



**Plan Commission
Meeting Minutes
September 29, 2020**

3930 N. Murray Ave. Village of Shorewood, WI 53211

1. Call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 6:31 p.m.

President Allison Rozek	No
Trustee Kathy Stokebrand	Aye
Eric Couto	Aye
Therese Klein	Aye
Barbara Kiely Miller	Aye
Sangeeta Patel	Aye
Daniel Wycklendt	Aye

Others present were Planning Director Bart Griepentrog, Planning Administrative Clerk Crystal Kopydlowski and Jackie Mich from Vandewalle & Associates.

Trustee Stokebrand ceded the role of committee chair to Mr. Griepentrog who ceded that to Ms. Mich of Vandewalle & Associates.

Ms. Mich asked to move the discussion of the Land Use Chapter up to item number three. Ms. Mich stated she wanted to ensure the commission had enough time to cover all the land use topics as it is a critical item.

Ms. Mich gave the Commission a project status update. She explained that the Vandewalle-led chapters are drafted and Village-led chapters are still in progress. The next step is to review all chapters with the Plan Commission and assemble a full complete plan document with all the chapters and all the maps. From there the project moves into the public participation phase getting the public's input on the drafted plan.

Ms. Mich emphasized that this was a collaborative effort between Vandewalle & Associates and Village staff. Vandewalle is leading three chapters and the public participation. They are advising on maps and will compile and produce the final document.

2. Review of draft Issues and Opportunities Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan Update.

Ms. Mich introduced the chapter and gave an overview of the chapter, the chapter's strategic directions and the strategic directions graphic.

Commissioners discussed the Issues and Opportunities Chapter.

Trustee Stokebrand said the bullet point under Direction 1 which stated "*in general, discourage or prohibit replacement or redevelopment of existing residential adjacent to Capitol and Oakland*" seemed to contradict other areas where flexibility was encouraged. Ms. Mich said this point discusses the properties next to or behind properties on Oakland

and Capitol. Ms. Kiely Miller said this addresses commercial creep into the residential areas and discourages that.

Trustee Stokebrand said another concern was that the mention of affordable housing only addresses the cost of buying houses, apartments or rental units and there is no addressing of taxes under Direction Three. Ms. Mich said that the most common way to do that is work with developers who used affordable housing tax credits and that allows them to bring in affordable units. She said typically tax credits are the way most communities do it but credits do not have anything to do with the village's tax rate but more with incentives that the developer can get that reduces their tax burden to develop the affordable housing. Mr. Griepentrog said taxes were addressed in the Economic Development Chapter but suggested including an additional bullet point focusing on a desire to keep the tax rate low so people are not overburdened.

Ms. Kiely Miller addressed the last bullet point of Direction One that stated only *"using TIF or considering height/bulk increases beyond what is allowed under current zoning when public benefits are allowed"*. She said if there is a zoning height that it has to be respected. Trustee Stokebrand said *"public benefits"* is vague and subjective and asked if the commission was comfortable with that language.

Trustee Stokebrand does not support the bullet point that states *"evaluate and relaunch loan and grant programs"* under Direction Four. She said the grant programs have been highly controversial and suggested removing mention of grant programs. Ms. Kiely Miller agreed that they are controversial. Mr. Griepentrog said recently the grant program was modified and the last three years was a lesser program and less lucrative. He said the CDA has listened to community input and has modified the program. He said if the programs were relaunched they would need to be focused on what the Village and/or CDA would be willing to support and this plan could document that. Mr. Couto suggested rephrasing the bullet to say *"evaluate and potentially relaunch"* and tighten up the language of this bullet point. Ms. Kiely Miller asked about the CDA discussions regarding residential loans. Mr. Griepentrog said there have always been separate residential and commercial loans and that the Neighborhood Improvement Loan is also frozen and will be reevaluate before the commercial program. Ms. Patel asked if a bullet point about this is under the affordable housing strategic direction. Mr. Griepentrog said a bullet point similar to that under strategic direction four would work. Ms. Patel suggested *"evaluate and explore the need for loans and grant programs"*.

