the requirements and if they were to change it significantly it would increase the cost of the individual lots. H. Mueller asked if there were any other areas that had new TNDs. D. Lindstrom stated in the Middleton / Madison area and continued that while Green Bay doesn't have any new TNDs the City is supported by many traditional neighborhoods. M. Conard asked what the price range would be for homes on the lots. T. Bunker stated anywhere for a single family home between \$180,000 to 350,000 and a multifamily would start at approximately \$55,000 per unit to be built. T. Gilbert asked what the R1 lot sizes are, in which T. Bunker replied 80 x 105 (8,400 sq. ft.)<sup>3</sup> or about a quarter of an acre. The lots were designed with more depth instead of width.

Mark VerHeyden - 3625 Finger Road: M. VerHeyden stated he feels the information given tonight is conflicting and stated that if you live in these homes on the smaller lots you won't be able to afford the senior living in the same neighborhood.

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

S. Bremer stated she agreed with Ald. J. Wiezbiskie that they are not at the point to vote one way or another on the proposal. However, they should look carefully as to whether or not there are ways of adjusting the zoning of the Smart Growth Plan requirements for this type of a development. She is

---

<sup>2</sup> Planning staff notes all land uses would be required to have greenspace – the plan did not illustrate all on site greenspace.

<sup>3</sup> Planning staff notes the minimum lot area for a standard R1- single family lot is 7,500 sq. ft.

convinced that the City, as a whole, would benefit from a space like this, but would like to see if there can be some adjusting to density.

Ald. J. Wiezbiskie stated he is concerned about the constituents that are already living out there. He is concerned about the fact that this is a huge project and the issue of control.

M. Conard stated that the TND idea itself is a good idea, however, the location is difficult because there are people who live there already and have purchased property and would be affected by this. She does not know if there is a place in the City of Green Bay that this can be done without affecting some property owners. Some of the property owners may have purchased their homes / land prior to the Comp Plan adoption. Those who purchased property / homes after the Comp Plan was adopted may not have been informed as to what is going to happen in that area and people do need to be informed of this information before buying a home or land. It was mentioned that the Comp Plan be accessible to realtors and public for this purpose.

A motion was made by J. Wiezbiskie and seconded by S. Bremer to send the request for a Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) designation in an area generally located north of Finger Road, west of Northview Road, south of Catalina Drive, and east of Erie Road, back to Plan Staff to gather additional information and fulfill the Application process and to consider any flexibility in zoning the Smart Growth Plan and state requirements for Traditional Neighborhoods. Motion carried.

3. (PP 12-02) Discussion and Action on the University Avenue Corridor Brownfield Redevelopment Plan and Resolution. (Ald. J. Wiezbiskie- District 1, Ald. D. Nennig – District 5, Ald. J. Moore – District 6, and Ald. R. Scannell-District 7)

D. Lindstrom introduced the Chair of the Citizen Steering Committee, Mark Nysted, who will be introducing the Green Bay University Avenue Corridor Brownfield Redevelopment Plan.

Mark Nysted thanked D. Lindstrom for all his work to make this project happen. He gave a brief background on how the plan was created. The Citizen Steering Committee (CSC) for this project consisted of citizens, neighborhood associations, businesses, land owners, churches, etc. The CSC actually drove the plan with the help of consultants and staff. He explained the Brownfield grant allowed them to identify some catalyst sites for redevelopment. Other items that were looked at were traffic flow, pedestrian safety, lifestyle, bicycling and other issues that have impacted University Avenue. The challenge regarding University Avenue is lack of attention, identity, and cohesion. The goal is to make University Avenue a destination corridor and a gateway to downtown and UWGB. They are looking for approval from the Plan Commission so they can go to City Council to make this a viable plan. He introduced Phil Carlson, the consultant from Stantec.

P. Carlson stated this is the draft report for the Plan Commission's recommendation to the City Council. He started by explaining what will be found within the plan and how it is organized. He stated the most important part of the plan is the Action Plan and what will come after it. He gave a brief overview of University Avenue and its land uses. He explained what and where the catalyst sites and brownfields are and stated there are five catalyst sites along University Avenue. One of the points of this study is to assess the sites and to be able to help with redevelopment. He then went through and identified the catalyst sites; former Tillman Nursery site, former Packerland Packaging site, the existing American Foods Webster Street Facility, the American Foods training facility, and the former Brown County Mental Health Center. He then went through the project goals and objectives:

1. Encourage a profitable positive safe environment by redeveloping the corridor with many types of uses.

2. Support the existing business climate and care for target new land uses to fill and improve the underutilized sites.
3. Leverage existing public and private catalyst projects to continue economic growth and vitality.
4. Strengthen interaction among developers, business owners, residents and residential groups, and large property owners along University Avenue.
5. Encourage interaction among diverse populations and demographics along the corridor.
6. Improve gateways and corridor aesthetics.
7. Encourage “place making” along University Avenue through advanced public infrastructures.
8. Develop multimodal traffic solutions.
9. Reinforce a positive relationship between the corridor and nearby environmentally sensitive areas.
10. Consider implications of future generations for sustainable development and redevelopment in the University Avenue Corridor.

#### *Market Assessment Plan*

P. Carlson continued by explaining key components of the Market Assessment Plan. The 3 key components are: Housing Market, Retail Market, and Office Market. He then gave examples of projects and possible projects around the University Corridor area as well as sharing information regarding VA Clinic.

#### *The Land Use Plan*

This Land Use Plan is organized throughout the corridor, but also identifies the five catalyst sites. Each catalyst site has their own concept development plans. He identified the land segments traveling west to east along University Avenue.

#### *Action Plan*

The Action Plan is the implementation component of the University Avenue Corridor Plan. P. Carlson stated that public input was a very important key to developing the Plan.

#### *Public Input*

There were several meetings held for the public to attend. During the last public meeting that was held there were over 100 people that had attended the meeting.

A question, answer and comment session ensued between Commissioners and University Avenue Plan project partners. M. Conard asked what the time frame is for implementing the UA Plan. P. Carlson stated anywhere from two (2) months to 40 years. S. Bremer asked if there has been any expressed interest in any of the catalyst sites. M. Nysted stated that there has been some interest in the Catalyst Site #1, former Tillman Nursery. Plan Commission gave positive feedback on the University Avenue Plan.

A motion was made by S. Bremer and seconded by Ald. J. Wiezbiskie to approve the University Avenue Corridor Brownfield Redevelopment Plan and Resolution. Motion carried.

#### **INFORMATIONAL:**

#### **OTHER:**

Director’s Update on Council Actions

P. Neumeyer reported the following information:

- The PUD’s for the Chamber of Commerce sign and East Town Mall Burger King signs were approved.
- A resolution was approved for a CUP for a two-family dwelling at 1865 Deckner Avenue.

**SUBMITTED PETITIONS: (for informational purposes only)**

A motion was made by S. Bremer and seconded by Ald. J. Wiezbiskie to adjourn the meeting.  
Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m.