Trustee Stokebrand asked about the last bullet under Direction Four that referenced *"encourage small businesses led by people of color by establishing a small business program to utilize vacant commercial spaces by offering reduced rents for startups for a short period"* and questioned if this type of program would work in the village. Ms. Mich said the bullet could be changed to say *"explore and evaluate"*.

Ms. Kiely Miller asked about the mention of form-based zoning (Direction Four) and expressed her concern with having residential in the business district and not having specific zoning uses in our code. Ms. Mich said many of their clients that pursue form-based zoning do more of a hybrid approach which include form-based provisions that relate to the bulk of the building or the height or the setback and then include land use based regulations also. Ms. Mich said that is her recommendation for the village.

3. Review of draft Land Use Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan Update.

Ms. Mich introduced the chapter and gave an overview of the chapter.

Commissioners discussed the Land Use Chapter.

Ms. Mich discussed the Areas Susceptible to Change Map. Ms. Kiely Miller said that some of the areas designated susceptible to change have been developed (Harbor Chase and The Oaks). She also questioned areas that may be less susceptible to change (The Shorewood Animal Hospital, Corner Bakery and Culvers). Ms. Klein said that opinions can change with time. Mr. Griepentrog said he did not want to pick and choose which surface lots could be susceptible. They included all surface lots on the map.

Ms. Mich discussed the working draft of the Future Land Use Map.

Trustee Stokebrand questioned the boundary for the Central Core Mixed Use District and suggested the south boundary be Shorewood Blvd.

Ms. Kiely Miller said that the allowance of taller building height is getting further from the intersection of Capitol and Oakland and she doesn't agree with this. She also asked how many stories are envisioned for the Higher-Density Residential. Ms. Mich said she had 4-5 stories in mind based on the Village's current zoning.

Ms. Kiely Miller recommended 2-4 stories allowed in the Main Street Mixed Use District. Trustee Stokebrand agreed.

Mr. Griepentrog said that if the Plan Commission wanted to recommend by consensus height limits in certain districts that this was where those changes should be made and zoning code changes would be done after.

Trustee Stokebrand asked if going around to each member to see if there was a consensus to change the building height restrictions from 4-5 stories to 2-4 stories in the Main Street Mixed Use and Suburban Mixed Use Districts was what should be done. Mr. Couto said he agreed. Mr. Griepentrog said that he would like to hear the consensus if that was the case. He said if anyone objected now would be the time. Ms. Klein said she had some hesitation and that they are making a decision on building height based on what the Commission feels a neighborhood should feel like and that there are financial part of this. She said no developer will come in and build a two-story building because they will not make any money. She said there has to be a balance between a feasible business plan for development and the request from President Rozek to increase the amount of housing to keep taxes down. These two things seem to go against this desire for a low building height village. She said she is more a proponent of it needs to make sense, it needs to fit, it needs to be financially viable and hold down taxes in our neighborhoods. Mr. Wycklendt agreed. Ms. Patel said the question is more about going from 5 stories to 4 stories in these districts. Mr. Griepentrog said in the zoning code there are areas that allow for up to 5 stories and some that allow for up to 4 stories. He said it is not consistent through a whole corridor and he would like that more clear and clean in the new zoning update after the comprehensive plan update. He said this is not an easy decision. Ms. Mich encouraged the Commission to keep a range at the comprehensive plan level because if the Village does take on a form-based planning process you may find that based on the context of existing buildings some buildings may want to be on the higher end of the range and another may want to be on the lower end.

Ms. Kiely Miller asked about the multi-housing area on the east side of Wilson Drive and thinks of them as a possibility for renovation or redevelopment and they are not listed as a possible future land use and asked why. Mr. Griepentrog said that there is a clear area for low density residential (single and two-family) and higher density which could be a 4-5 story building. He added that there is also a middle range with a 4-10 unit building similar to what is on Wilson Drive. He would advocate for the consideration of a third residential density category and put it on the Wilson Drive corridor.

Ms. Patel said that light and views were always a topic when discussing zoning when she lived in California and because of that concept she would not lump Capitol Drive and Oakland Avenue together. She said that one complaint with Metro Market was the loss of light because of it. Ms. Mich said it was a good point and she would have to research it more. Mr. Griepentrog said it could be addressed with form-based zoning where the first two stories could be continuous development along the street but then the third and fourth could only be no more than a certain feet wide allowing for the sun to peak through.

Ms. Mich reviewed each Central District Future Land Use categories.

Ms. Mich introduced the Central Core Mixed Use District.

Trustee Stokebrand said that in the Central Core Mixed Use District she would not extend 6-8 stories beyond the southeast corner of Oakland and Capitol (beyond that block). Mr. Couto felt the same way with the east side of Oakland Avenue up to Olive Street not allowing 6-8 stories. Ms. Kiely Miller said that was also the feedback from the public and the stakeholders. She feels keeping that height clustered around the intersection of Capitol and Oakland makes sense. Ms. Mich asked where the northern boundary would be changed to. Trustee Stokebrand said nothing north of Capitol.

Ms. Mich said there were people in the public input who wanted more density. She said they knew that whatever map was developed someone would not be happy. She said she is pushing a bit on the 6-8 stories which is not in the current code and if they lower it to 5 stories that is what is currently allowed. She said if they change to lower than what is current that is a policy change. Ms. Mich said that it has to be acknowledged that there are buildings taller than four stories on Oakland north of Capitol Drive.

Ms. Klein and Mr. Wycklendt disagree with not allowing any more six-story buildings north of Capitol Drive. Mr. Wycklendt said there are more spaces north of Capitol Drive taken up by six-story buildings than there are south of Capitol.

Mr. Griepentrog said there was a public comment that referenced a six story building north of Capitol looked less contextual because it was only on the west side and suggested if there was an opportunity to balance it on the east side the district would look more cohesive. He cautioned making non-conforming structures by downsizing the zoning.

Ms. Patel said to leave the current zoning and let developers apply for planned development districts etc. to build outside of what is allowed. Trustee Stokebrand agreed.

Mr. Couto asked if the Commission agreed on the boundaries of the Central Core Mixed Use District. Trustee Stokebrand suggested the south boundary end at Shorewood Blvd. and the north boundary end at Capitol Drive. Mr. Couto agreed.

Mr. Griepentrog said he has heard a legitimate amount of conversation on height for the moment. He did say this is one chapter of the plan and that decisions on height and aesthetics to impact other things like taxes and affordable housing. He will work with Ms. Mich and make sure it all lines up with other things and makes sense moving forward.

Mr. Couto asked how we move forward with the decisions on height. He asked if a vote was should be taken. Mr. Griepentrog explained that the Plan Commission is the recommending body and that the Village Board is the final authority. He said a vote could be done on issues of height and that reasons for dissent could be put in the minutes.

Ms. Mich introduced the Main Street Mixed Use District.

Ms. Kiely Miller said this was the one area she would like to rezone. She encouraged 2-4 stories and there is a mix of residences on Capitol Drive and it is a smaller narrower street with a different character than the entertainment district on Oakland Avenue. Mr. Griepentrog asked if Ms. Kiely Miller was referring to Capitol Drive east of Murray Avenue. She said yes. He said the area is now zoned B-3 which lines up more with Capitol and thinks the recommendation would be to zone it more consistent with the smaller scale Oakland but asked if she was suggesting an even smaller scale. She said yes and felt 4-5 stories was too big and wanted to retain the character of the neighborhood. Ms. Mich encourage 4-5 stories across from the school and the more commercial uses because it would be the most compatible. Trustee Stokebrand asked what the current zoning allows in this area. Ms. Kiely Miller said it is currently zoned for 4-5 stories and she would recommend changing it to 2-4 stories. Mr. Griepentrog said that character and height are two different things. He said there are way to design a 4-story building that could complement the existing neighborhood pattern.

Mr. Wycklendt said there has been a lot of talk about affordability and if we don't encourage development there will not be affordability in the village. Building up is a way to grow the tax base in the village. A four to five story building that is aesthetically pleasing could be great and developers will not come here to tear down and build a 2-4 story building.

Trustee Stokebrand supports 2-4 stories in the Main Street Mixed Use District.

Ms. Kiely Miller supports 2-4 stories in the Main Street Mixed Use District.

Ms. Patel supports 2-4 stories in the Main Street Mixed Use District and if a developer want higher they can seek that out.

Ms. Klein likes the outline/boundary of the area and encourages more shopping and retail down to Downer. She said it is lightly used and could encourage some more livelihood.

Trustee Stokebrand agrees with the boundaries.

Mr. Couto agrees with the boundaries and 2-4 stories for height.

Ms. Mich introduced the Suburban Mixed Use District.

Trustee Stokebrand agreed with this district.

Mr. Couto said this area has less of a sunlight issue. Mr. Wycklendt said that is not necessarily true because if you build big on the north side of Capitol Drive it will block the sun from the south.

Trustee Stokebrand said they seemed to be fans of 2-4 stories. Ms. Klein said there are already a lot of four-story buildings in this district and said someone could build a ten-story building where Culvers is and no one would notice.

Ms. Patel discussed the possibility of making a defined process that makes requesting a taller building easier. Ms. Mich said other communities will have designated criteria and expectations along with a formal process if a developer were requesting a higher building. Ms. Patel suggested maybe designating on the map which areas allow for a procedure like this.

Ms. Klein suggested extending the boundary to the west to include the ReMax building.

Ms. Mich introduced the Higher Density Residential District.

Ms. Klein asked about why some areas on the map go around the few residential properties in the commercial district. Ms. Mich said they should be included because this is a long term plan and that will be researched.

Ms. Klein asked about looking into the River Park area that is zoned exempt institutional which includes the high-rise complex that a lot of people live in.

Ms. Kiely Miller asked what the recommended building height was for this district. Ms. Mich said that she is reviewing the current R-9 district and the B-2 district to provide a recommendation.

Trustee Stokebrand suggested labeling the area Main Street Mixed Use instead. Ms. Klein asked why it is labeled Higher Density Residential and not Main Street Mixed Use. Ms. Mich said because it is predominantly residential now and they try to concentrate the existing mixed use and commercial rather than diffusing them across the village. Ms. Kiely Miller said there are a number of successful businesses in this district currently. Mr. Griepentrog said he would not want to exclude the possibility of some commercial in this district but its predominant characteristic is high density residential. He also said he believed Oakland Avenue in this area is bigger and so it doesn't lend itself to walkability like the north end. He does like the classification category but there is room in there for the maintenance of existing mixed-use structures. Trustee Stokebrand said the consensus is to leave this as High Density Residential. Maintaining the existing mixed-use is more of a zoning fine-grained detail.

Ms. Mich discussed the Central District Master Plan's Land Use Strategy and how proactive the Village should be when it comes to development. She referenced the Redevelopment Opportunities Map and questioned if the plan update should identify specific sites.

Ms. Kiely Miller said that this would be more of a market approach instead of proactively seeking developers. She feels the map is outdated and that the central plaza on the high school property hadn't been a priority when the referendum was going through. She felt the village should not be involved with school district property.

Ms. Patel said she is in the middle of proactive and reactive. She doesn't feel the village should actively seek a developer with a specific idea in mind but would rather have developers come in with their ideas. She said the village should have information available on sites and what is allowed.

Ms. Mich said identifying sites in the plan is a way to market the community to developers.

Mr. Wycklendt said communities need to be proactive to present plans to encourage development and developers to step up. He said the village should designate sites for potential development/redevelopment and make the process easier and not make developers go to multiple long meetings. The Village has to find ways to encourage developers to come here.

Ms. Kiely Miller suggested relooking at the designated sites.

Mr. Griepentrog said when staff sees developers they are often asked about available sites. He said they will direct developers to vacant sites but not others unless designated in this plan or with further direction.

Mr. Couto said he is afraid that if you put a bunch of properties on a list that could anger a property owner. He asked what stops a poll being sent to property owners asking if they would be interested in redeveloping. Mr. Griepentrog said that is asking staff to be

proactive and that has not been asked for. Ms. Kiely Miller said this would be a good first step. Trustee Stokebrand agreed but said this is a staff question and if this can be added to the work load.

Ms. Patel said the map and sites are very subjective which is why she prefers it should be more general.

Mr. Wycklendt likes the idea of giving staff direction to be more proactive with developers when they are seen at conferences etc.

Ms. Mich said the last policy question related to the Areas Susceptible to Change Map. She said there were concerns with how residential areas adjacent to Capitol and Oakland experience somewhat abrupt land use transition between higher density mixed use on the main corridors and the fairly low density residential immediately next door. She said some communities choose to allow somewhat higher density development in these transition areas and that would allow for a more gradual land use transition. The question is whether to promote some change in land use between the high density corridors and the single families in that transition area or keep the current land use pattern.

Ms. Klein asked how you put in a provision like this when a community is all built up. Ms. Mich said it would be a committed developer who would have to buy multiple properties at once and develop them together.

Ms. Kiely Miller said her block has a transition similar to what is being described. She said many blocks adjacent to Oakland and Capitol have a mix of duplexes and single families and doesn't know if we need the disruption of putting something in between.

Trustee Stokebrand said it sounded like there was more of a desire to keep the corridor 2-4 stories rather than making a buffer to make 5 stories look less bad.

Mr. Griepentrog said this was a good conversation that deals with the balance of needs. He explained that currently single families cannot be made into duplexes because the zoning code currently does not allow it. Trustee Stokebrand asked if we are trying to increase housing stock why are we not allowing single families to be converted to duplexes or triplexes. Mr. Griepentrog said this was a previous policy and he cannot answer. Mr. Couto says this flies in the face of all they have been discussing.

Ms. Patel said if you buy a single family residence near the commercial district now you have a better idea of what to expect than you did years ago.

Trustee Stokebrand asked if the policy regarding single family not being allowed to be converted to duplexes should remain. She agreed to leave the policy as is. Mr. Couto agreed.

Ms. Klein said she liked the idea of a transition/buffer zone and that just because you draw the line doesn't make development happen. Mr. Griepentrog said this probably isn't feasible because of the cost of the lots in Shorewood.

Mr. Couto asked why they would want more duplexes. Trustee Stokebrand said it increases the assessed value and provides more housing. She said she sees both sides of the argument.

Ms. Patel said she is not a fan of duplexes.

Trustee Stokebrand said the consensus was to leave the policy as it.

4. Review of draft Intergovernmental Cooperation Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan Update.

The chapter was not discussed and commissioners were encouraged to email or call with their comments on the chapter.

5. Discuss Comprehensive Plan Update Project Schedule

Ms. Mich shared the next steps of the process. Mr. Griepentrog informed the Commission that the public meeting will likely be scheduled in November.

6. Future agenda items.

No future agenda items were discussed.

7. Discuss next meeting(s).

The next meeting will be October 27, 2020.

8. Adjournment.

Mr. Wycklendt moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 p.m., seconded by Mr. Couto. Vote to adjourn 6-0.

Recorded by,



Crystal Kopydlowski
Planning Department Administrative Clerk